

Appendix I:

Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP)

AAP Options Appraisal Summary

Development of Spatial Options 2013 – 2015, Preferred Options for the AAP and Reasons for Choices (January 2016)

Options in Blue Text were identified or modified following Issues & Options Stage (July 2015)

Options Reviewed January 2016 following Preferred Options Stage – No Further Changes Made

See AAP Options Appraisal Matrix (Excel Spreadsheet) for Full Details of High Level SA of AAP Options

AAP Options Appraisal Summary - Development of Spatial Options 2013 – 2015, Preferred Options for the AAP and Reasons for Choices (January 2016)

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
2. Walsall Town Centre						
Options for Town Centre Boundary						
Town Centre Boundary Option 1 (UDP Boundary)	Retain the current extent of the Town Centre boundary as defined on the Walsall UDP 2005 Town Centre Inset Map.	This is the 'do nothing' option and would mean retaining the current boundary for the Town Centre in the adopted Walsall UDP. The existing boundary could be retained unless there is a reason for change.	0	Effects on SA Objectives are likely to be neutral overall although there are some uncertainties with regard to impacts on investment, and therefore on SA Objectives to generate sustainable economic growth and create sustainable communities, improve accessibility, improve air quality, and reduce vulnerability of key facilities to flood risk and other climate change effects.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as there is evidence to support boundary changes.
Town Centre Boundary Option 2 (Expanded Boundary)	Increase the current extent of the Town Centre boundary.	BCCS Policy CEN3 sets ambitious targets for delivery of new retail and office floorspace in the Town Centre, so the Town Centre may need to be expanded to accommodate this. There are also some 'town centre' uses outside of the current boundary that play a role in the centre which the boundary could be extended to include.	0	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be neutral overall. However, there are uncertainties about the effects on some of the SA Options. While the Option would allow more opportunities for development and investment in the strategic centre, which could encourage economic growth and benefit local communities, it could also encourage peripheral development on the edge of the Town Centre rather than investment in the retail core, which could have less positive effects in terms of accessibility, traffic generation, and impacts on air quality. Effects on SA Objectives to reduce vulnerability of key facilities to flood risk and other climate change effects are also uncertain as it is not clear where development would take place.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of a combination of Options 2 and 3 (new Option 4), as there is a need to expand the Town Centre boundary in some areas to incorporate development opportunities and current 'town centre' uses, and there is also a need to contract the boundary in some areas to remove non 'town centre' land uses.
Town Centre Boundary Option 3 (Contracted Boundary)	Decrease the current extent of the Town Centre boundary.	There are some areas of the Town Centre that are poorly related to the rest of the centre and which do not have development opportunities. These areas could be removed to make the Town Centre boundary more logical.	-	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be negative overall. The Option is likely to lead to concentration of development in a smaller centre, leading to a risk of negative effects on townscape character and quality and conservation areas. The Option is also likely to reduce opportunities for development and investment in the strategic centre, leading to uncertain effects on the local economy, local communities, traffic congestion and related impacts on air quality. Effects on SA Objectives to reduce vulnerability of key facilities to flood risk and other climate change effects are also uncertain as it is not clear where development would take place.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of a combination of Options 2 and 3 (Option 4), as there is a need to expand the Town Centre boundary in some areas to incorporate development opportunities and current 'town centre' uses, and there is also a need to contract the boundary in some areas to remove non 'town centre' uses.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Town Centre Boundary Option 4 (Contracted and Expanded Boundary)	The Town Centre boundary is expanded in some areas to incorporate development opportunities and current 'town centre' uses but is also contracted in other areas to remove non- town centre uses.	This is a combination of Options 2 and 3 which allows for a realistic Town Centre boundary to be defined, to include areas that provide opportunities for new 'town centre' development and to remove areas where there are no 'town centre' uses, and which it is not appropriate to include in the Town Centre.	+	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall. The Option would allow non- 'town centre' uses on the edge of the Town Centre to be retained. It would also help create conditions for expanding and improving the range of facilities and services available in the Strategic Centre, making it more attractive for residents and visitors, and therefore more competitive with other centres of a similar size and scale. As the Town Centre is a highly accessible location it may also reduce the distance people need to travel to shop, to work or for leisure. However, there is potential for increased visitors to generate more traffic and congestion and related air quality problems, which would need to be addressed through improved access for pedestrians and cyclists and more effective management of road traffic through the Town Centre. The Option would also not remove the potential for key facilities to become vulnerable to flood risk and other climate change effects, depending on where development would take place.	Preferred Option - see Draft AAP Policies Map and Policy AAP1	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because the Town Centre needs to include sufficient opportunities to deliver new retail floorspace in appropriate locations so it is necessary to expand the boundary to include areas where there is scope for this. It is also appropriate to contract it where there are non-'town centre' land uses that do not need to be included in the Town Centre, because there is little scope for the expansion of 'town centre' uses into these areas.
3. A Place for Shopping						
Options for Primary Shopping Area (PSA) Boundary						
PSA Option 1 (UDP Boundary)	Retain the current PSA boundary as defined on the Walsall UDP 2005 Town Centre Inset Map.	Shopping investment would remain focussed and the heart of the shopping centre (Park Street) would be maintained.	0	Effects on SA Objectives are likely to be neutral overall although there are some uncertainties with regard to impacts on investment, and therefore on SA Objectives to generate sustainable economic growth and create sustainable communities, improve accessibility, improve air quality, and reduce vulnerability of key facilities to flood risk and other climate change effects.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as changes are needed to ensure the PSA is a robust boundary that takes into account current and future retail developments
PSA Option 2 (Expanded Boundary)	Expand the current PSA boundary.	This could allow for larger retail units at a faster rate than through focussing on the current PSA allowing the AAP to deliver the BCCS targets.	-	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be negative overall. While expanding the PSA may deliver larger retail units at a faster rate than through focussing on the current PSA, this could also result in a shift of investment away from Park Street and St Matthew's Quarter. This in turn could lead to an increase in empty units within these locations, and poor pedestrian links as the retail offer is diluted. The economic impact on is therefore potentially negative, and the more recent work on the AAP has suggested the plan should focus investment in order to sustain the current retail offer and to attract further investment.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it may result in a shift of investment away from Park Street and St Matthew's Quarter which could in turn lead to an increase in empty units within these locations, and poor pedestrian links as the retail offer is diluted. Also, since the targets for retail floorspace have been reduced, expanding the PSA would not be sustainable.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
PSA Option 3 (Contracted Boundary)	Reduce the current PSA boundary.	Reducing the PSA could result in fewer vacant units and a more compact retail offer.	+	Effects on SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall. Reducing the PSA may result in fewer vacant units and a more compact retail offer. This should result in the most accessible and vibrant Town Centre. This may, however, mean it is difficult to deliver the larger units required to meet modern retailers' demands. As a result, larger units may locate on the edge of the centre as the PSA cannot accommodate them which may mean some are less well linked, although there is potential for the AAP to identify well-located edge-of-centre sites for convenience retailing or bulky goods to try and overcome this impact, by ensuring the most suitable locations are considered for development first in accordance with the sequential approach. A concentrated area for development may also result in more changes to the built environment and a impact on the centres character. However the AAP is supported by a characterisation study that aims to limit the negative impact on the centres character, and the plan also identifies area within the PSA which would benefit most from development avoiding the redevelopment of buildings with significant character.	Preferred Option - see Draft AAP Policies Map and Policy AAPS1	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because the PSA boundary needs to reflect the likely scope for future retail development over the plan period. It is therefore proposed to reduce the PSA to remove some sites that we do not foresee being developed for retail use.
PSA Option 4 (Phased Expanded Boundary)	Expand the PSA once all development opportunities within the current Primary Shopping Area have been maximised.	A staged approach would help to protect the retail core while ensuring space for further retail investment.	0	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be neutral overall although there are some uncertainties over the effects of this approach. A staged approach would help to protect the retail core while ensuring space for further retail investment. However an expanded PSA overall could be difficult to sustain and protect, which may lead to increased vacancies if demand decreases after the expansion.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it would result in the same risks as Option 2, and given the revised retail targets for the Town Centre, there is no need to allocate for sites outside of the current boundary.
Options for Location of Major Retail Development						
Location of New Retail Option 1 (Park Street & St. Matthew's Quarter Only)	Park Street (as defined in Figure 4.2 of main AAP document) and St Matthew's Quarter are allocated for retail development opportunities.	This would mean that shopping investment remains focussed and the heart of the shopping centre would be maintained.	++	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be very positive overall, as concentrating development could result in a more attractive centre as investment is focussed and vacancy rates are reduced, and it will also encourage redevelopment of unattractive parts of the centre.	Part of Preferred Option, which is a combination of this Option and Option 4 - see Draft AAP Policies AAPS2 and AAPIS and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as part of the Preferred Option because It is important for the future health and status of the Town Centre to attract new development into the heart of the shopping centre. The draft policy therefore promotes the PSA as the main focus for new retail development, with sites in St Matthew's and Park Street identified as opportunities.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Location of New Retail Option 2 (Park Street & St. Matthew's Quarter Then Other Locations)	Once opportunities have been maximised for Park Street and St Matthew's Quarter, development opportunities elsewhere in the Town Centre will be allocated for retail development.	A phased approach to the location of major new retail investment would ensure the heart of the shopping centre is protected whilst providing opportunities to meet the comparison retail targets.	+	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall. While investment may take longer to deliver as Park Street and St Matthew's Quarter are in need of redevelopment and reconfiguration in order to meet modern retailers' requirements, this approach would ensure a sustainable approach to retail development in the Town Centre so that development is steered towards the most appropriate and accessible locations with priority in the short-term being given to the existing retail core.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as the proposed reduction in the target for new retail floorspace means it is not necessary to allocate new sites or areas for future retail development. The sequential approach will be applied to any retail proposals that cannot be accommodated in the PSA.
Location of New Retail Option 3 (Market-Led - No Opportunities Identified in AAP)	The location of major retail development is uncontrolled through the AAP and the location of key retail is left to the market.	It would be possible to leave location of new retail development entirely to the market, so the option needs to be explored.	?	Effects of this option on the SA Objectives are uncertain, but could be negative, as the Council would have little control over the location of new retail development and the heart of centre would be at risk of further decline as investment is attracted to easier to develop edge-of-centre locations. A lack of control over the location of retail development would have implications for the delivery of other targets such as office floor space or leisure.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it would mean that the Council would have little control over the location of new retail development and the heart of centre would be at risk of further decline as investment is attracted to easier to develop edge-of-centre locations.
Location of New Retail Option 4 (No Provision for Additional Retail Floorspace)	No provision is made in the AAP for additional retail floorspace in the Town Centre.	Variation on Option 3 but without any commitment to delivery of any new retail floorspace in the Town Centre.	N/A	This is not a 'reasonable alternative' and has therefore not been subject to appraisal.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it is not a 'reasonable alternative.' This approach would be contrary to the Black Country spatial strategy, and would seriously harm the health of the Town Centre and its ability to attract new investment. See 'Unreasonable Options' schedule for further details of the reasons for rejecting this Option.
Location of New Retail Option 5: (Identify Appropriately Located Sites for Convenience and Bulky Goods Retailing Outside the PSA)	The plan would identify sequentially preferable sites outside the PSA, which are as well-linked to the PSA as possible, and which should be considered by applicants in preference to other sites outside the PSA, in order to minimise the negative effects of developing outside the PSA whilst not discouraging investment.	It is proposed to contract the PSA in order to concentrate investment, and to reflect the new lower retail floorspace targets. However, there are demands for convenience retailing and bulky goods that the Council is aware of. It would therefore be a reasonable option for the Council to identify preferred sites outside the PSA which have the potential to be well-linked to the PSA, which should be considered by applicants who are looking to bring forward retail development that cannot be accommodated in the PSA.	+	This Option would have positive effects overall, as it would ensure that investment that might otherwise be diverted towards other centres outside Walsall could be accommodated in appropriate locations on the edge of the PSA, where there are opportunities to link pedestrian and cycle routes with the retail core areas within the PSA.	Part of Preferred Option, which is a combination of this Option and Option 1 - see Draft AAP Policy AAPS2 and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as part of the Preferred Option because there is a need for the AAP to provide further guidance on locations for these types of development to strengthen the Council's position on the sequential approach and encourage investment in sites that link best to the PSA, where retail development cannot be accommodated within it. The draft policy therefore identifies a number of edge-of-centre locations where new convenience and bulky goods retailing will be supported, where it can be demonstrated that the development is in accordance with the sequential approach.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Walsall Market						
Walsall Market Option 1 (The Bridge/ Bradford Street)	Pursue the proposed permanent location for Walsall Market on The Bridge and in Bradford Street.	The work being undertaken on the location for a new market at the Issues & Options stage in 2013 indicated that this was the most appropriate location for the Market.	+	Effects of this option on the SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall, as the Bridge is considered the most accessible location for Walsall Market, and is a large area of public space, allowing a high quality environment to be created, to improve the attractiveness of the Market and Town Centre as a whole.	Preferred Option - see Draft AAP Policies Map and Policy AAP3	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because planning permission has now been granted for the permanent location of the Market on The Bridge and in Bradford Street. The AAP Draft Plan therefore allocates the site covered by the planning permission as the location for the Market.
Walsall Market Option 2 (Other Indoor/ Outdoor Locations)	The Council reconsiders other potential indoor and outdoor locations for Walsall Market.	The work being undertaken on the location for a new market had not been concluded at the Issues & Options stage in 2013, so at the time it was reasonable to explore other options for the location of the Market.	?	The overall effects on the Option on the SA Objectives are uncertain, as it is not clear where the Market would be located or what form it would take, so there is potential for positive and negative effects on accessibility, visual impacts, and the overall retail offer of the Town Centre.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as the outcomes of work commissioned by the Council as part of the planning application concluded that the Market should be located permanently on The Bridge and in Bradford Street. The proposal now has planning permission.
4. A Place for Business						
Options for New Major Office Development						
Location of New Offices Option 1 (Gigaport)	The Gigaport remains the prime location for office development in Walsall Town Centre.	Gigaport has been a long term aspiration of the Council and the area has outline permission for office development.	+	Overall, the option is likely to have positive effects on the SA Objectives, as the Gigaport provides enough sites suitable for office development in an accessible and visible location. Through having a specific area to encourage office development it is hoped this will create a high quality businesses environment in the centre triggering further investment. There may be some increase in traffic and emissions along the Ring Road which already suffers from congestion. Some developments may need to be set away from the road to reduce the impact of air pollution on the scheme.	Preferred Option - see Draft AAP Policy AAPB1	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because it is considered to be the most appropriate location to focus new office development and for the development of a business district. The Draft AAP therefore proposes to allocate Gigaport as the prime office location in the Town Centre.
Location of New Offices Option 2 (Dispersed Locations)	Offices are dispersed around the centre.	There are a number of locations where offices could be accommodated so the option needs to be explored.	+	Overall, the option is likely to have positive effects on the SA Objectives as footfall generated by office developments would be spread out around the Town Centre, which may help support surrounding retail and other uses. However, there are some uncertainties as it may be more difficult to create an office environment in the Town Centre, and areas within the Gigaport could remain undeveloped, impacting on the attractiveness of the centre overall.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as it would mean office accommodation could be spread across the Town Centre, missing out on the opportunity to create a specific business district, and therefore making the offer less attractive to investors and businesses.
Location of New Offices Option 3 (No Provision for Additional Office Floorspace)	No provision is made in the AAP for additional office floorspace in the Town Centre.	There is currently only a limited office market in the Town Centre and it may be difficult to encourage further large-scale office development.	N/A	This is not a 'reasonable alternative' and has therefore not been subject to appraisal.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it is not a 'reasonable alternative.' This approach would be contrary to the Black Country spatial strategy, and would seriously harm the health of the Town Centre and its ability to attract new investment. See 'Unreasonable Options' schedule for further details of the reasons for rejecting this Option.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Current Office Stock						
Current Office Stock Option 1 (Encourage Investment in Current Office Stock)	The AAP identifies current office stock in the Town Centre that may be outdated and in some case underused, which would benefit from further investment to improve the quality, attractiveness and suitability of the office stock for existing and prospective occupiers.	There are a number of office blocks that would benefit from investment however there have also been a number of proposals to redevelopment these for housing. The policy therefore looks to promote the investment in office and to deter the loss of offices in the centre	+	Effects of this option on the SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall, as it could encourage investment in current office stock that would make the units more appealing to businesses attracting new businesses into the centre supporting the local economy. It could also have a positive impact on the environment of the centre as buildings are enhanced. However, there is no guarantee that the offices identified would be attractive to investors.	Preferred Option - see Draft AAP Policy AAPB1	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because there are a number of office blocks in the Town Centre that could significantly improve the range and quality of the existing office stock available if they were refurbished. The Draft AAP therefore identifies the office blocks that it is desirable to retain and upgrade, and encourages proposals to refurbish them.
Current Office Stock Option 2 (Allocate Current Office Stock for Alternative Uses)	The AAP identifies current office stock in the Town Centre that may be outdated and in some case underused, which could be allocated for redevelopment or conversion to alternative uses such as residential.	There have been a number of proposals for the conversion of office floor space to residential so the approach could be formalised through the plan.	?	Effects of this option on the SA Objectives are uncertain. On the one hand, it could have positive effects in terms of encouraging the beneficial use of office units that are currently vacant, helping to bring life into the centre, and having a positive impact on the environment of the centre as buildings are enhanced. However, the loss of office floorspace could have a negative impact on the economy of Walsall. It is also unclear whether it would result in good quality housing being created, as this would depend on which office buildings are identified and where they are within the Town Centre.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as sufficient opportunities for conversion of obsolete office stock are likely to come forward through the market rather than through the local plan, particularly if the current relaxation of controls over office conversions to residential are continued into the future. However, the Draft AAP does encourage conversion of existing buildings to residential use where appropriate, including offices, through Draft AAP Policy AAPLV1.
Options for Social Enterprise						
Social Enterprise Option 1 (No Policy on Social Enterprise)	The AAP does not include any policy to encourage social enterprise in particular areas of the Town Centre and leaves it completely flexible as to where new social enterprises can be developed.	This is the 'do nothing option' where the plan would have no policy or area within the town centre identified to promote social enterprises in the Town Centre, allowing complete flexibility over where these types of enterprises could be developed.	?	Effects of this option on the SA Objectives are likely to be uncertain overall. There is already some social enterprise activity in the Town Centre which could continue without the policy, but it is less likely that this could grow and provide more opportunities for young people to develop their skills and access jobs, or start their own businesses, if the AAP does not recognise this and support further clustering of social enterprises in the same area.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected because it is more likely that new social enterprises will be attracted to an area where there is already a focus for these types of enterprises.
Social Enterprise Option 2 (Identify Social Enterprise Zone) – include a policy in the AAP identifying a Social Enterprise Zone around the Goldmine Centre	The AAP includes a policy identifying a Social Enterprise Zone around the Goldmine Centre where new social enterprises will be encouraged to develop.	This would support development/ clustering of new social enterprises around the Goldmine Centre in line with the Black Country LEP Social Enterprise Prospectus.	+	Effects of this option on the SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall, as it would encourage the growth of the current social enterprise at the Goldmine Centre, and would support further clustering of social enterprises focussing on different needs in the same area, offering more opportunities for young people to develop their skills and access jobs, or start their own businesses.	Preferred Option - see Draft AAP Policy AAPB2	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because this approach reflects the work already done to encourage social enterprise in this area, and provides a basis to build on and develop this further. The Draft AAP therefore identifies a Social Enterprise Zone around the Goldmine Centre.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Industrial Uses						
Industrial Uses Option 1 (Safeguard Existing Industrial Areas)	The AAP protects and enhances the current industrial uses within the Town Centre boundary.	There are existing employment uses in the Town Centre which the AAP could look to promote.	-	Effects on SA Objectives are likely to be negative overall. While there could be some positive effects in terms of protecting existing industrial jobs and industrial heritage, it is also likely to constrain the expansion of the businesses, conflict with surrounding land uses, and discourage the development of new 'town centre' uses in the Town Centre, in particular, offices.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as some of the existing employment uses in the Town Centre are not necessarily in the most appropriate location. This may constrain the businesses, conflict with surrounding uses, and stop areas being used for development of 'town centre' uses, especially offices.
Industrial Uses Option 2 (Allow Incremental Change to Other Uses)	Alternative uses for the current industrial sites and the relocation of industry are considered once all other development opportunities have been maximised, in accordance with BCCS Policies (in particular, DEL2).	This is the 'do minimum' option, representing the current situation, while also allowing for flexibility. It allows industry to be protected where appropriate without constraining the growth of the Town Centre and development of 'town centre' uses.	+	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall, as this option would allow industry to be protected where appropriate, without constraining the growth of the Town Centre and development of 'town centre' uses. However, there are some uncertainties about the effects, as it may put pressure on business owners to relocate, so the effects on the local economy would depend on a mechanism for relocating industry being found, otherwise there is a risk that industry and jobs could be lost or be relocated outside Walsall.	Preferred Option - see Draft AAP Policy AAPB3	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because this approach recognises that the employment land in the Town Centre is of variable quality and that some sites could have potential for further employment use. It is proposed to identify the sites that should be protected as either Existing High Quality or Retained Local Quality Industry, and those that could be released for other development, based on the guidance in the BCCS and the evidence from the 2015 Walsall Employment Land Review.
Industrial Uses Option 3 (Target Specific Industrial Sectors)	The AAP aims to attract particular industrial sectors, for example, those that could benefit from the close location to the Manor Hospital, where sites could be allocated for the promotion of Research and Development or other related uses.	This approach could help with the diversification of the economy within the Town Centre, attract new businesses and bring more expenditure into the centre.	+	Effects on SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall, as this option could help with the diversification of the economy within the Town Centre, attract new businesses and bring more expenditure into the centre. However, there is currently little evidence of need for particular sectors within Walsall and there could also be competition for land from other 'town centre' uses. For the benefits to be realised a balance would need to be found between promoting industrial sectors and identifying suitable locations for them to develop, while at the same time identifying suitable opportunities for 'town centre' development.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as there is not sufficient evidence to support a targeted approach and new industry such as this would be better directed towards areas identified as Existing or Potential High Quality Industry outside of the Town Centre boundary (see SAD Draft Plan Policies IND1 and IND2).
Industrial Uses Option 4 (Do Not Safeguard Any Industrial Areas): No protection in the AAP for existing industrial land or for occupiers of the land.	All industrial land in the Town Centre is allocated for alternative uses without any process of ensuring the current occupiers have suitable premises to relocate.	This approach could provide further opportunities for 'town centre' developments or residential development on industrial land in the Town Centre.	N/A	This is not a 'reasonable alternative' and has therefore not been subject to appraisal.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it is not a 'reasonable alternative.' This approach would be contrary to the Black Country spatial strategy, would impact on existing businesses and may result in the loss of employment. See 'Unreasonable Options' schedule for further details of the reasons for rejecting this Option.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
5. A Place for Leisure						
Options for Leisure Facilities						
Leisure Facilities Option 1 (No Change to Gala Baths)	The Council does not invest in the Gala Baths.	When the Issues & Options were identified in 2013 the Gala Baths was not considered a priority for investment in sports, so this option needed to be explored.	-	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be negative overall - whilst in the short term the service provided would remain the same, it is anticipated that without further investment in the near future the Baths would fall into disrepair and would become unviable for the Council to run. In the long-term this is likely to have negative effects on visual amenity as well as on provision for sport and recreation if the building becomes vacant and derelict.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 2, as the Gala Baths is now recognised as being in need of investment to secure its future and the Council has committed funding to achieve this.
Leisure Facilities Option 2 (Retain and Invest in Gala Baths)	The Council invests in the Gala Baths in its current location.	When the Issues & Options were identified in 2013 this was one of a number of options being considered for the Gala Baths.	++	This is likely to have very positive impacts on the SA Objectives overall as it would ensure that the Gala Baths stays open, accessible and viable for a longer period of time, and is likely to attract more users to the facility as well as providing opportunities to enhance the quality of the building.	Preferred Option - see Draft AAP Policies Map and Policy AAPLE2	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because the Council has now committed funding towards the retention and refurbishment of the Gala Baths on its existing site. It is therefore proposed to identify the site in the AAP as the key location for sports provision in the Town Centre.
Leisure Facilities Option 3 (Close Gala Baths and Invest in Other Facilities)	The Council invests in leisure facilities elsewhere in the Town Centre.	The Gala Baths is a restricted site in terms of opportunities to enhance the quality of the facility and the range of sporting facilities on offer. It may therefore be preferable to invest in other sports and leisure facilities elsewhere in the Town Centre.	?	Effects of this option on the SA Objectives are uncertain, as it would depend on the location of the new facility and whether it would exactly replace the existing provision of Gala Baths.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 2, as the Council has committed investment to the Gala Baths for refurbishment. Securing the funding needed to invest in another leisure facility would be difficult, as would securing a new use for the current Gala Baths site.
Leisure Facilities Option 4 (Replace Gala Baths with New Leisure Centre)	The Council seeks partner and/or private sector investment to deliver leisure facilities in the Town Centre.	The Gala Baths is a restricted site in terms of opportunities to enhance the quality of the facility and the range of sporting facilities on offer. It may therefore be preferable to identify another site in the Town Centre where there is more scope to develop a new modern leisure centre pool and related sports and leisure facilities.	?	Effects of this option on the SA Objectives are uncertain, as it would depend on the location of the new facility and whether it would exactly replace the existing provision of Gala Baths. It would also depend on the market and the Council's ability to secure an appropriate partner or investor.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 2, as the Council has now committed investment to the Gala Baths for refurbishment. Securing the funding needed to develop a new leisure facility on a new site would be difficult, as would securing a new use for the current Gala Baths site.
Leisure Facilities Option 5 (No Leisure Facilities in Town Centre)	The Council does not provide any leisure facilities in the Town Centre.	If the Baths closed it could be possible that no provision was found in the Town Centre as there are other facilities communities could access outside of the centre.	--	The overall effects of this option on the SA Objectives would be very negative, particularly with regard to the health and well-being of Walsall's residents, as the Town Centre is the most accessible location in the borough for this type of facility, so the closure of the facility would reduce the ability of residents to access health and fitness facilities.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 2, as maintaining the Gala Baths is now identified as a priority for the Council.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Cultural and Community Facilities - Museums and Local History Centre						
Cultural and Community Facilities Option 1 (Allocate Leather Museum Site)	The Leather Museum site is allocated as a potential location for a combined Museum and Local History Centre.	When the Issues & Options were identified in 2013 the Council was considering a proposal to combine the Leather Museum and Walsall Museum with the Local History Centre, therefore this was an option that needed to be considered.	++	Overall effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be very positive as this option would help to retain an important historic asset in its existing location and setting, and would also provide an enhanced community facility, bringing similar uses together within the Town Centre. There are some uncertainties about the future uses of the buildings to be vacated - while the area vacated by the Walsall Museum is part of the Central Library and could therefore be re-used by the Library or as Council offices, there is some uncertainty about what will happen to the existing Local History Centre building.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policies Map and Policy AAPLE2	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because the Council has now agreed to the creation of an integrated heritage centre based at the Leather Museum, and this is planned to be implemented by 2018. Walsall Museum closed in April 2015 but it is intended that the Museum collection will be relocated to the Leather Museum, and that the Local History Centre will also be relocated to this site. This option provides greater certainty that the Council's aspirations will be met and is also likely to be essential to securing any funding likely to be available to deliver the project. It is therefore proposed to allocate the site in the AAP and to include an enabling policy.
Cultural and Community Facilities Option 2 (Do Not Allocate Any Site)	The AAP does not allocate a specific site for a combined Museum and Local History Centre.	As the funding for a combined Museum and Local History Centre had not been secured at the time that the Issues & Options were identified in 2013, an alternative option was identified for the AAP not to allocate any site for such a facility.	0	Overall effects on the SA Objectives would be neutral, although there would be some uncertainties about the long-term future of the facilities given the difficulties of funding each of them at a time of economic constraints. Indeed, since the Issues & Options stage in 2013, Walsall Museum has closed due to budgetary cuts, pending the proposed relocation of its collection to the Leather Museum.	Rejected	This option has been overtaken by events, and has been rejected in favour of Option 1, because the Council has now agreed to the creation of an integrated heritage centre based at the Leather Museum, and this is planned to be implemented by 2018.
Options for Cultural and Community Facilities – Performance Venues						
Cultural and Community Facilities Option 3 (New Large Performance Venue)	The AAP allocates land for a large performance venue.	There is a recognised gap in provision for such a venue.	+	Overall, the effects of this option would be positive if delivered, as it would be positive for the vitality of the Town Centre. As it would be provided in a highly accessible location, it would also have wider benefits for local communities. However, there are uncertainties about delivery as this depends on whether there is a market for such a venue and whether it would be economically viable.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as there is no evidence that such a facility could be delivered.
Cultural and Community Facilities Option 4 (Promote Existing Performance Venues)	The AAP identifies, promotes and protects existing venues (Walsall Town Hall, New Art Gallery, Walsall College).	There are a number of facilities in the centre which could be made more use of and the AAP could look to promote this approach.	++	Overall effects on SA Objectives are likely to be very positive, as while this option would not add to the provision for live performance venues in the Town Centre, it is likely to enhance the role of existing facilities and may help to make them more viable and secure their future. As these facilities are in a highly accessible location, it would also have wider benefits for local communities.	Preferred Option is a combination of this Option and Options 5 and 6– see Draft SAD AAP Policy AAPLE2	Preferred Option is a combination of Options 4, 5 and 6 because there is little evidence of a demand for a new facility. The Draft AAP therefore identifies the Town Hall as an existing facility which will be promoted as a venue for performance events, while also allowing for new performance venues to come forward in appropriate locations.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Cultural and Community Facilities Option 5 (No Provision for Performance Venues)	The AAP leaves the location of cultural and community facilities to the market.	Such as use would be suitable in the town centre and it is possible that a proposal would come forward.	?	Overall effects on SA Objectives are uncertain, as the Council would have reduced control over locations and phasing, however the negative impacts of allocating land, such as discouraging other types of 'town centre' development that would benefit the centre, would be avoided.	Preferred Option is a combination of this Option and Options 4 and 6– see Draft SAD AAP Policy AAPLE2	Preferred Option is a combination of Options 4, 5 and 6 because there is little evidence of a demand for a new facility. The AAP therefore promotes existing performance venues, as well as supporting investment in other leisure uses, although it is not explicit about a new performance venue.
Cultural and Community Facilities Option 6 (Provide Performance Venues in Mixed Use Schemes)	The AAP allocates locations for mixed use leisure opportunities which include performance space.	There are a number of locations where this is possible use along with other centre uses.	++	Overall effects on SA Objectives are uncertain, as the Council would have reduced control over locations and phasing, however the negative impacts of allocating land, such as discouraging other types of 'town centre' development that would benefit the centre, would be avoided.	Preferred Option is a combination of this Option and Options 4 and 5– see Draft SAD AAP Policy AAPLE2	Preferred Option is a combination of Options 4, 5 and 6 because there is little evidence of a demand for a new facility. The AAP therefore promotes existing performance venues, as well as supporting investment in other leisure uses, although it is not explicit about a new performance venue.
Options for Cultural and Community Facilities – Outdoor Events						
Cultural and Community Facilities Option 7 (Identify Spaces for Outdoor Events)	The AAP allocates space(s) for outside performances and events that is to be protected, enhanced and promoted through the redevelopment of the Town Centre.	There is a gap in formal recognised space for such a use.	++	Overall effects on SA Objectives are likely to be very positive, as outside events or performances are likely to have a positive effect on the vitality and viability of the Town Centre. As the Town Centre is highly accessible location, it would also have wider benefits for local communities to hold such events in a location that they can easily access by public transport.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 8 as there is a need for flexibility over how public spaces in the Town Centre are used. There are already public spaces which could be used for public outdoor events, and these areas will be protected through other AAP policies for the Market and Public Realm.
Cultural and Community Facilities Option 8 (No Provision for Outdoor Events)	The AAP does not allocate or set any policies for the promotion of outdoor performances or events.	There are spaces which already provide opportunities for public events without a formal allocation.	--	Overall effects of this option on the SA Objectives are likely to be negative, as it would reduce the likelihood of major outdoor events taking place in the Town Centre, and therefore there could be opportunity costs/ economic impacts from the loss of the potential increased footfall/ expenditure that such events bring, as well as forcing local communities to go elsewhere to less accessible locations for such events. It could also mean that outdoor public spaces not in the control of the Council are not available for events or are not protected against development.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policies AAPS3 and AAPLV7	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because there is a need to allow flexibility over how public spaces in the Town Centre are used. There are already public spaces which could be used for public events and the proposed new Market has also been designed so that the stalls can be demounted allowing for The Bridge area to be used for public spaces. It is therefore proposed that the AAP should promote public events and the protection of public spaces where events could take place, but does not allocate any spaces for outdoor events.
Options for Evening Economy						
Evening Economy Option 1 (Zones Identified for Investment)	The AAP identifies particular zones within the Town Centre in which to focus investment in the evening economy.	There are some areas in the centre where there is a concentration of evening economy uses.	?	The overall effects on the SA Objectives would be uncertain - while there would be benefits in terms of co-locating such uses, including policing/ public safety and management of noise, it may lead to other areas of the Town Centre being deserted in the evenings and could therefore have economic impacts on these areas as well as making them less safe and welcoming to people.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 3, as there is likely to be limited demand for investment in the evening economy in Walsall. It is therefore proposed to allocate Walsall Waterfront as a leisure destination and to steer leisure uses towards this location in preference to other areas.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Evening Economy Option 2 (Dispersed Development)	The location of evening economy establishments is not zoned.	Many sites within the town centre are suitable for evening economy uses and such uses bring vibrancy and increased surveillance in the centre. This is the 'do minimum' option, as it would be left to the market to decide where new evening economy establishments should be developed.	?	The effects of this option on the SA Objectives are also uncertain, as the Council would have less control over the location of such uses and the benefits of co-location may not be realised. However, there may be benefits of dispersing such uses across the Town Centre, such as ensuring animation at all times of the day and night, dispersing noise and reducing the risks of anti-social behaviour from concentrating people in one area.	Rejected although some flexibility is proposed – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLE1	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 3, as Walsall Waterfront has been identified as the main location where leisure developments should be focused. However, there will be flexibility to develop leisure uses elsewhere in the Town Centre, where they will not jeopardise delivery of Walsall Waterfront.
Evening Economy Option 3 (Specific Locations for Development)	The location of evening economy establishments is not zoned but specific locations are identified where they could be developed.	This is a variation on Option 1 and would involve identifying specific locations in the Town Centre which could be particularly suitable for development of new evening economy establishments, rather than 'zones,' for example, Walsall Waterfront.	?	Overall effects on the SA Objectives are uncertain. It is likely to have many of the benefits of Option 1 in terms of synergies from co-location of evening economy establishments with other complementary leisure uses. By identifying specific locations rather than wider 'zones,' depending on the choice of location, there is also less risk of adverse impacts on other land uses which are not complementary to the evening economy, such as housing.	Preferred Option - see Draft AAP Policy AAPLE1	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option, because there is likely to be limited demand for investment in the evening economy in the Town Centre. It is therefore proposed to allocate Walsall Waterfront as a leisure destination, and to steer leisure uses, including evening economy establishments, towards this location.
Options for Overnight Accommodation						
Overnight Accommodation Option 1 (Zones Identified for Investment)	The AAP identifies particular zones within the Town Centre in which to focus investment in overnight accommodation.	There are some areas which could be a focus for leisure development, including hotels, such as Walsall Waterfront.	+	Overall effects of this option on the SA Objectives would be positive, as new hotel development is likely to improve the vitality and viability of the Town Centre. Identifying 'zones' where hotel development is likely to be particularly suitable would also reduce the likelihood of land use conflicts or competition with other 'town centre' land uses. This option could also have wider benefits for visitors and local communities, as 'zones' could be identified near to public transport hubs.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 3, as there is not considered to be sufficient demand to identify 'zones' for hotels. However, areas of the Town Centre that are suitable for hotel investment have been identified in the Draft AAP.
Overnight Accommodation Option 2 (Dispersed Development)	The location of overnight accommodation is not zoned but is dispersed around the Town Centre to support different elements of the Town Centre offer.	There are a number of locations in the Town Centre which could be suitable for a new hotel development. This is the 'do minimum' or 'do nothing' option, as it would be left to the market to decide where new hotels should be developed.	?	Effects of this option on the SA Objectives are uncertain, as the Council would have less control over location, which could mean hotels are less accessible to public transport links and may lead to land use conflict/ competition with other 'town centre' development. However, allowing hotels to be built anywhere in the Town Centre could be more attractive to the market, as there would be more potential for hotels to serve different areas/ niches within the hotel sector.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 3, as there are some areas of the Town Centre that are particularly suitable for hotel investment, so it would be appropriate to identify these areas as preferred locations in the AAP.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Overnight Accommodation Option 3 (Specific Locations for Development)	The location of overnight accommodation is not zoned but specific locations are identified where hotels could be developed.	This is a variation on Option 1 and would involve identifying specific locations in the Town Centre which are considered suitable for a new hotel development, rather than 'zones.'	+	Overall effects of this option on the SA Objectives would be very similar to Option 1 and would be positive, as new hotel development is likely to improve the vitality and viability of the Town Centre. Identifying specific locations or sites where hotel development is encouraged would also reduce the likelihood of land use conflicts or competition with other 'town centre' land uses. This option could also have wider benefits for visitors and local communities, as hotels and associated restaurants and function spaces could be steered towards locations near to public transport hubs.	Preferred Option - see Draft AAP Policy AAPLE3	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option, because some parts of the Town Centre are considered to be particularly suitable for development of new hotels. It is therefore desirable to steer any new investment available towards these areas.
Options for Walsall Canal Arm, Towpaths and Basin						
Canal Option 1 (Development Required to Enhance Canalside Environment)	The AAP sets higher standards of design for development along the Canal and requires development fronting the Canal to financially contribute towards the enhancement of the canal network. This would supplement the existing local plan policy and supplementary planning guidance ('saved' UDP Policies ENV29 and T11, BCCS Policies CSP3, CSP4, CSP5 and ENV4, Designing Walsall SPD, Walsall Waterfront SPD).	The Walsall Canal is an important asset to Walsall Town Centre and should be promoted and protected as much as possible. It is acknowledged that there is existing policy guidance in place and that much of the canalside environment in the Town Centre has already been developed. However, this option would allow higher standards of design to be set in the AAP for further new developments adjacent to the Canal, requiring them to create attractive routes and spaces.	+	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall. Providing more specific guidance in the AAP would allow the Council more control over any further development surrounding the Canal, so it is more likely to be attractive, well designed, and accessible for all members of the community. The Canal is designated as a Conservation Area and providing guidance will also ensure that all new canalside development respects the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as well as enhancing the wider townscape, and contributing appropriately towards wider walking, cycling and environmental networks.	Preferred Option - see Draft AAP Policy AAPLE4	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option, because there is a need for a specific policy to guide the development of the remaining areas adjacent to the Walsall Canal in the Town Centre. It is therefore proposed to include a policy in the AAP promoting the Canal as a location for new development, including moorings, but requiring new developments to be appropriately designed and to contribute towards green infrastructure and enhancement of biodiversity and heritage assets, and towards improved access and connections to this important Town Centre amenity.
Canal Option 2 (Development Not Required to Enhance Canalside Environment)	This is the 'do nothing' or 'do minimum' option as it would mean relying on existing local plan policy and supplementary planning guidance ('saved' UDP Policies ENV29 and T11, BCCS Policies CSP3, CSP4, CSP5 and ENV4, Designing Walsall SPD, Walsall Waterfront SPD) to guide the design of development adjacent to the Walsall Canal within the Town Centre. The AAP would not set out any further specific guidance.	There are existing local plan policies in place to guide the design of new development adjacent to canals in Walsall, and the design of new development in the Waterfront area, including the Walsall Canal. It would therefore be possible to allow the market to lead on the scale and design of new development in this area.	?	The effects of this option on the SA Objectives are uncertain, as the existing policies and guidance may not be sufficient on their own to deliver the quality of development required adjacent to the Canal, and could lead to developments which reduce the accessibility of the Canal to all members of the community and their ability to use the Canal as a leisure resource.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 1, as a specific policy is needed to ensure that the relevant issues relating to design, character, accessibility and relationship to the wider green infrastructure network are given significant weight when considering proposals to develop the remaining canalside areas.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Location of New Leisure Development						
Location of Leisure Option 1 (Waterfront Only)	The AAP allocates Waterfront as the primary location for large scale leisure developments.	Waterfront is an attractive location for leisure development. Some leisure development has already taken place or is in the pipeline, and there is potential to capitalise on this and to develop it as a key leisure destination, by identifying Waterfront as the main location for large-scale leisure development in the Town Centre.	+	Effects on SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall, because the Waterfront area is near to the PSA and near to the railway station, so concentrating leisure uses in this area will complement the range of land uses already available in the vicinity, having positive effects on the vitality and viability of the Town Centre. It would also have wider benefits for visitors and local communities, as it would mean that new leisure developments would be developed in the most accessible location in Walsall, near to public transport hubs.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policies AAPLE1 and AAP14	The Preferred Option is based mainly on this option because Waterfront is the most appropriate location for leisure development in the Town Centre and is already a focus for leisure development - a new cinema is already under construction in this location. It is therefore proposed to allocate Waterfront as the main location for leisure development in the Town Centre. However, there is flexibility to develop leisure uses in other suitable locations where they would not jeopardise the Waterfront development.
Location of Leisure Option 2 (Waterfront Then Other Locations)	Leisure development is allocated elsewhere in the Town Centre only when Waterfront is fully delivered for leisure or other uses.	This would allow greater flexibility over leisure developments in the Town Centre and would also provide a longer-term strategy, so that if there is a market, further new leisure development could be developed in the Town Centre once the Waterfront development is fully completed.	+	Effects on SA Objectives are likely to be similar to Option 1, but allowing further leisure uses in other locations once the Waterfront development is complete could further improve the economic performance and the offer of the Town Centre, depending on what uses were provided and where they were built. It would also have wider benefits for visitors and local communities, as it would enable new leisure developments to be provided elsewhere in the Town Centre once Waterfront is fully developed, rather than in out-of-centre locations in Walsall or in other centres outside Walsall.	Partly rejected although there is some flexibility for leisure development in other areas – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLE1	Partly rejected - There is not sufficient demand for sites to be allocated for leisure uses alone, although there are a number of sites that are identified as mixed use where leisure uses would be suitable. The AAP states that leisure use would be supported on these sites if it would not jeopardise the Waterfront development.
Location of Leisure Option 3 (No Leisure Locations Identified)	This is the 'do nothing' or 'do minimum' option as it would mean relying on existing local plan policy (e.g. 'saved' UDP Policies S1 – S4 and BCCS Policies CSP4 and CEN1 – CEN3) to guide the location of new leisure development in the Town Centre. The exact location of such developments would therefore be left to the market.	There are existing local plan policies in place to guide the location of new leisure developments in the Town Centre. It would be possible to allow the market to lead on locations without allocating sites in the AAP.	?	The overall effects of this option on the SA Objectives would be uncertain, as it would mean the Council has less control over where new leisure developments are located. While having more flexibility could be more responsive to the market, it is more likely that new leisure uses would be dispersed around the Town Centre than focused in a particular area, and they may not necessarily be developed near to the main public transport hubs. This could make the facilities less accessible to people who rely on public transport, and could also encourage more trips into the Town Centre by car, generating increased air pollution along routes where the statutory limit values for NO2 are already being exceeded.	Partly rejected although there is some flexibility for leisure development in other areas – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLE1	Partly rejected – Walsall Waterfront is considered to be the most appropriate location for leisure development in the Town Centre and is being allocated as the main site for this type of development. However, there is flexibility over where leisure uses can be developed elsewhere in the Town Centre, provided that this would not jeopardise the Waterfront development.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
6. A Place for Living						
Options for Level and Location of Housing Development						
Housing Option 1 (New Housing Allocations)	The AAP allocates further sites for housing development.	There are sites which may be most suitable for residential.	?	Overall effects on SA Objectives are uncertain, as it could affect delivery of targets for retail and office floorspace or delivery of other ‘town centre’ uses, depending on which sites are allocated. Provision of further housing in the Town Centre would help to improve its vitality and viability as well as providing homes in a highly accessible location where residents would have access to shops, jobs and a range of other amenities as well as to public transport networks. By allocating specific sites, it is possible to minimise harmful effects on occupiers from the surrounding environment, by avoiding sites at risk from flooding and sites exposed to noise or air pollution, and by requiring developers to provide a good standard of design and amenity.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV1	The Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1, 2 and 3. A key issue for the AAP is that encouraging further homes in the Town Centre is not allowed to prejudice delivery of new retail and office floorspace and economic and commercial function of the Strategic Centre. However, there are locations where housing could be developed without having such impacts, and where housing is the most suitable land use. It is therefore proposed to allocate two sites in Charles Street for residential development in the AAP.
Housing Option 2 (Provide Housing through Mixed Use Schemes Only)	No further land is allocated for housing development, but the use is included as an option for mixed use developments where suitable.	Residential is a suitable use as part of some mixed use schemes and can help with deliverability.	+	Overall effects on the SA Objectives would be similar to Option 1 and would generally be positive, because this option is likely to deliver more new homes in areas where it would not compromise delivery of ‘town centre’ developments. As the mixed use sites would be allocated in the AAP, it would be possible to minimise harmful effects on occupiers from the surrounding environment, by avoiding sites at risk from flooding and sites exposed to noise or air pollution, and by requiring developers to provide a good standard of design and amenity.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV1	The Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1, 2 and 3. A key issue for the AAP is that encouraging further homes in the Town Centre is not allowed to prejudice delivery of new retail and office floorspace and economic and commercial function of the Strategic Centre. However, there are locations where it would be possible to develop housing as part of a mixed use scheme without having such impacts. It is therefore proposed to identify housing as a possible use in these locations in the AAP.
Housing Option 3 (Providing Housing through LOTS & Other Vacant Floorspace)	The AAP encourages the use of flats over shops (‘living over the shop’ = LOTS) or other vacant floorspace for housing.	There are a number of vacant or underused buildings within the centre which could be promoted for residential.	+	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall, as this would not only deliver new homes and support the vitality and viability of the Town Centre, but could also support retention of existing buildings and have a positive effect on local character and townscape. However, there are some uncertainties if housing is provided in areas where no social infrastructure exists. There may also be impacts upon residential amenity from neighbouring ‘town centre’ uses and exposure to existing environmental constraints, such as flood risk and air pollution, if any vacant building is allowed to be converted to housing.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV1	The Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1, 2 and 3. A key issue for the AAP is that encouraging further homes in the Town Centre is not allowed to prejudice delivery of new retail and office floorspace and economic and commercial function of the Strategic Centre. However, there are vacant buildings in the Town Centre, including the upper floors above retail and office units, which could be converted to housing without having such impacts. It is therefore proposed to promote the conversion of suitable vacant buildings to housing in the AAP.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Housing Option 4 (No New Housing Provision)	No further land is allocated through the AAP for housing development.	There is no policy requirement to allocate land in the Town Centre for housing, as no targets are set in the BCCS and the indicative housing provision in BCCS Appendix 2, based on existing commitments, has already been met.	?	The overall effects on the SA Objectives are uncertain, as this may mean that some development opportunities are not delivered for a considerable period of time as housing may be the best option for some sites. Also it may mean some housing needs are not met, if there is demand to live in the Town Centre but no provision has been made. There would also be uncertainties about the effects on the amenity of the occupiers of the new housing, depending on where it is developed and the quality of the surrounding environment. For example, some areas of the Town Centre have a poor environment and are exposed to noise and traffic emissions.	Rejected.	This Option has been rejected, because while the indicative housing provision in the BCCS has already been delivered, the creation of more homes in the Town Centre is considered appropriate to support the vitality and viability of the centre, and there are sites which would be suitable.
Options for Residential Environments						
Residential Environments Option 1 (Minimum Standards for Residential Environments)	The AAP sets out requirements for satisfactory residential environments recognising the benefits and possible restrictions of housing within centres.	If residential development is promoted in the Town Centre, it is important that it provides an adequate living environment and standard of amenity, and further guidance in the AAP could help to achieve this.	+	Overall effects on SA Objectives are likely to be positive, as requiring developers to provide safe and attractive residential environments is likely to attract more people to live in the Town Centre, and is also likely to enhance the townscape and attractiveness of the centre. However, such requirements can increase the costs of a residential development which could affect the viability of residential schemes.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV1	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option, because there is a need to ensure that any new homes developed are of high quality, and are appropriately located so that the amenity, health and wellbeing of occupiers are not compromised. Creating a high quality living environment without prejudicing the viability of other ‘town centre’ development is also an important consideration for the AAP. It is therefore proposed to set out key requirements for the quality of residential developments in the AAP as a guide to developers, including signposts to national requirements, and requirements for developers to demonstrate that housing development will not impact on the core commercial and retail roles of the Strategic Centre.
Residential Environments Option 2 (No Specific Requirements)	This is the ‘do nothing’ or ‘do minimum’ option as it would mean relying on existing local plan policy on design and managing effects on amenity (e.g. ‘saved’ UDP Policies ENV10, ENV11, ENV12, ENV14, ENV32, ENV40 and JP8, BCCS Policies CSP4, ENV2, ENV3, ENV5 and ENV8 and Designing Walsall SPD). No specific additional requirements would be set for the quality of residential environments in the Town Centre in the AAP.	There are existing local plan policies in place to guide the design of new housing development and potential effects on amenity, health and wellbeing from existing environmental conditions. It would therefore be possible to rely on the existing policy framework as a basis for evaluating the suitability of new housing schemes in the Town Centre.	?	Effects on the SA Objectives are less certain than with Option 1. While it is acknowledged that there is existing local plan policy guidance in place on urban design and managing the effects of new development on amenity and wellbeing, there is a possible risk that quality will be compromised without further guidance. If high quality residential environments are not created, it is less likely that people will be attracted to live in the Town Centre.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected because of the importance of ensuring that new housing development in the Town Centre is of high quality, and is appropriately located so that the amenity, health and wellbeing of occupiers are not compromised. Creating a high quality living environment without prejudicing the viability of other ‘town centre’ development is also an important consideration for the AAP. For these reasons, further guidance is considered useful.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Education and Health						
Education and Health Option 1 (Allocate Land for Expansion of Existing Education and Health Facilities)	The AAP allocates land to deliver the future expansion requirements of the Manor Hospital, other health providers, and Walsall College.	There are existing facilities in and around the Town Centre, such as the Manor Hospital and Walsall College which may need space to grow and expand in the future.	+	Effects on the SA Objectives would be positive overall, as the Town Centre would benefit socially and economically from a strengthened health and education sector. However allocating sites specifically for education could impact on the ability to deliver the BCCS floor space targets for offices, particularly if there is no demand for expansion and land remains undeveloped as a result.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV2	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option in part, as while there is no evidence of a need for expansion of the Manor Hospital into the Town Centre, there is a potential need for expansion of Walsall College. It is therefore proposed to allocate space for the future expansion of the College in the AAP, but not for health care provision, as there is no evidenced need.
Education and Health Option 2 (No Provision for Education and Health)	This is the ‘do nothing’ option as the AAP would not allocate land for the future expansion requirements of the Manor Hospital, other health providers, or Walsall College. Proposals for new or expanded facilities would be assessed against existing local plan policy on education and healthcare (‘saved’ UDP Policies T10 – T12 and 8.7 and BCCS Policies HOU2 and HOU5).	There is currently not sufficient evidence of a demand for expansion of the Manor Hospital or for new health and social care facilities in the Town Centre other than for Walsall College, to justify allocating land for this specific purpose. Existing local plan policies may be sufficient to guide the location of new or expanded facilities if there is a requirement for this during the plan period.	?	Effects on the SA Objectives would be uncertain, as without any specific proposals or strategy for education and healthcare development in the AAP, the Town Centre may not benefit from a strengthened health and education sector, missing out on opportunities for jobs, training, and attracting related industries.	Rejected, although AAP allows for future developments to come forward if there is a need – see Draft AAP Policies AAPLV2 and AAPLV3.	This Option has been rejected, as it is not considered appropriate to rely entirely on the market to deliver. Where possible the AAP has allocated sites for expansion of existing facilities, as with the College, but it is accepted that further proposals for education, health and social care development could come forward in the Town Centre in the future and that these will have to be considered on a site by site basis.
Education and Health Option 3 (Protect and Promote Current Health Care Facilities)	The AAP does not allocate land for the future expansion requirements of the Manor Hospital, or other health providers, but looks to protect current facilities, support any new proposals and build on the links with the Hospital.	There are a number of healthcare facilities in the Town Centre that should be protected, and there may also be a future need for new health and social care facilities in the Town Centre which should be supported. Also the proximity of the Manor Hospital to the Town Centre is a positive advantage which should be built on, where possible.	+	Effects of this option on the SA Objectives would be positive overall, as it would safeguard existing facilities and would provide the potential for them to be improved and expanded if there is a need. However, there may be some issues around location, as health care facilities are ‘sensitive receptors’ and if they are already exposed to air pollution sources, allowing expansion could increase exposure unless the effects are mitigated in some way. There may also be impacts on the highway network, depending on the scale of the proposal and its location, for example, whether it is likely to generate increased trips by car or is well related to public transport.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV3	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option in part, as while there is no evidence of a need for expansion of the Manor Hospital into the Town Centre, it is recognised that provision should be made for this in the AAP as the situation could change over the plan period. It is therefore proposed to include an ‘enabling’ policy in the AAP to support further healthcare provision in the Town Centre in locations that are accessible to the Hospital and other key health care facilities where there may be a need for linked trips.
Options for Community Facilities						
Community Facilities Option 1 (The AAP Allocates Land for a new Community Facility)	A suitable site is allocated in the AAP for a ‘community hub,’ the plan also includes policy criteria to be used to assess the suitability of alternative locations for community facilities, if the site identified is not delivered.	Since the Issues and Options document was published in 2013, the Council has considered whether there is a need for a ‘community hub’ to bring community uses together in the most accessible location for the borough, the Town Centre. A new Option has therefore been identified to allocate land for such a ‘community hub,’ and provide criteria to be used to assess the suitability of other locations for community facilities, should the site identified not be delivered, to supplement the guidance provided in existing local plan policy.	+	Effects on the SA Objectives are likely to be positive overall, as the allocation of land for a community hub in the Town Centre would expand the range of facilities available in the Strategic Centre and would ensure that the new facility is provided in a highly accessible location. This will also have positive impacts of equality and the community as they would be able to access the facility by a choice of transport modes. This may however, make the delivery of other uses on the site identified difficult, and could compromise delivery of other ‘town centre’ uses.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV4 Rejected at Publication Stage	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because the Council considers there is a need to bring community uses together in the most accessible location in the borough, which is the Town Centre. It is therefore proposed to include a policy in the AAP on community facilities in the Town Centre, which identifies the Challenge Block as a priority location for this. This site already includes a number of community facilities and is in a particularly accessible location, near to public transport hubs. It is also proposed to include criteria to assess the suitability of proposals for community facilities outside the area identified.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
						<p>There were no consultation responses to the Preferred Option stage from community groups/organisations to support the allocation and there is no available evidence to show that a community hub is needed or that one can be delivered. It is therefore considered difficult to justify the allocation even though the Council’s view is that a community hub would help support the sustainability of community groups in the centre and provide a modern accessible facility.</p>
<p>Community Facilities Option 2 (The AAP Does Not Allocate Land for Community Facilities)</p>	<p>This is the ‘do nothing’ option as the AAP would not allocate land for community facilities or for a new ‘community hub’ in the Town Centre. If there is a need for such facilities the location would be determined outside of the plan making process, having regard to existing local plan policy on the location and accessibility of such facilities (‘saved’ UDP Policies T10 – T12 and BCCS Policy HOU2).</p>	<p>There is already local plan guidance in place on the location of new community facilities. It is therefore possible that a new ‘community hub’ could be developed in the Town Centre without the need to allocate a site for it in the AAP, or provide further criteria for assessing proposals.</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>Effects on the SA Objectives would be uncertain, as by not allocating a site for a new community facility in the Town Centre, there is a risk that such a facility could be developed in a less central and less accessible location. Also, not allocating a site may make the delivery of a ‘community hub’ less viable, because of competition from other ‘town centre’ uses and without a site, it would be more difficult for the providers to secure funding.</p>	<p>Rejected</p>	<p>This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 1, as it is considered appropriate for the AAP to steer community facilities towards locations that have good public transport links so that they will be accessible to everyone, including people who do not have access to a car.</p>
<p>Community Facilities Option 3 (The AAP does not allocate land for community facilities but provides criteria and identifies a priority site):</p>	<p>This is a mixture of the two options. It identifies a priority site but doesn’t allocate it. Criteria is provided to guide a community facility if the priority site is not deliverable.</p>	<p>The Council received no consultation responses in support of the allocation from community groups that would use the facility and there has been no evidence made available to show there is need or demand for such a facility. Therefore the deliverability of a community facility is uncertain and allocating a site for this use may mean the site remains undeveloped for some time and that the other uses needed on site are jeopardised.</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>Effects on the SA Objectives would be uncertain, as by not allocating a site for a new community facility in the Town Centre, there is a risk that such a facility could be developed in a less central and less accessible location. Also, not allocating a site may make the delivery of a ‘community hub’ less viable, because of competition from other ‘town centre’ uses and without a site, it would be more difficult for the providers to secure funding. However the identification of a priority site and the use of criteria reduce the risk of a community facility being developed in an inaccessible location and still shows the Council is supportive of such a use at the site which should help with delivery.</p>	<p>Publication Stage Option see Publication Draft AAP Policy AAPLV4</p>	<p>This is considered to offer the best solution to the issue of having no evidence to support an allocation but there still be a strong aspiration from the Council to deliver a community hub that is in an accessible location.</p>

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for the Character of Walsall Town Centre						
Character Option 1 (Protect Buildings Important to Local Character)	The AAP identifies buildings that enhance the character of Walsall Town Centre and protects them.	There are a number of key buildings that are important to the character and distinctiveness of the Town Centre, which could be identified for protection in the AAP.	+	Effects on SA Objectives towards the conservation of heritage assets and townscape quality would therefore be positive. However, protecting certain buildings could impact on other objectives to encourage 'town centre' developments and improve the economic health of the Strategic Centre, by constraining the design, restricting the opportunity for comprehensive development, or adding costs. This could impact on the ability to deliver comprehensive schemes in order to meet the BCCS retail and office floorspace targets.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 2, because many historic buildings in the Town Centre are already protected by Listing or Local Listing designations and large areas of the Town Centre have also been designated as Conservation Areas. A key issue for the AAP is protecting the positive aspects of the character of Walsall Town Centre while at the same time, encouraging new investment and development. This Option alone would not look at the character of areas overall, and may result in some character of the centre being lost. The Town Centre Characterisation Study takes a more holistic approach to character.
Character Option 2 (Encourage Development in Places of Character)	The AAP identifies buildings and places that are positive to the character of Walsall Town Centre and seeks to ensure they contribute to future development.	The Walsall Town Centre Characterisation Study (2015) has provided up-to-date evidence on the character of different parts of the Town Centre, and the positive aspects of local character that it would be desirable to develop and enhance in each area through new developments. It would be possible to include a policy in the AAP requiring new developments to relate positively to local character in each of the character areas of the Town Centre.	++	Effects of this approach on SA Objectives towards the conservation of heritage assets and townscape quality are likely to be very positive, as it would support well designed new buildings which reinforce existing character in a positive way, as well as developments that would retain and conserve existing buildings important for local character. While this could have similar effects to Option 1 in terms of discouraging development in certain areas because of the restrictions and added costs, the approach is more flexible, and would allow large scale new 'town centre' developments to take place in appropriate locations, where they do not detract from local character.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV5	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because the Town Centre Characterisation Study provides the most up-to-date evidence of the character of the Town Centre. A key issue for the AAP is protecting the positive aspects of the character of Walsall Town Centre while at the same time, encouraging new investment and development. The Study has identified and mapped six distinctive character areas in the Town Centre and has identified their main characteristics and sensitivity to change. This allows the AAP to provide guidance on how new developments in the Town Centre will be expected to apply the evidence from the Characterisation Study, and address local character and distinctiveness in each of the character areas.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Character Option 3 (Consolidate and Enhance Identified Character Zones)	The AAP seeks to consolidate and enhance the four identified character zones (as shown on Figure 7.4 of AAP Issues & Options Document (2013)).	There are some areas of the Town Centre with their own character, which have been identified in the Issues & Option Report (2013). This evidence could be used to form the basis of a policy in the AAP on addressing local character through new development.	+	Effects of this approach on SA Objectives towards the conservation of heritage assets and townscape quality are likely to be positive, as it would improve the attractiveness of the Town Centre and assist in its legibility as well as seeking to retain buildings and spaces that make a positive contribution towards the Town Centre's character. However, the character zones identified in 2013 have not taken into account the latest evidence on local character from the Town Centre Characterisation Study (2015) which has involved a more in-depth study into the character of different parts of the Town Centre. Also, as with Option 2, it could have the effect of discouraging development in certain areas because of the restrictions and added costs, although the approach is more flexible than Option 1, and would allow large scale new 'town centre' developments to take place in appropriate locations, where they do not detract from local character.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected in favour of Option 2, because there is more up-to-date evidence on the character of the Town Centre from the Town Centre Characterisation Study (2015). A key issue for the AAP is protecting the positive aspects of the character of Walsall Town Centre while at the same time, encouraging new investment and development. The new Study identifies six distinctive character areas in the AAP area based on the key features of the townscape, and these are a more accurate representation of the character of different areas of the Town Centre than the four 'Clover Leaf' character zones identified in the Issues & Options Report (2013).
Options for Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings						
Conservation Option 1 (Review Conservation Area Boundaries)	Review Conservation Area boundaries.	This would help identify negative aspects of the Town Centre conservation areas, such as areas at risk identified by Historic England, as well as potential opportunities for improvement and enhancement. Rationalizing these designations will assist in their management. However, to work effectively this would need buy-in from community groups, civic trusts and heritage groups.	?	The overall effects are uncertain - while this would help identify negative aspects of Conservation Areas as well as the opportunities, and rationalizing these designations could assist in their management, to work effectively this would need buy-in from community groups, civic trusts and heritage groups and it is not certain this could be achieved.	Rejected	Whilst this Option is not being progressed through the AAP, as it has not been possible to review the Conservation Areas at this stage, it is still a long term aspiration of the Council. Conservation Areas are protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the NPPF. The Council will look to review the current conservation area boundaries, appraisals and management plans when it is able to do so and the Town Centre Characterisation Study (2015) provides a good evidence base to start this process from.
Conservation Option 2 (Address Specific Problems Affecting Conservation Areas)	Prepare policies that address specific aspects of decline in conservation areas, such as poor advertisement, poor shop fronts or low quality materials.	The Town Centre conservation areas would benefit from having up-to-date management plans. This would help protect the historic environment and improve design of new developments in the conservation areas. However it could result in prescriptive architecture.	+	The overall effects are likely to be positive as it would help protect the historic environment and improve design. However, such guidance could also result in prescriptive architecture/ too rigid an approach if it was not applied carefully.	Rejected although the key issues are addressed in Draft AAP Policies AAPLV5 and AAPLV6	This option has been rejected in favour of a combination of Options 4 and 5, although it is proposed that the AAP Policies covering the historic environment and good design will address the issues faced by the Conservation Areas. The Characterisation Study can be used to identify sites that are less sensitive to change and therefore have the potential to enhance the conservation areas as well as the highly sensitive to change sites which form the key focus of the conservation areas.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Conservation Option 3 (Grading of Locally Listed Buildings)	Introduce grading for locally listed buildings.	Grading locally listed buildings would allow for different (more / less) stringent constraints to be applied to different sites, thereby making them more viable. This could include removing the listing of buildings which are protected by a Conservation Area.	+	The overall effects are likely to be positive as grading these buildings would allow for different (more / less) stringent constraints to be applied to different sites, thereby making them potentially more viable for re-use or conversion. This could include removing the listing of buildings which are protected by a Conservation Area.	Rejected	This option has been rejected in favour of a combination of Options 4 and 5, as it would involve a comprehensive survey of the locally listed buildings and other buildings that could be considered as candidates for local listing, which is neither possible nor practical. If the grading was to use the same style of system as Listed Building grades, it would also prove difficult to be consistent, as building types that are important in one Conservation Area may not have the same importance or weight in another. For example, a C19th factory building would have greater importance to a Conservation Area designated for its Victorian features than it would in one designated for Georgian features.
Conservation Option 4 (Improve Interpretation of Historic Environment)	Prepare a policy to facilitate learning and interpretation of the historic environment around the Town Centre.	Heritage is often seen as being specialist, elitist and inaccessible to many people, so this option would look to address this issue by providing further information and guidance on the historic environment of the Town Centre and heritage assets which are of particular importance.	+	The overall effects are likely to be positive, as heritage is often seen as being specialist, elitist and inaccessible to many people, so helping people to understand what is important about heritage assets in the Town Centre and why they should be protected could help with their protection. However, reaching out to all members of the community may be difficult.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV5 and Walsall Town Centre Characterisation Study (2015)	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option in part, because the Walsall Town Centre Characterisation Study (2015) is an important piece of new evidence illustrating the character of different parts of the Town Centre, and will be published on the Council website as part of the evidence base for the AAP. The publication of the Study provides the opportunity to enhance public understanding of the historic environment of the Town Centre, the key characteristics of different areas, and the positive features of the townscape that are of importance to local character.
Conservation Option 5 (Rely on Existing Policy and Legislation)	This is the ‘do nothing’ option and would involve continuing to manage the historic environment and heritage assets in the Town Centre under the current legislation and local plan policy (‘saved’ UDP Policies ENV25 – ENV30 and BCCS Policies CSP4, ENV2, ENV3 and ENV4).	Current legislation and local plan policy already offers the historic environment protection, but without further work through the AAP, further enhancement might not be possible and development may not have full regard to the key features of importance to local character in the Town Centre.	?	The effects are uncertain, as while current policy and legislation already offers the historic environment some protection, without further work through the AAP to identify what the priorities are and how they should be addressed, conserving the main heritage assets may be more difficult and opportunities for further improvements and enhancements are likely to be lost.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV5	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option in part because it is proposed to include policy guidance in the AAP that aims to manage the historic environment under the current legislation, having regard to the latest evidence from the Town Centre Characterisation Study (2015), which will add information to the decision making process and help to protect and enhance the positive aspects of the character of the Town Centre overall as well as the distinctive characteristics of each of the six character areas identified in the Study.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Protected Views						
Protected Views Option 1 (Protect Locally Important Views)	Policies are set for protecting views through the management of new development within or bordering the sight line.	A policy could be included in the AAP which identifies locally important views that will be protected, to help to protect the character of the Town Centre. The objective would be to prevent further damage to these views, either by blocking or unacceptably imposing or by creating an intrusive element in the view's foreground or middle ground, and clarify development height thresholds where appropriate.	+	The effects should be positive as Where views are protected, the policy would seek to prevent undue damage to the view, either by blocking or unacceptably imposing or by creating an intrusive element in the view's foreground or middle ground. This could, however, impact upon scheme viability.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV6	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option because not protecting important views of landmark buildings is likely to have an adverse effect on the overall character of Walsall Town Centre. It is therefore proposed to include a policy in the AAP to protect the views of landmark buildings in the Town Centre and to show the relevant buildings on the Policies Map.
Protected Views Option 2 (No Provision to Protect Views)	This is the 'do nothing' option and would involve continuing to rely on existing local plan policy and urban design guidance ('saved' UDP Policy ENV32, BCCS Policies CSP4 and ENV2 and Designing Walsall SPD) to protect locally important views within the Town Centre.	An alternative option would be not to address this issue in the AAP, and to rely on existing local plan policy and urban design guidance to protect locally important views.	?	The impact is uncertain as this could result in some views being lost which could have a negative impact on the character of Walsall.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as not protecting important views of landmark buildings is likely to have an adverse effect on the overall character of Walsall Town Centre. There is a risk that if such views are not identified in the AAP, they will not be taken into account when new developments are planned and key views could be lost from certain directions.
Options for the Design of New Buildings						
Design Option 1 (Rely on Existing Design Policy)	This is a 'do nothing' option and would mean that the AAP sets no design requirements over and above what is already included in existing local plan policy and urban design guidance ('saved' UDP Policies ENV32 and ENV33, BCCS Policies CSP4 and ENV2 and Designing Walsall SPD).	There is existing local plan policy and urban design guidance in place for Walsall generally and for the Town Centre, which would provide a framework for evaluating the quality of the design of new developments, which are also required under current planning legislation to include a Design and Access Statement.	?	This option would mean no further requirements are set. It may be difficult to ensure high quality design in the centre making it a less attractive as a place to visit or invest in. This may make it easier for developments to come forward. The impact is therefore uncertain.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as design guidance is considered key to enhancing the Town Centre and giving certainty to developers on the requirements.
Design Option 2 (Design Codes for the Town Centre)	Design Codes are set for the Town Centre requiring high quality design, setting out what level is expected, and identifying key locations for exemplar buildings.	It would be possible to provide more specific guidance on the design of development in the Town Centre or in particular parts of the Town Centre through the use of Design Codes, which have been used elsewhere as a means of ensuring that minimum design standards are met in new developments.	?	New developments will be designed to complement and enhance the existing character of the town centre. However following design guidance may constrain designs or add a cost to developments. The impact is therefore uncertain.	Rejected Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policies AAPLV5 and AAPLV6	This Option has been rejected as rigid Design Codes are not considered appropriate for the Town Centre. The Preferred Option is to include policies in the AAP that provide an overview to developers of what is expected in terms of good design, including areas where the local character could be improved, frontages that need improving and sites with potential to develop new landmark buildings.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Design Option 3 (Design Standards for Buildings in Key Locations)	The AAP seeks exemplar design standards for new buildings in prominent locations to set a precedent for the Town Centre.	It would be possible for the AAP to identify specific standards for design quality, enhancement of local character, and enhancement of the environment and image of the Town Centre for key buildings and sites.	?	Such buildings would set a standard for high quality design across the town, enhancing the character, environment and image of the town centre. Requiring exemplar design may mean refusing applications which do not meet these standards. This could impact on the regeneration of the centre and the economy of Walsall overall. The impact is therefore uncertain.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policies AAP11 – AAP16	The Investment chapter includes more detailed guidance around design and prominent locations where higher quality buildings will be required have been shown AAP Policies map.
Design Option 4 (Apply BCCS Renewable Energy Requirements Only)	This is a ‘do nothing’ option and would mean that the AAP sets no renewable energy requirements above what is already required in current local plan policy (BCCS Policies DEL1 and ENV7).	As there is no evidence of significant take up of renewable and low carbon energy technologies in the Town Centre, it would be a reasonable option to continue to rely on the existing policy framework to assess whether new development proposals have had sufficient regard to this.	0	Overall neutral impact. No further investment in renewable energy is made above the current levels required, this may mean the centre is less sustainable and there are more negative impacts on the environment. However further requirements in the centre could mean developments locate elsewhere meaning there is more car usage and a negative impact in terms of emissions.	Part of Preferred Option	This Option has been chosen as part of the Preferred Option, as the BCCS requirements for renewable energy are considered sufficient and would mean no further impact on site viability.
Design Option 5 (Additional On-Site Renewable Energy Requirements for Town Centre Developments)	Requirements for on-site renewable energy generation are set where appropriate from Town Centre developments that go beyond the requirements in existing local plan policy (BCCS Policies DEL1 and ENV7).	The AAP could identify further requirements for new developments in the Town Centre to generate their energy on-site from renewable or low carbon sources, above those included in existing local plan policy. This would help reduce the environmental impact of development in the Town Centre and give more certainty to developers and investors in Walsall as to what is likely to be required.	?	This would reduce the environmental impact of some developments, and would give certainty to developers and investors in Walsall. However it may deter some developers from the town centre due to increased building costs resulting in the overall impact being uncertain.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as the BCCS requirements for renewable energy are considered sufficient and would mean no further impact on site viability.
Design Option 6 (Allocate Sites for New Renewable Energy Generating Infrastructure)	The AAP actively allocates land for large scale renewable energy and/ or district heating projects such as areas for generating and capturing combined heat and power.	If there is evidence of a demand and that viable projects are likely to come forward, suitable sites could be allocated for renewable energy generation and/ or district heating projects in the AAP.	++	Very positive - This would give more certainty to the delivery of a key renewable energy project that could over time reduce the energy costs of businesses in the area and reduce the impact of development.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as there is currently no evidence to justify the allocation of land for this purpose in the Town Centre as no renewable energy generation or district heating projects are proposed.
Options for Public Realm						
Public Realm Option 1 (Identify Priority Areas for Improvement)	The AAP allocates areas to prioritise for public realm improvements.	The Council has already undertaken some work on the need for public realm improvements in the Town Centre, and this could be built on by including appropriate guidance in the AAP on which areas will be a priority for improvement.	++	Very positive - The environment of particular areas well-used by the public is improved which would enhance the experience and image of the town centre. A high quality environment is also important in attracting further investment into the town centre. However such improvements can be costly. There would also be ongoing resource implications for the maintenance of these areas.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV7 and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option to reflect the work undertaken on priorities for improvements. It is proposed to identify the priority areas for improvement on the AAP Policies Map.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Public Realm Option 2 (Identify Sites for New Public Spaces)	Sites are allocated for new proposed public realm.	If there is evidence that new public spaces need to be created in particular areas of the Town Centre, or there are proposals in the pipeline to create them, it would be appropriate to identify these areas in the AAP.	+	This would give more certainty to new public realm being created. This may however make it more difficult to meet the floor space targets as land is used for public realm and not maximising the amount offices or retail reducing the positive impacts.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as the Council is proposing to focus on improving existing areas of public realm, rather creating new ones. The implementation of the permanent relocation of Walsall Market will deliver a high quality public space at The Bridge.
Public Realm Option 3 (No Area-Specific Guidance)	This is the 'do nothing' option, and would mean that the AAP recognises the importance of public realm in line with current local plan policy and urban design guidance ('saved' UDP Policies ENV9, ENV32 and ENV33 and BCCS Policies CSP4 and ENV2 and Designing Walsall SPD), but does not identify specific areas for improvement.	The AAP could promote public realm through a policy or supporting text which signposts to existing local plan policy and design guidance on the public realm, but does not show areas where improvements are planned or are needed.	?	Uncertain - The Council is unable to lead on which, if any, areas of public realm are improved. This may also have a negative impact on town centre investment. There may however still be some public realm improvements made albeit without a strategic approach making the impact uncertain.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as it does not give enough significance to the role of public realm in the Town Centre.
Options for Linkages						
Linkages Option 1 (De-Cluttering of Park Street)	Improvements to Park Street continue to make it more legible by the removal of planting beds, seats, lights, and signs and enhancement of the paving.	Park Street is considered by some as cluttered and busy. Improvements to the public realm in this area would look to address this.	+	Positive as Park Street would become clearer and easier to navigate due to being less cluttered. There would be further cost implications, but a failure to do so may deter future investment and visitors. This may change the way people experience Park Street.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV7	This Option has been chosen as part of the Preferred Option as Park Street is the main shopping street in the Primary Shopping Area, and is therefore identified as a priority area for public realm improvements which will address this issue.
Linkages Option 2 (No Alterations to Park Street)	Park Street's character is maintained but with no further alternations to its appearance and character.	There have been some minor improvements to Park Street and the surrounding area in recent years and the Council could continue to maintain these areas as they are.	?	No further investment is made in improving the appearance of Park Street. Existing issues with legibility and clutter remain and may get worse with time, which may in turn deter investment and visitors. Uncertain impacts as improvements may happen without the plan allocating for them.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as Park Street is the main shopping street in the Primary Shopping Area, so it is particularly important to create a high quality environment within this street and the surrounding areas.
Linkages Option 3 (Improve Accessibility Through Redevelopment of Poundland Site)	The building currently occupied by Poundland is identified to be demolished if improvements to the public transport network are delivered.	The building has been identified as a major barrier to pedestrian movement, and potential public transport changes in this area would provide an opportunity to remove this visual and physical barrier.	?	Uncertain whether public transport improvements could be delivered, and whether the removal of this building would improve pedestrian linkages. Improved linkages could help prevent vacant units and attract further investment in retail. However a building which is currently in use could be demolished and the businesses here displaced which may have a negative impact if businesses are lost.	Rejected	As the proposals around public transport have changed since the Issues & Options stage (2013), this option has been rejected. The demolition of a large occupied retail unit with the Primary Shopping Area is not considered to be the best option if other ways to improve linkages can be secured.
Linkages Option 4 (Other Methods of Improving Linkages)	The AAP identifies other ways in which linkages can be improved between Park Street and the rest of the Town Centre.	There are other ways to improve linkages such as improved pedestrian crossing, de cluttering of the street and improved signage. This could be implemented as an alternative.	+	Positive - Ways to improve linkages would be found, but the main visual barrier would remain, retaining the businesses but improving linkages.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policies AAPLV7, AAPT1 and AAPT2 and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as part of the Preferred Option because it is considered to be the most deliverable way to improve linkages for pedestrians and cyclists.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Environmental Infrastructure						
Environmental Option 1 (Identify Assets Requiring Improvement)	The AAP highlights the existing key environmental assets where improvements will be sought.	This would help to give further protection to environmental assets in the Town Centre, and would also identify opportunities for improvement and enhancement of the environmental network through new development.	++	Very positive - This would create an improved environment, provide certainty to developers, but may deter some investors due to additional requirements	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV8	This Option has been identified as part of the Preferred Option as it is considered the best approach towards delivering new green infrastructure in the Town Centre without placing too higher burden on developers. It is therefore proposed to include a policy on environmental infrastructure in the AAP which identifies the key features to be protected and reasonable requirements for enhancement in new developments.
Environmental Option 2 (Rely on Existing Policy to Deliver Environmental Improvements)	This is the ‘do nothing’ option, and would mean that the AAP sets out no specific assets for improvement or mechanisms to deliver improvements to environmental infrastructure but relies on existing local plan policy and guidance to secure improvements (‘saved’ UDP Policies ENV23 and ENV24, BCCS Policies CSP3, ENV1 – ENV5 and Environment Key Diagram and Conserving Walsall’s Natural Environment SPD).	There is existing local plan policy in place to protect and enhance environmental infrastructure many of the environmental assets in the Town Centre are protected through existing local plan allocations or designations.	?	This could mean that the environmental transformation of the town centre is limited and the Council would find it more difficult to secure external funding opportunities. This may impact on the environment of the centre overall, deterring investors and visitors. The fact there are existing other policies makes the impact uncertain rather than negative.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as improving current and providing new environmental infrastructure is crucial in achieving a sustainable Town Centre that contributes towards the wider environmental networks across the borough and beyond, and is also visually attractive.
Environmental Option 3 (Set Requirements for New Developments to Deliver Environmental Infrastructure)	The AAP requires developments over a certain size to include green roofs and requiring all developments to consider the use of green walls, trees and sustainable urban drainage systems.	Existing local plan policy may not provide sufficient justification on its own to secure green infrastructure through new developments in the Town Centre – the AAP could include further guidance on the circumstances/ sites where this will be sought.	++	Very positive - This would help to deliver green infrastructure in the centre which will have a positive impact in the environment and reduce emissions. A greener centre could attract further investment and mean that the community uses the centre more.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV8	This Option has been identified as part of the Preferred Option as it is considered the best approach towards delivering new green infrastructure in the Town Centre without placing too higher burden on developers. It is therefore proposed to include a policy on environmental infrastructure in the AAP which identifies the key features to be protected and reasonable requirements for enhancement in new developments.
Options for Open Space						
Urban Open Space Option 1 (No Allocations)	This is the ‘do nothing’ option and would mean that the AAP does not identify any areas of open space for protection, meaning that reliance would be placed on existing local plan policy to protect them (‘saved’ UDP Policy LC1 and BCCS Policies CSP3, CSP4 and ENV6).	There are existing local plan policies in place to protect important areas of green space and public spaces, which could be applied when considering development that could lead to the loss of existing green space and other public spaces in the Town Centre.	?	This could mean that the environmental transformation of the town centre is limited and the green space in the centre is less protected from development. Urban open space is however protected by the NPPF so the impact won’t necessary to negative but uncertain.	Rejected	Rejected as not allocating the site may mean it could be developed for a ‘town centre’ use which may have a more direct economic benefit, which would be outweighed by the negative impact on the amenity of the area for residents and on the environment/ biodiversity. Existing local plan policies for protection of open space would also have limited effect if Town Centre open spaces are not identified in policies that are to be retained following the adoption of the AAP.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Preferred Option - Reasons for Choices
Urban Open Space Option 2 (Allocate Urban Open Space adjacent to Art Gallery)	The AAP allocates the area of green space outside the Art Gallery (opposite the Canal) as Urban Open Space and continues to protect the existing area of Urban Open Space near to St. Matthew's Church.	The allocation of these areas of green space for protection would enhance the environment around Church Hill and in the Waterfront area, both of which are important residential areas. The Waterfront area is also identified as an important development area so it is important to have some green space in this area to maintain its quality. Safeguarding the open space in this area would also contribute towards the development of the green corridor along the Canal and improve linkages to wider ecological and greenway networks.	++	Very positive - This would help to deliver green infrastructure in the centre which will have a positive impact in the environment and reduce emissions. A greener centre could attract further investment and mean that the community uses the centre more. This would prevent the site being developed for a town centre use which may have more direct economic benefits.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPLV8 and Policies Map	This has been chosen as the Preferred Option, as the allocation of this green space as urban Open Space is considered the best option to protect it from development, and to provide the opportunity to create a green corridor along the canal. This will create a high quality environment, providing amenity space for existing and potential future canalside residents, contributing to the quality of the environment in the Waterfront leisure destination area on the other side of the Canal, improving links for pedestrians and cyclists through the enhancement of the greenway and linking with 'green roofs,' enhancing the quality of the green corridor for wildlife.
7. Transport, Movement and Accessibility						
Options for Pedestrianisation						
Pedestrianisation Option 1 (Area Between Crown Wharf and Park Street)	The area between Crown Wharf Retail Park and Park Street is pedestrianised to encourage movement between the Town Centre and the retail park.	There is a need to improve linkages to support the vitality of the town centre. Pedestrianisation would help the ease of movement of people across this road.	+	Positive - The town centre is well connected, providing better links between the town centre and the retail park. There would however be implications for traffic movement.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as enhancing the route between Crown Wharf Retail Park and Park Street would encourage greater movement between the two popular shopping areas. Due to the location of Crown Wharf Retail Park many visitors may not be aware of its proximity to the Town Centre and therefore solely shop at the retail park. However, pedestrian patterns of movements are influenced by new developments; this has been seen with the opening of Tesco and the College. At present the Old Square Shopping Centre is being redeveloped to house several new retail units including the Co-op and Primark. Additionally the Lower Hall Lane/ Digbeth site (TC03) has planning permission for retail redevelopment, which in turn would completely transform the retail opportunities for the High Street/ Digbeth area of the Town Centre. With so many new stores located in such a small zone of the Town Centre, adjusted pedestrian movements will become established. Redevelopment of the High Street/ Digbeth shopping area may see those visitors using Crown Wharf Retail Park travelling further into the Town Centre to visit new stores. It is therefore not considered necessary to pedestrianise the area at present until the impact of new developments and changes in footfall is understood.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Pedestrianisation Option 2 (Partial De-Pedestrianisation to Allow Bus Access to The Bridge/ Park Street)	Through partial de-pedestrianisation buses could be allowed into the Bridge and/or Park Street areas to allow greater penetration into the Town Centre and easier links between public transport modes and services.	This option would improve the movement of buses in the centre.	?	Uncertain - Loss of pedestrianisation could lead to safety concerns and people being dissuaded from using Park Street and the Bridge due to having to share it with buses. It could however improve the pedestrian flow of individuals.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, because the consultant's study found The Bridge to be the best location for Walsall Market, and it is therefore proposed to allocate The Bridge as the preferred location for the Market. The area will also provide a space for public events on non-market days. As such, de-pedestrianising The Bridge as a route for bus services to utilise would jeopardise the future of Walsall Market. Additionally the use of the space for buses to travel through the Town Centre may result in severance which would have a detrimental effect on the movements of pedestrians through the centre.
Pedestrianisation Option 3 (No Change to Existing Pedestrianised Areas)	No further areas of pedestrianisation are identified through the AAP.	There are already some areas of pedestrianisation and there may not be a need for further areas	?	Uncertain - There continues to be a physical separation between Park Street and the Crown Wharf Retail Park and in other locations across the town centre. This may mean the less is less accessible by foot but more accessible by bus and car.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as no areas have been identified for further pedestrianisation, and other proposals have been identified to improve linkages throughout the Town Centre.
Options for Pedestrian Movement						
Pedestrian Movement Option 1 (Further Requirements and Guidance on Pedestrian Movement)	The AAP sets out requirements for new developments where they need to be well linked to the Primary Shopping Area and other important locations, and the Policies Map identifies locations where improvements to pedestrian linkages are needed.	Existing local plan policy is not specific about existing pedestrian linkages and does not identify the areas where improvements are needed in the Town Centre. If this guidance was provided in the AAP it would ensure that new developments take this into account. Also, identifying specific locations where improvements to linkages are needed in the Town Centre will provide more certainty and help to secure their delivery.	++	Very positive - New development is well linked but this may place increased costs on developers. Locations where improvements to linkages are needed are identified helping to secure their delivery. This improves schemes vitality and also increases the attractiveness of visitors to the centre. Better connections may also mean people use public transport more making the centre more sustainable.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPT1 and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option, as it is necessary to identify areas of weak linkages in the AAP to ensure that new developments will improve linkages where feasible and be well integrated with existing pedestrian routes. It is considered that this is the best way to deliver improvements for pedestrians throughout the Town Centre, although it is recognised that it may place increased costs on developers.
Pedestrian Movement Option 2 (No Requirements for Pedestrian Movement)	This is the 'do nothing' option and would require nothing further from development than what is already required in existing local plan policy on walking ('saved' UDP Policies T1, T8, T11 and LC5 and BCCS Policies CSP5, TRAN4 and TRAN5).	There are existing local plan policies in place aimed at maintaining and improving existing pedestrian routes, which could be applied when considering development in the Town Centre which would affect existing pedestrian linkages or would offer potential to improve linkages.	?	Uncertain - This would mean there are less requirements on developments to show how well they link with the centre and no prioritise have been identified for improvements in linkages. Not addressing the linkages issues within the centre could mean developments fail to benefit the centre as a whole and may have an adverse impact on some areas in the centre as footfall is not spread across the centre. This may also mean less people use public transport which could have a negative impact on the environment and traffic congestion.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, because there are weak pedestrian linkages in the Town Centre which need to be addressed, to enable key areas of the centre to be accessible to all. Unless new developments address the need to maintain and where necessary improve existing pedestrian linkages, developments could fail to benefit the Town Centre as a whole and this may have an adverse impact on some areas in the centre by blocking or preventing movements between areas.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Cycling						
Cycling Option 1 (Protection of Cycle Routes and Further Guidance on Enhancement)	The current cycle route is shown on the policies map and protected. Greenways are identified to improve links to open space and other areas including the hospital. New Greenways and other paths that need improving are identified.	There are number of cycle routes in the Town Centre which could be protected in the AAP, and improvements to cycle routes that would benefit the centre.	++	Very positive - The current cycle route is shown on the policies map and protected. Greenways are identified to improve links to open space and other areas including the hospital. New Greenways and other paths that need improving are identified. Many of these routes are used by pedestrians too so improvements will be for those access the centre on foot as well. This will help link the centre and encourage more sustainable transport which has environmental and health impacts. The protection of the canal footpaths for cycle routes also protects the canals historic environment and ensures it continues to provide a positive environment for communities and the wildlife.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPT2 and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option, as it is necessary to identify existing cycle routes requiring protection and areas where new routes or links could be provided to enhance the wider cycling network, to ensure that new development will maintain existing routes, improve linkages where feasible, and be well integrated with existing cycling routes. It is considered that this is the best way to deliver improvements for cyclists throughout the Town Centre, although it is recognised that it may place increased costs on developers.
Cycling Option 2 (No Protection of Cycle Routes)	This is the 'do nothing' Option and would require nothing further from development than what is already required in existing local plan policy on cycling and cycle routes ('saved' UDP Policies T1, T9, T11 and LC5 and Proposals Map and BCCS Policies CSP5, TRAN4, TRAN5 and Cycle Network Diagram).	Some existing cycle routes are already protected as public rights of way. There are also existing local plan policies in place aimed at maintaining and improving existing cycle routes and cycling networks, which could be applied when considering development in the Town Centre which would affect existing routes or would offer potential to create new cycle routes and extend existing cycling networks.	?	Uncertain - The plan makes no provision for cycling which may mean routes are lost and there are no further improvements to cycle provision. This could deter people from cycling to the centre having a wider impact on the sustainability of the centre and an increase in other forms of transport that create emissions.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, because there are cycle routes running through the Town Centre which are not currently protected and could be at risk if they are not identified for protection in the AAP. There are also parts of the Town Centre where links between routes could be improved. Unless new developments address the need to maintain and where necessary improve existing cycle routes, developments could fail to benefit the Town Centre as a whole and this may have an adverse impact on some areas in the centre by blocking or preventing movements between areas for cyclists.
Options for Public Transport						
Public Transport Option 1 (Expansion of St. Paul's Bus Station)	Re-develop St. Paul's into a bus station with larger capacity.	St Paul's is running at capacity and would benefit from expansion	-	Negative - This would deliver one centralised bus station with close proximity to the rail station, which would increase accessibility to the town centre. However this would require large detours for buses or the de-pedestrianisation of The Bridge, and have implications for neighbouring land uses.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it is unlikely to be delivered in the time period of the plan.
Public Transport Option 2 (New Multi-Modal Interchange Facility)	Development of a new multi-modal facility at Station Street.	A new facility could connect the bus service with the rail service	+	Positive - This would result in a much improved bus/rail interchange. There would however be implications for the railway station car park.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it is unlikely to be delivered in the time period of the plan.
Public Transport Option 3 (Expansion of Bradford Place)	Redevelop Bradford Place Interchange to create larger capacity by expanding into Jerome Retail Park.	Bradford Place is running at capacity and would benefit from expansion	+	Positive - Creating extra capacity will improve passenger experience, safety and the reliability of services, but would have implications for neighbouring land uses.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPT3 and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option. It is therefore proposed to allocate land in the AAP for the expansion of Bradford Place.
Public Transport Option 4 (No Change to Public Transport Infrastructure)	No major public transport changes are identified through the AAP.	The current service is providing a good level of buses to the centre and there have been some improvements to Bradford Place already	?	Uncertain - As demand rises, public transport will face further pressure, resulting in less reliable services, causing more car dependency and potentially impact upon the economic growth prospects of the town centre.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it may result in less people using public transport, the centre being less accessible and increases in car emissions.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Walsall Rail Station						
Walsall Rail Station Option 1 (Expand Walsall Railway Station)	The AAP proposes the redesign and expansion of the railway station to create greater capacity.	There are proposals for a rapid transit scheme that would need a new platform at the railway station.	++	Very positive – by creating extra capacity it will mean Walsall is better linked and more attractive to visitors and investors. This will impact positively on the economic growth prospects of the Borough, enabling local rail services to be improved and increase the possibility of attracting national rail services. This could also reduce car usage with benefits to the environment and road congestion. The car park at station street would be lost and there may be some impact on the character of Station Street which does have some buildings of strong character, although improvements to the station may be the catalyst needed for improvements to Station Street overall. There may also be implications for the Saddler’s Shopping Centre.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPT3 and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option, as the improvements are needed to increase the capacity of the station in the event that the proposed improvements go ahead. It is therefore proposed to allocate land to allow for the future expansion of the station in the AAP.
Walsall Rail Station Option 2 (No Change to Walsall Railway Station)	The AAP promotes the railway station as a transport hub but does not seek to enhance its capacity.	The railway station already provides a good service to places like Birmingham and other improvements could be made without an expansion	?	Uncertain – the current situation is maintained with minor improvements to some local services. However the full economic benefit of improving the rail network is not achieved. This may mean that the land is not safeguarded for the expansion of the station and that some improvements are not delivered.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as not safeguarding the land needed to expand the station could mean that essential improvements to public transport are not delivered, which could disadvantage people who rely on this to get to the centre. There is also a risk that Walsall’s rail services could be reduced if the improvements cannot be implemented.
Options for Taxis						
Taxis Option 1 (Additional Taxi Ranks)	The AAP identifies the locations for additional taxi ranks.	New locations are identified in the AAP for additional taxi ranks.	+	Positive, by providing more taxi ranks would help make the centre more accessible especially for those without access to car.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as the location of demand for taxi ranks will change over the plan period as new development is delivered in the Town Centre. It may not be possible to do a long term plan for something which needs to meet changing demands.
Taxis Option 2 (No Additional Taxi Ranks)	The AAP does not identify additional locations for taxi ranks.	The number and location of taxi ranks is determined outside of the plan making process.	?	Uncertain - The current level of taxis remain and any additional ranks are decided outside of the plan making process. Uncertain impact as taxi will meet demand so it’s unlikely to impact on the level of service overall.	Preferred Option – not addressed in AAP	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option as this is considered the best approach to deal with something that is customer lead and likely to change over time.
Taxis Option 3 (Review Location of Taxi Ranks)	The AAP reviews the location of all taxi ranks.	The AAP identifies locations for taxi ranks in the most accessible locations.	+	Positive - Taxi ranks are reviewed so they are located in the most accessible location. Could mean the centre is better served by taxi in terms of location.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as the location of demand for taxi ranks will change over the plan period as new development is delivered in the Town Centre. It may not be possible to do a long term plan for something which needs to meet changing demands.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Coach Facilities						
Coach Facilities Option 1 (Identify Locations for Coach Stopping Facilities)	The AAP identifies the locations for coach stopping facilities.	A new location is identified which can meet the current and increased demand for coach services	+	Positive - This would mean that more coach facilities could stop in the centre and that it is accessible to coach users	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as there is no evidence of further demand for coach facilities in the Town Centre, and the current location for coach stopping is considered suitable to meet existing needs.
Coach Facilities Option 2 (No Provision for Coach Stopping Facilities)	No coach stopping facilities are identified through the AAP.	The current stopping location remains in use	?	Uncertain - The current stopping arrangements would remain and any future issues would be addressed outside of the plan making process. This would not mean that current levels are reduced by may mean further operators are deterred from the centre.	Preferred Option – not addressed in AAP	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option as there is no evidence of further demand so this is considered the most practical option at the present time.
Options for the Road Network						
Road Network Option 1 (Air Quality Standards for Buses)	The AAP sets more stringent air quality standards for buses operating within the Town Centre.	This would require a higher standard from buses improving the air quality in the Town Centre.	+	Positive as the air quality of the town centre would be improved, resulting in a more attractive environment. The cost may be passed on to travellers and the buses that don't meet the requirements may still operate but serve other areas in Walsall rather than improving air quality overall.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as while it is recognised that some new low emission buses have recently been introduced, it is likely to be difficult to implement further improvements in practice, or to enforce such a policy, without the co-operation of bus operators. Even if such a policy could be introduced it may result in a reduction of bus operators in the Town Centre, which could affect the number of visitors, impacting on the vitality and viability of the Strategic Centre.
Road Network Option 2 (Introduce Measures to Encourage Low Emission Vehicles)	The Council works with businesses (such as retailers) and bus operators to encourage the take up of cleaner, low carbon and low emission vehicles to minimise the adverse impacts of vehicles on emissions.	This would require a higher standard from delivery vehicles and buses, improving the air quality in the Town Centre.	+	Positive - this could result in some improvements in air quality in the town centre but could have resources implications.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as while it is recognised that some new low emission buses have recently been introduced, it is likely to be difficult to implement further improvements in practice, or to enforce such a policy, without the co-operation of bus operators, retailers and other businesses that generate a significant number of trips into the Town Centre by road. Even if such a policy could be introduced it may result in a reduction of bus operators and delivery vehicles in the Town Centre, which could affect the operation of existing businesses and the number of visitors, impacting on the vitality and viability of the Strategic Centre.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Road Network Option 3 (No Action to Reduce Vehicle Emissions)	The AAP recognises the issues around the air quality but sets no standards or process by which to reduce emissions within the Town Centre.	Issues around air quality would be addressed through other mechanisms than the plan.	?	Uncertain - Air Quality issues in the town centre are not improved and may possibly get worse. However there are other requirements that need to be met outside of the plan which will mitigate against this.	Part of Preferred Option – not addressed in AAP	This Option has been chosen as part of the Preferred Option as it is considered that reductions in road traffic emissions are best addressed in other ways than through the AAP. For example, further work being undertaken as part of the West Midlands Low Emissions Strategy is likely to identify other measures outside of the planning process to improve air quality in Walsall and the surrounding urban areas.
Road Network Option 4 (Identify Roads Requiring Investment)	The AAP identifies roads and areas where highway improvements are planned or are likely to be required during the plan period.	The road network leading to the Town Centre, especially along the Ring Road, suffers from congestion, which is also having effects on air quality. If nothing is done to address this it could deter future investment in the Town Centre. The existing transport strategy for Walsall in the BCCS does not identify improvements to the road network in the Town Centre as a priority, and no projects are identified in the current West Midlands Local Transport Plan.	?	Uncertain - Improvements are identified which will help secure any funding available. By improving the road network more development could be attracted to the centre especially within the Gigaport area. The better moving the traffic is the less impact on air pollution there is along the corridor although there may be an increase in car emissions overall.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPT4 and Policies Map	The road network especially along the ring road suffers from congestion and this could deter future investment so improvements are needed to ensure it meets future needs.
Road Network Option 5 (No Highway Improvements Identified)	This is a 'do nothing' option that would mean no highway improvement proposals are identified in the AAP and reliance would be placed on existing local plans and transport plans to deliver any future requirements to the highway network in the Town Centre ('saved' UDP Policies T4 and T5, BCCS Policies CSP5, TRAN1, TRAN2, TRAN3, TRAN5 and Transport Key Diagram, West Midlands Local Transport Plan, Walsall Transport Strategy).	There is an existing transport strategy in place for Walsall in the BCCS, and a number of improvement projects are programmed in the West Midlands Local Transport Plan, although these do not currently include any road improvements in Walsall Town Centre. It is possible that such improvement schemes could come forward outside of the plan making process, such as through the current review of the West Midlands Local Transport Plan.	?	Uncertain - Any improvements are undertaken as and when identified. This may mean they are not delivered which could mean that the situation of the road network gets worse resulting in less development being attracted to Walsall with sites remaining vacant and a negative impact on the economy. Also the congestion result in a build up of air pollution along the ring road which has a negative impact on the environment of centre and possible health implications.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as where highway improvements are planned or likely to be needed in the Town Centre it is important for the AAP to identify them, as securing funding for such improvements is usually dependent on them being identified as requirements in the local plan.
Options for Car Parking						
Car Parking Option 1 (Allocate Land for New 'Super' Car Parks)	The AAP allocates land for 'super' car parks in locations that serve the Town Centre and take into account the proposed redevelopment.	There is a need for more well-located, safe and accessible car parking in the Town Centre.	+	Positive - This will enable 'super' car parks to support investment anticipated in the town centre, making it more attractive to a wider range of potential users. It will also improve the strategic highway network and customer safety.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPT5 and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as part of the Preferred Option, while it is not proposed to identify locations for 'super' car parks, it is proposed to identify potential locations for a new multi storey car park near to the Primary Shopping Area, where a need has been identified for more parking provision.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Car Parking Option 2 (Rationalise Current Car Park Provision)	The AAP sets out an approach to rationalising current car park provision without providing for 'Super' Car Parks.	There are some car parks that could be redeveloped as they are not well used and are in less accessible locations.	?	Uncertain - whilst this may result in some under-utilised car parks being developed for other purposes, this will not assist the anticipated investment in the town centre and may deter some potential users.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPT5	This Option has been chosen as part of the Preferred Option as there is a need to manage redevelopment of existing car parks to prevent loss of too many spaces pending the completion of the proposed new multi storey car park.
Car Parking Option 3 (No Strategic Approach Towards Town Centre Car Parking)	No strategic approach is identified for the location of car parks within the Town Centre.	Car parks could be provided and managed by private operators.	-	Negative - The current car parking offer remains difficult to navigate for town centre users and acts as a barrier to customers and those making investment decisions. The centre could become less accessible and deter visitors and investors. More developments may have their own car park as a result which could mean there is less land developed for other town centre uses.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it would not ensure that there will be enough car parking to meet the needs of visitors to the Town Centre, taking into account the new development proposed.
Car Parking Option 4 (Standards for Off-Street Car Parking Charges)	The AAP sets a consistent approach to parking charges for all off-street parking provision in the Town Centre.	The Council has an approach which is not implemented consistently by all car parks, which results in some car parks not meeting the needs of Town Centre visitors, impacting on the health of the centre.	0	Neutral - This would result in a more attractive car parking offer to customers and businesses. Controlling the price may result in a loss of competition which may mean some car parks chose to close. Also means that car parking that is for developments, also serves the Town Centre as a whole, and that linked trips are encouraged supporting the centre economy.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPT5	This Option has been chosen as part of the Preferred Option to ensure that there is a more consistent approach. It is therefore proposed to reflect the need for greater consistency in the AAP policy on car parking.
Car Parking Option 5 (No Standard Approach for Off-Street Car Parking Charges)	The AAP sets no standard approach to off-street car parking charges.	There are other policy requirements / mechanisms outside the local plan process that would allow the Council to manage car parking in the Town Centre.	0	Neutral - This would result in no control over car parking prices, which may lead to high prices which deter customers.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it is not considered sufficient to support the approach of the Council towards car parking in the Town Centre.
8. A Place for Investment						
Options for Overall Approach						
Approach Option 1 ('Big Three' and Park Street Identified as Development Opportunities)	The AAP promotes the 'Big Three' and Park Street as the key development opportunities as the overall approach to regenerating the Town Centre.	There are already an existing approach in the UDP and BCCS of prioritising sites in certain locations in the Town Centre and the AAP could continue and further develop this approach.	+	Positive - These sites are promoted as the main development opportunities in the town centre, in favour of other smaller sites. Potential investment is directed towards these areas. Without clear uses promoted for sites it's possible that the potential of opportunities will not be realised. This means development is in the most accessible location and will act as a catalyst for further developments.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it would not provide enough guidance to developers and investors to help delivery of the regeneration strategy for the Town Centre, which is focussed around creating destinations for shopping, leisure and office.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Approach Option 2 (Vision and Land Use Policies for 'Big Three' and Park Street)	The AAP sets out clearly the vision for the 'Big Three' and Park Street areas, along with the type of uses to be promoted within these developments.	There is already an established approach in the UDP and BCCS of promoting particular types of land uses in certain locations in the Town Centre, and the AAP could continue and further develop this approach.	+	Positive - These sites are promoted as the main development opportunities in the town centre. Each site has a clear vision for the types of uses which are acceptable, and other uses will be discouraged. Focusing on specific uses should result in a stronger town centre, with developments only being delivered in the locations which are most appropriate. This would allow clarity on how the BCCS targets would be met. However refusing all alternative uses may mean that investment is not forthcoming and sites may remain undeveloped for longer.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPI1	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option as it is considered as the best approach to provide a strong vision for the regeneration of the Town Centre, to deliver the sites for uses which build on their locations such as leisure by the Canal and an office corridor on the Ring Road.
Approach Option 3 (No Specific Guidance for 'Big Three' and Park Street)	The AAP is flexible about uses and the vision for the 'Big Three' and Park Street areas, allowing the market to lead.	It would be possible to identify key sites for development in the AAP, while not being prescriptive about the types of land uses that can be developed, allowing the most profitable 'town centre' land uses to come forward.	?	Uncertain - The AAP does not seek promote certain areas or to control where particular uses are delivered within the town centre. This may mean that developments can be delivered more quickly, but investment may not come forward in the most appropriate locations which could have a negative impact on the attraction of other investment. This could result in the BCCS targets for retail and office floor space not being met.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it would not provide enough guidance to developers and investors to help delivery of the regeneration strategy for the Town Centre, which is focussed around creating destinations for shopping, leisure and office.
Approach Option 4 (Environmental Standards for New Development within 'Big Three')	The AAP sets exemplar environmental standards for the 'Big Three' sites in order to drive the regeneration of the Town Centre forward.	It would be possible to require more environmental infrastructure to be provided within the main development opportunities identified in the AAP.	?	Uncertain - These buildings would have only minimal environmental impact and would set a precedent for developments in the rest of the town centre. However such high standards may bring increased costs, impacting on viability. This is considered to be potentially damaging to delivery as developments could go elsewhere where there are less requirements undermining the regeneration strategy.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it is considered to be potentially damaging to delivery as developments could go elsewhere where there are less requirements undermining the regeneration strategy.
Approach Option 5 (Design Standards for New Development within 'Big Three')	The AAP sets exemplar design for the 'Big Three' sites, in order to drive the regeneration of the Town Centre forward.	It would be possible to require higher standards of design within the main development opportunities identified in the AAP.	?	Uncertain - These buildings would be high quality and would set a precedent for developments in the rest of the town centre, improving its overall attractiveness and acting as a catalyst for further investment. However such high standards may bring increased costs, impacting on viability. This is considered to be potentially damaging to delivery as developments could go elsewhere where there are less requirements undermining the regeneration strategy.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it is considered to be potentially damaging to delivery as developments could go elsewhere where there are less requirements undermining the regeneration strategy.
Options for St. Matthew's Quarter – Old Square						
Old Square Option 1 (No Land Use Change)	The AAP identifies Old Square Shopping Centre to remain primarily a retail location.	This would help to deliver the BCCS targets for retail floor space and protect the core of the Town Centre.	++	Very positive - This will help to deliver the targets for retail floor space and protect the core of the town centre. It may mean that the units remain vacant for longer but a flexible approach is already applied to alternative uses within the centre will minimising this risk.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPI2 and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as part of the Preferred Option as this area is regarded as a key retail area within the St. Matthew's Quarter. It is therefore proposed to identify the site as a retail opportunity priority.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Old Square Option 2 (Expand/ Redevelop with Larger Retail Units)	The AAP identifies the Old Square Shopping Centre as an opportunity to be expanded/ redeveloped to provide larger units.	This could help to attract retailers seeking larger unit sizes which are not generally available elsewhere in the Town Centre, therefore enhancing the overall shopping experience and vitality of the Town Centre.	++	Very positive - Proposed to attract retailers seeking larger unit sizes which are not generally available elsewhere in the town centre, therefore enhancing the overall shopping experience and vitality of the town centre.	Part of Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAPI2 and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as part of the Preferred Option as this area is regarded as a key retail area within the St. Matthew's Quarter. It is therefore proposed to identify the site on the AAP Policies Map as a site for potential redevelopment and to include guidance on new unit sizes.
Old Square Option 3 (Identify as Mixed Use Development Opportunity)	The AAP promotes Old Square Shopping Centre as a development opportunity for a variety of Town Centre uses.	It is possible that other 'town centre' land uses could be accommodated in this shopping centre without compromising the overall retail offer of the Town Centre.	?	Uncertain - It is possible that other uses could be accommodated in the shopping centre. This may make it difficult to meet the retail floor space targets which have been set to sustain the economy of the centre so this may have a negative impact	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it may mean that the BCCS targets for retail floorspace cannot be met. However, the AAP could still support other land uses in the shopping centre where they would not impact on the primary function of the Old Square area as a shopping destination.
Options for St. Matthew's Quarter – Shannon's Mill						
Shannon's Mill Option 1 (No Land Use Change to Front Site)	The AAP identifies Shannon's Mill front site to remain primarily a retail location.	This would continue the current approach towards the site.	+	Positive - This would provide a retail development opportunity close to the current retail offer. This would help deliver the retail floor space but could stretch the retail offer across a larger area resulting in vacancies in the heart of the centre as there may not be enough retail demand to support the number of units. This may mean the site remain undeveloped for some time as there could be limited demand for retail on the site	Part of Preferred Option which is combination of Options 1, 2 and 3 - see Draft AAP Policy AAPS2, AAPI2 and Policies Map	The Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1, 2 and 3 because there is a need for flexibility, given that the site has remained undeveloped for some time. The retail floorspace targets for the Town Centre have also been reduced in order to consolidate retail development within the Primary Shopping Area, so it is not essential to the health of the centre to allocate this site for retail development. However, retailing is still the preferred land use for the front site to maintain an active street frontage, and this is reflected in the in the Draft AAP policies for this site.
Shannon's Mill Option 2 (Identify Rear Site as Mixed Use Development Opportunity)	The AAP promotes the Shannon's Mill rear site as a development opportunity for any appropriate 'town centre' uses.	The site has remained undeveloped for some time with limited retailer interest. Identifying other potential land uses may therefore be the best way to bring the site forward.	+	Positive - This would allow the front end to be used as retail whilst the rear is developed for another use. This has the potential to maximise the site potential but would mean that the rear couldn't be developed for retail, this may restrict the size of retail development that could fit on the site	Part of Preferred Option which is combination of Options 1, 2 and 3 - see Draft AAP Policy AAPS2, AAPI2 and Policies Map	The Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1, 2 and 3 because there is a need for flexibility, given that the site has remained undeveloped for some time. The retail floorspace targets for the Town Centre have also been reduced in order to consolidate retail development within the Primary Shopping Area, so it is not essential to the health of the centre to allocate this site for retail development. It is therefore recognised that other land uses than retailing may be more viable and appropriate at the rear of the site and this is reflected in the Draft AAP policies for this site.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Shannon's Mill Option 3 (Identify Whole Site as Mixed Use Development Opportunity)	The AAP promotes the whole of the Shannon's Mill site as a development opportunity for any appropriate 'town centre' land uses.	Shannon's Mill is on the edge of the Primary Shopping Area and there has been little retail interest in the site over recent years, meaning that other potential uses for the site need to be considered.	+	Positive - This would allow for more flexibility and could result in the site coming forward faster. Some uses may support the surrounding retail uses such as leisure or residential. It could however result in a retail opportunity site being lost	Part of Preferred Option which is combination of Options 1, 2 and 3 - see Draft AAP Policy AAPS2, AAPI2 and Policies Map	The Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1, 2 and 3 because there is a need for flexibility, given that the site has remained undeveloped for some time. The retail floorspace targets for the Town Centre have also been reduced in order to consolidate retail development within the Primary Shopping Area, so it is not essential to the health of the centre to allocate this site for retail development. The AAP therefore allows for mixed use development on this site, although it is also proposed to identify it as a sequentially preferable edge-of-centre site for convenience retailing and bulky goods retailing that cannot be accommodated within the Primary Shopping Area boundary.
Options for Walsall Gigaport						
Gigaport Option 1 (Identify as Walsall's Main Business/ Office Development Location)	The Gigaport is allocated and promoted through the AAP as Walsall's business district with the development of large office accommodation and associated uses.	The Gigaport has been identified for some time as the preferred location for office development in the Town Centre. This area has the potential to develop as a business district where offices can locate close to each other in an attractive planned environment.	+	Positive - Gigaport provides enough sites suitable for office development in an accessible and visible location. Through having a specific area to encourage office development it is hoped this will create a high quality businesses environment in the centre triggering further investment. There may be some increase in traffic along the Ring Road which already suffers from congestion and some increase in emissions in the area. Some developments may need to be set away from the road to reduce the impact of air quality on the scheme.	Part of Preferred Option which is combination of Options 1, 2 and 3 - see Draft AAP Policy AAPS2, AAPI2 and Policies Map	The Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1 and 3 because there are no other areas likely to be as suitable for office development as the Gigaport. It is therefore proposed to allocate the Gigaport is being allocated as the priority area for office development in the Town Centre.
Gigaport Option 2 (Identify for Other Town Centre Uses)	The Gigaport is allocated for other appropriate 'town centre' uses and business needs are allocated elsewhere in the Town Centre.	There are other sites in the Town Centre outside the Gigaport area which may be suitable for office development.	?	Uncertain - The AAP does not control which town centre uses are delivered in the Gigaport area. Being located away from the heart of the centre the area may not be suitable for other town centre uses. It could also be more difficult to meet the BCCS floor space targets using a collection of smaller sites. Furthermore a dispersed office market is less likely to attract similar levels of investment.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as the Gigaport area is not near to the Primary Shopping Area and is therefore less suitable for other 'town centre' uses such as retailing and leisure than other potential opportunity sites. It could also be more difficult to meet the proposed office floorspace targets on smaller, dispersed sites, as they are less likely to attract large-scale office investment.
Gigaport Option 3 (Identify Land Adjacent to Littleton Street as Phase One)	The sites located adjacent to Littleton Street should be promoted as the first phase of sites delivered in Gigaport.	These sites are the most prominent sites in the Town Centre, and their successful delivery could provide a catalyst for further investment in office developments in the same area.	+	Positive - These sites are the most prominent and their successful delivery will provide impetus for further investment. However focusing on these sites could lead to other less prominent sites remaining undeveloped for longer periods of time.	Part of Preferred Option which is combination of Options 1, 2 and 3 - see Draft AAP Policy AAPS2, AAPI2 and Policies Map	The Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1 and 3 because it is recognised that these sites are likely to have more potential being near to recent landmark office developments. It is therefore proposed to identify these sites as a priority for development within the Gigaport area.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Options for Walsall Waterfront – Waterfront North						
Waterfront North Option 1 (Allocate for Leisure Uses)	Waterfront North is allocated through the AAP for leisure facilities, for example cinema and conferencing facilities.	When the Issues & Options were identified in 2013 there was a proposal for a cinema and other leisure uses at this site.	++	Very positive - Waterfront North would be promoted as the key opportunity for strategic leisure developments. The area is a good location for leisure facilities, in close proximity to the Art Gallery, with the potential for an enhanced canal side environment, and good public transport links. However dismissing other investment on this site may mean that some investment is not secured in the town centre.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policies AAPLE1 and AAP14	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option as this site is considered to be the best option for creating a leisure destination in Walsall in the light of the recent planning permission for leisure development. The cinema development is now on site. It is therefore proposed to allocate Waterfront North in the AAP as the main location for leisure development in Walsall Town Centre.
Waterfront North Option 2 (Allocate for Any Town Centre Uses)	Waterfront North is allocated for any appropriate Town Centre use.	At the time the Issues & Options were identified in 2013 the cinema proposal hadn't started on site, so it was possible that another use would come forward, hence this was identified as an alternative option for this site.	+	Positive - Other town centre use may come forward but this may not be the most appropriate location for such uses and there may be a knock on effect on other areas of the town. This would make it difficult to meet the BCCS aspiration to attract a cinema, and could result in missing the opportunity to make the most of the canal side location.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it has been overtaken by events. The site is now being developed for leisure uses including a new cinema following approval of planning permission.
Options for Walsall Waterfront – Waterfront Lex						
Waterfront Lex Option 1 (Allocate for Leisure Uses)	Waterfront Lex is allocated through the AAP for leisure facilities, for example conferencing/ banqueting facilities.	Development of new leisure facilities on this site would complement the leisure developments currently under construction/ proposed at Waterfront North.	+	Very Positive - Leisure facilities at Lex would complement potential facilities at Waterfront North.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as the evidence suggests that there is limited demand for other leisure uses in Walsall beyond the cinema scheme currently under construction at Waterfront North, so a flexible approach to land uses on this site is needed.
Waterfront Lex Option 2 (Allocate for Housing)	Waterfront Lex is allocated through the AAP for residential use.	Residential development could be an appropriate use for this site given the canalside location and the potential to create a good standard of amenity.	?	Uncertain - Residential development could be an appropriate use for this site. However the town centre's indicative target for residential development has already been met, and allocating land for further housing may deter other town centre investment.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected, as securing investment in office, leisure and other 'town centre' uses is important for the future health of the Town Centre. As is a key opportunity site for development, allocation for residential use only would limit the options and could deter investment.
Waterfront Lex Option 3 (Allocate for Any Town Centre Uses/ Mixed Uses)	Waterfront Lex is allocated for any appropriate town centre use, or a mixed use proposal.	The site is potentially suitable for a variety of land uses including housing or 'town centre' uses.	+	Positive - The maximum benefit of the canal side frontage may not be realised, but a mixed use scheme may ensure deliverability of the site. Flexibility in the approach to uses should help delivery the site.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAP14	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option for the site as number of suitable 'town centre' land uses have been suggested for the site, but there are no firm proposals, so there is a need for flexibility.
Options for Park Street Shopping Core						
Park Street Option 1 (Allocate Park Street Area as Walsall's Main Retail Development Location)	Park Street is allocated and promoted as the key location in the Town Centre for retail uses.	Park Street is the main shopping street in the Town Centre where most of the main retail outlets are located, and is the core of the Primary Shopping Area.	++	Very positive - Retail investment is focused on Park Street and the retail heart of the town is maintained. Some redevelopment of units may be required as without this it could be hard to attract investment, particularly from retailers requiring larger stores.	Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1 and 2 – see Draft AAP Policy AAPS2, AAP15 and Policies Map	The Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1 and 2, as Park Street is the main shopping street in the Town Centre and therefore forms the core part of the Primary Shopping Area identified in the Draft AAP. As such, it is proposed to encourage further retail development in this area to consolidate its primary retail function.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Park Street Option 2 (Allocate Park Place and Saddlers' Centre as Walsall's Main Retail Development Location)	Park Place Shopping Centre and the Saddler's Centre should be allocated as the focus for retail-led development.	These two shopping centres are the main sites in the Park Street area with potential for new retail development. Both centres have a number of vacant units and there is potential for redevelopment/ reconfiguration to provide new retail opportunities.	?	Uncertain - Retail investment is still promoted in the Park Street area, but is focused on the two shopping centres rather than the street itself. This may offer greater opportunity to create larger units which are needed to attract retailers, but the smaller units on Park Street may become vacant.	Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1 and 2 – see Draft AAP Policy AAPS2, AAPIS and Policies Map	The Preferred Option is a combination of Options 1 and 2, as both centres have a frontage onto Park Street, which is the main shopping street in the Town Centre. Both centres are therefore included in the Primary Shopping Area identified in the Draft AAP, but it is recognised that there is scope for improvement as some units are not in use, so it is proposed to identify them as the main sites in the Park Street area likely to have potential for redevelopment/ reconfiguration.
Options for Secondary Sites						
Secondary Sites Option 1 (Allocate Secondary Sites as Development Opportunities)	The AAP allocates Secondary Sites outside the main opportunity areas for development. These sites are identified on the Policies Map and there is a policy identifying suitable uses for each site.	There are a number of sites outside the 'Big Three' and Park Street which would be suitable for investment and which would benefit the town centre if developed	+	Positive - A number of sites which are development opportunities are identified as development opportunities. This could conflict with the priorities but the policy can mitigate against this by requirements proposals to complement the regeneration strategy in the AAP. Identifying the sites may help them come forward and attract further investment in the centre.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAP16 and Policies Map	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option, because there are a number of sites in the Town Centre that do not fall within the main development opportunity areas which would be suitable for development that would benefit the Town Centre as a whole. It is therefore proposed to allocate these sites in the AAP and to provide guidance on appropriate land uses.
Secondary Sites Option 2 (Do Not Allocate Any Further Development Sites)	No further sites are allocated for development in the AAP apart from the 'Big Three' and Park Street.	Sites could come forward outside the 'Big Three' and Park Street without being allocated for development in the AAP. The suitability of the proposals could be assessed using the existing planning policy framework/ Town Centre regeneration strategy provided by the BCCS and AAP without the need to allocate sites.	?	Uncertain - Not identifying sites wont necessary mean they don't come forward it may however mean there is less confidence from developers and investors in the sights delaying their development.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected as it is considered appropriate to identify suitable land uses for other potential development sites in the Town Centre that would not undermine the proposals for the main opportunity areas or discourage investment in 'town centre' development in the areas most likely to maintain the future health and core retail function of the centre.
Options for Flood Risk Management						
Flood Risk Management Option 1 (Strategic Approach to Water Management)	The AAP takes a strategic approach to integrating water management infrastructure, such as requiring Sustainable Drainage Systems to be incorporated into the design of the public realm in the Town Centre.	Parts of the Town Centre are at significant risk from surface water flooding and fluvial flooding. A strategic approach towards water management in these areas may be appropriate to reduce the risks.	++	Very Positive - Developers would be required to contribute to such solutions which may affect development costs and viability, although this would reduce the costs of onsite measures. This would provide wider amenity benefit to the urban realm and an opportunity to demonstrate innovate approaches to water management.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected because developments come forward at different times making delivering a comprehensive solution to flood risk difficult.

Option	Summary of Option	Reasons for Choosing Option	Options Appraisal – Overall Score	SA Options Appraisal – Summary of Outcomes	Current Status of Option (July 2015)	Reasons for Choices
Flood Risk Management Option 2 (Site-by-Site Approach to Water Management)	This is the 'do nothing' option, and would mean that water management solutions would be considered on a site by site basis, having regard to existing national policy guidance and local plan policy on the sequential test for flood risk and surface water management (NPPF paragraphs 100 - 104, NPPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change, 'saved' UDP Policy ENV40 and BCCS Policies CSP3, DEL1 and ENV5).	It is possible to manage flood risk on a site-by-site basis by applying existing national policy guidance and local plan policies.	+	Positive - Developers would need to provide drainage on a site by site basis, limiting the potential for more sustainable and innovative solutions to water management given site constraints including the land available for such solutions. There would be little benefit to the operation of the overall drainage network.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAP17	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option as existing policy guidance is considered sufficient to address flood risk and water management issues in the Town Centre. However, it is proposed to include a generic policy on development constraints in the AAP, which includes general guidance to developers on addressing flood risk issues.
Options for Other Constraints						
Constraints Option 1 (Policy on Development Constraints in the Town Centre)	The AAP considers what constraints there are to development in the Town Centre and sets out policy guidance on how new developments will be expected to address them.	There are a number of development constraints in the Town Centre and these can have a direct impact on the viability of schemes. It may be helpful for the AAP to identify these and provide guidance to developers on the main priorities and requirements.	+	Positive - A positive approach towards understanding the constraints and working with developers to overcome them will help with delivery.	Preferred Option – see Draft AAP Policy AAP17	This Option has been chosen as the Preferred Option, as while there is existing policy guidance in place on addressing development constraints it is considered helpful to have a policy in the AAP identifying the main constraints present in the Town Centre, and providing guidance to developers on how they are expected to be addressed.
Constraints Option 2 (No Policy on Constraints)	This is the 'do nothing' option, and would mean that where development constraints are present, issues for development would be considered on a site by site basis, having regard to existing national policy guidance and local plan policy (for example, guidance on pollution, ground contamination and instability, flood risk and minerals safeguarding in NPPF paragraphs 7 - 10, 17, 100 -104, 109 – 111, 120 – 125, 144, relevant NPPG, 'saved' UDP Policies ENV10, ENV14 and ENV40 and BCCS Policies CSP4, DEL1, ENV5 and MIN1).	There are already existing national policy guidance and local plan policies in place, aimed at ensuring that new developments address environmental and physical constraints where this is essential to the delivery of a sustainable development.	?	Uncertain – There is already policy guidance around constraints, which could provide the basis for ensuring constraints are dealt with sufficiently.	Rejected	This Option has been rejected because existing policy guidance on its own is unlikely to provide sufficiently clear guidance to developers on the types of constraints present in the Town Centre.

Revised SAD and AAP SA Objectives (July 2015)

SA1	Air Quality - Minimise emissions of potentially harmful air pollutants from new development in Walsall and exposure of 'sensitive receptors' to poor air quality in the parts of Walsall Borough where monitoring shows that the national air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂) are not being met and/ or that there are high levels of other potentially harmful air pollutants
SA2	Biodiversity and Geodiversity - Conserve, protect, enhance and restore Walsall's biodiversity and geodiversity by ensuring that new development contributes towards the establishment of coherent and resilient ecological networks, makes provision for enhancement of biodiversity and geological conservation wherever possible, and does not harm the integrity of European Sites or cause further loss, harm or deterioration of designated sites, other important wildlife habitats, and geological features, or compromise existing ecological networks
SA3	Climate Change - Reduce Walsall's contribution towards climate change and adapt to the unavoidable effects of climate change on the Borough, by promoting developments that avoid, reduce or minimise emissions of harmful greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide (CO ₂), and by identifying opportunities to mitigate the anticipated effects on key infrastructure and other important assets
SA4	Communities and Population - Support the development of strong, sustainable and inclusive communities in Walsall by developing well designed housing that meets current and future housing needs in locations that support the transition to a low carbon future and are resilient to the unavoidable effects of climate change, have a good standard of amenity and are accessible to existing and planned employment areas and social infrastructure; enable the development of appropriately located new social infrastructure where there is a need, and ensure that other new developments will have a positive effect on the quality of life for local communities, and will not be harmful to their amenity, health and well-being
SA5	Cultural Heritage - Conserve, protect and enhance Walsall's cultural heritage by encouraging better management of conservation areas and historic parks and gardens, by identifying appropriate, viable and beneficial uses for vacant historic buildings, and by ensuring that new development does not compromise the quality or character of heritage assets and their settings or destroy features or archaeology of national or local importance
SA6	Economy and Centres - Promote sustainable, low carbon economic growth and retain businesses and jobs in Walsall by identifying and safeguarding sufficient land for employment and training of the right quality in appropriate and accessible locations to meet the needs of local businesses and potential investors, without compromising the amenity of local communities or the operation of other businesses, by helping to address barriers to sustainable economic growth and investment where possible, such as providing new infrastructure where it is needed to support existing and future businesses, and by identifying opportunities for retail, office and leisure development in centres to meet anticipated requirements
SA7	Equality and Diversity - Reduce inequalities which result from social-economic disadvantage by ensuring that the diverse needs of communities in Walsall are met by planned housing and other developments, and ensure that groups or individuals with protected characteristics, as defined in the Equalities Act 2010, do not suffer direct or indirect discrimination as a result of policies that are included or omitted, including ensuring that developments intended for use specifically by protected or disadvantaged groups, or by them in conjunction with others, are in accessible locations, which are not exposed to significant environmental problems and are likely to be resilient to climate change effects
SA8	Health and Wellbeing - Improve the health and well-being of Walsall residents and address health inequalities by ensuring that new development supports healthy lifestyles and wellbeing and does not present unacceptable risks to the health, safety and wellbeing of local communities and people who visit Walsall for work, shopping or leisure, by developing new health and social care facilities where there is a need, and by ensuring that health and social care facilities are accessible to those they are meant to serve and are likely to be resilient to climate change effects
SA9	Landscape and Townscape - Conserve, protect and enhance the landscape and townscape by developing an environmental infrastructure network for Walsall that protects valued areas and provides opportunities to improve areas of lesser quality, and by ensuring that new development is well designed, of a type and scale appropriate to its surroundings, and respects the character of buildings, spaces and other features where they contribute positively to the environment
SA10	Material Resources - Use Walsall's material resources prudently and efficiently by safeguarding mineral resources and mineral and waste infrastructure, by addressing identified mineral supply requirements, by supporting proposals that would reduce waste and manage unavoidable waste in accordance with the 'waste hierarchy,' and by enabling the provision of the infrastructure needed for treatment, transfer and disposal of waste and manufacture and distribution of mineral products in appropriate locations, where operations will not endanger human health, or cause unacceptable harm to the environment, or the amenity and wellbeing of local communities
SA11	Renewable and Low Carbon Energy - Reduce Walsall's reliance on non-renewable, carbon based energy sources, by minimising energy consumption, by increasing the capacity available to generate energy and fuel from renewable and low carbon sources including waste that cannot be re-used or recycled, by identifying opportunities for co-location of new energy generating infrastructure near to complementary land uses where there is scope to use residual heat, and by delivering more affordable, secure and reliable supplies of energy to local communities and businesses, in ways that will not generate harmful pollutants or have other adverse effects on the environment, and will be resilient to climate change effects
SA12	Soil and Ground Conditions - Maintain and improve the quality of Walsall's soils and land, by avoiding development of greenfield land, including the 'best and most versatile' agricultural land, where previously-developed land or lesser quality greenfield land is available, by encouraging development likely to use soils, land and buildings efficiently, re-use or recycle construction, demolition and excavation wastes, and bring previously developed and derelict land back into beneficial use, and by ensuring that new development deals with existing contamination and geotechnical problems and does not exacerbate existing problems or cause such problems on land not already affected
SA13	Transport and Accessibility - Deliver the transport infrastructure required to improve connectivity, reduce congestion and support economic growth in Walsall and adjoining parts of the West Midlands urban area, reduce the vulnerability of transport infrastructure to climate change effects, reduce the impacts of transport on the environment and on the health, amenity and well-being of local communities, and ensure that new employment and social infrastructure is accessible to local people by a choice of transport modes, and encourages them to make smarter and healthier transport choices
SA14	Water Environment - Conserve and protect Walsall's water resources, maintain water quality and reduce the risk of flooding, by minimising water consumption, by avoiding development in areas where water resources are present or areas at risk of flooding, by ensuring that new development will not have adverse impacts on hydrology or water treatment and supply infrastructure, including increasing vulnerability of such infrastructure to climate change effects, and that any waste water likely to be generated by new development can be managed in ways that minimise the risk of flooding and pollution of surface and groundwater

Key to Options Appraisal Scoring

Symbol	Meaning	Reasons for Scoring Selection
++	Likely to have strong positive effects	This score has been applied where an Option is likely to be particularly beneficial/ complimentary towards the achievement of the SA Objectives, for example, where it would contribute directly towards meeting one or more of the SA Objectives.
+	Likely to have positive effects	This score has been applied where an Option is likely to have some beneficial/ complimentary effects on the SA Objectives, for example, where it would indirectly contribute towards meeting one or more of the SA Objectives or would be complementary, or where the potential positive effects identified are likely to outweigh any potential negative effects identified.
0	Likely to have neutral/ no effects	This score has been applied where an Option is likely to have no effects on the SA Objectives or where the effects would be negligible or net neutral overall, for example, where there would be both positive and negative effects, but overall there would be a balance between the positives and negatives so that one does not outweigh the other.
-	Likely to have negative effects	This score has been applied where an Option is likely to be detrimental/ harmful to the achievement of the SA Objectives, for example, where there would be an indirect conflict with one or more of the SA Objectives, or where the potential negative effects identified are likely to outweigh any potential positive effects identified.
--	Likely to have strong negative effects	This score has been applied where an Option is likely to be very detrimental/ harmful to the achievement of the SA Objectives, for example, where it would directly conflict with one or more of the SA Objectives.
?	Effects uncertain	This score has been applied where the effects of an Option on the SA Objectives are uncertain, for example, where there are a number of variables, or where there are likely to be both positive and negative effects, but it is not possible to determine whether one would outweigh the other, or that the overall effects would be neutral.
N/A	Not applicable – Option not subject to appraisal	This score has been applied where the Option has been rejected from the outset because it is not considered to be a 'reasonable alternative' for the plan, and has therefore not been subjected to SA. The SA only has to cover 'reasonable alternatives' so it is not necessary to appraise Options that are not considered to be 'reasonable.' A separate schedule of the Unreasonable Options for the AAP has been prepared, explaining the reasons why they are not 'reasonable alternatives.'