

Appendix Q:

Walsall Site Allocation Document (SAD)

Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP)

Screening and Appraisal of Pre-Submission Main Modifications to SAD and AAP – Summary

- Table Q1: Pre-Submission Main Modifications to Walsall Site Allocations Document (SAD) – Screening and Appraisal of Effects**
Table Q2: Pre-Submission Main Modifications to Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) – Screening and Appraisal of Effects
Table Q3: SAD & AAP Sustainability Objectives

The numbering of modifications in this appendix is based on the final schedule of modifications published in October 2016 rather than the version agreed by Cabinet in July 2016. The appraisal takes account of changes made post-Cabinet. Some modifications have been added or combined in the final schedule but the order in which they are listed in this appendix is based on the order the modifications appear in the Cabinet report, except where the modifications are new.

Table Q1: Pre-Submission Main Modifications to Walsall Site Allocations Document (SAD) – Screening and Appraisal of Effects (July 2016)

Modification Reference	Policy/ Section Reference	Summary of Modification	Reasons for Modification	Screening - Likelihood of Significant Effects	SA Required?	Appraisal – Overall Score	Appraisal of Modification – Summary of Effects/ Reasons for Not Appraising the Modification
2. Objectives, Regeneration Corridors and Issues							
MMSAD1	Policy RC1	Delete “ and Centre ” from third line of policy	The SAD does not cover Walsall Strategic Centre so the policy cannot apply to this area	None. The policy does not place any new requirement on development and is intended to help monitor other policies, in particular existing policies in the BCCS	No	N/A	
N/A	2.3 Issues: Assets and Constraints	Add the main assets and constraints to development in Walsall which have been taken into account in the site selection process, and which will also need to be taken into account when development is proposed on other sites not allocated in the SAD.	This section formed part of the Publication Draft Plan but was not appraised by itself prior to the Publication of the SAD in March 2016, although the identified assets and constraints have been taken into account as part of the appraisal of the sites proposed to be allocated under the topic-specific policies. Modification MMSAD3 proposes additional assets and constraints to be taken into account whilst modifications are also proposed to the assets and constraints to be taken into account for specific sites. These modifications are appraised below.	Section 2.3 of the SAD is likely to help prevent, minimise or reduce the likelihood of significant harmful effects on the environment, amenity, businesses and infrastructure, and increase the likelihood of positive effects. The guidance will ensure that any assets and constraints within or near to development sites are identified in advance, so that the potential effects are taken into account in the site selection process and in the delivery of planned developments.	No, but the identified assets and constraints have been taken into account as part of the appraisal of the sites proposed to be allocated under the topic specific policies.	N/A	
MMSAD2	Policy section f) Water	Addition of references to the need for new development proposals to have regard to Environment Agency flood risk mapping and any new technical information that becomes available on flood risk, and to include any necessary allowances for the effects of climate change.	In response to representations on the Publication Draft SAD by the Environment Agency (2658).	The Modification is likely to improve the resilience of new developments to the unavoidable effects of climate change, by ensuring that significant risks from fluvial flooding are taken into account in the site selection process and in the design and delivery of planned developments.	Yes	+	Effects are likely to be positive overall from having emphasised the need to consider the latest available flood risk evidence, and the need to consider the necessary allowances for the effects of climate change. Uncertain effects are identified in relation to SA 5, 6, 7 and 9 as a result of the possible effects that might occur to flood risk extents in the future, and the inability to predict how this might impact upon the economy, built environment, cultural heritage, equality and landscape and townscape.
MMSAD3	Table 2.1: Assets and Constraints and Walsall’s Local Plan Policies	Addition of Permitted Minerals Sites (PM/ pm) and Registered Common Land (RCL) to list of specific assets and constraints in the table.	To address inconsistency and to respond to objections by Mineral Products Association (441) and Parkhill Estates (2597) on the Publication Draft SAD concerning potential conflicts where housing is	The Modification in respect of mineral sites is likely to minimise land use conflicts when development is proposed near to permitted mineral extraction sites, and related impacts on amenity	No, but the permitted sites have been taken into account as part of the appraisal of	N/A	Elements of the modification that require SA are undertaken as part of the appraisal of particular sites proposed to be allocated under the topic specific policies for housing and industry. The modifications to these policies have been appraised

			<p>proposed near to potential future mineral working areas.</p> <p>The control of development affecting Registered Common Land operates outside the planning system but it can affect whether development is capable of being implemented.</p>	<p>and supply of minerals of local and national importance. It will ensure that the effects on mineral resources and future mineral working are taken into account in the site selection process and in the design and delivery of planned developments.</p> <p>Certain potential mineral sites in the Brownhills and Pelsall area are Registered Common Land</p>	<p>particular sites proposed to be allocated under the topic specific policies for housing and industry. The modifications to these policies have been appraised</p>		
3. Homes for Our Communities							
MMSAD4	HC1: Land Allocated for New Housing Development Table HC1 Flood Risk Constraints Heritage Asset Constraints LDO Minerals Safeguarding Constraints	<p>Update Asset and Constraint information for several of the housing sites identified in the policy (HO11, HO16, HO37, HO176, HO181, HO182, HO217, HO303, HO305 and HO308). These comprise flood risk, listed buildings/ conservation area, Darlaston LDO and minerals safeguarding.</p> <p>Note added referring to boundary of sites HO303 and HO305 being amended.</p> <p>N.B. Updating of planning status to indicate sites under construction as at 31st March 2016 (HO11, HO27 and HO29) is also part of this Modification but does not require appraisal.</p>	<p>Flood risk details updated/ boundary of Site HO305 amended to take account of latest advice and mapping from Environment Agency (2658), reference to Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) added to all potential housing sites of 5ha or more in size to ensure consistency with BCCS Policy MIN1, and in response to representation from Mineral Products Association (441). Heritage asset constraints identified were omitted in error from Publication Draft SAD.</p> <p>Boundary of site HO303 amended to exclude area of Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.</p>	<p>The Modification is likely to improve the resilience of new developments to the unavoidable effects of climate change, by ensuring that significant risks from fluvial flooding are taken into account in the site selection process and in the design and delivery of planned developments. By identifying site allocations near to listed buildings and conservation areas the Modification will ensure that the effects on heritage assets are taken into account in the design and delivery of the development, reducing the likelihood of significant harmful effects and increasing the likelihood of positive effects. It will also reduce the risk that housing development on Site HO182 will needlessly sterilise mineral resources of potential economic value, and that the potential for ‘prior extraction’ is considered.</p> <p>Amendment to site HO303 will avoid potential harm to SINC.</p>	Yes	+	<p>Overall effects are likely to be positive as the Modification will ensure that planned housing developments and the occupiers of the new housing will be less vulnerable to flooding and the associated costs and risks (SA3, SA4, SA6, SA7, SA8, SA9, SA14), that large-scale housing developments will not lead to needless sterilisation of mineral resources of potential economic value (SA10) or harm to SINC (SA2), and that housing developments will also preserve and enhance any heritage assets affected (SA5).</p>
MMSAD5	HC1: Land Allocated for	Delete Site HO58: Walsall Road, Walsall Wood as housing site	Site lies adjacent to Highfields North Permitted Minerals Site	The Modification will prevent the land use conflicts likely to	Yes	0	Overall effects are likely to be neutral, except for specific beneficial effects on people, health and well-being, the

	New Housing Development Table HC1 and Policies Map	allocation. The effect of this change is that the site will now be 'white land,' not allocated for any particular land use.	(MP9) which is subject to a 'dormant' planning permission for mineral extraction (see SAD Policy M8). The potential for land use conflict has been identified by Parkhill Estate (2597) and means that the site would not be suitable for housing during the lifetime of the plan. Mineral Products Association (441) has also raised concern that site allocations on peripheral sites could compromise mineral working and sterilise mineral resources.	arise if the site is allocated for housing development. This will in turn help to minimise the significant harmful effects on amenity that could arise if housing was developed adjacent to the permitted site at Highfields North (MP9), and may also prevent the potentially significant harmful effects on brick clay supply that could arise if proximal housing development were to compromise the implementation of the 'dormant' mineral permission.			economy and material resources through avoidance of land use conflict (SA4, SA6, SA8, SA10).
MMSAD6	HC4: Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show people Paragraph a)	Amend first sentence of Policy HC4 a) to clarify that the sites listed in Table HC4a are proposed for permanent pitches/ plots.	For clarification.	This Modification is for clarification only, therefore no significant effects are likely.	No	N/A	This Modification does not require SA because it is for clarification only and does not change the policy therefore no significant effects are likely to arise.
MMSAD7	HC4: Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show people Tables HC4a and HC4b Flood Risk Constraints Minerals Safeguarding Constraints Other Environmental Constraints	Update Asset and Constraint information for three of the sites identified for gypsies, travellers and travelling show people (HO11, HO27 and HO29). These comprise flood risk, proximity to SLINCs, greenways, canal corridors and PROWs and minerals safeguarding.	Flood risk details updated to take account of latest advice and mapping from Environment Agency, reference to Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) constraint added to all potential housing sites of 5ha or more in size, to ensure consistency with BCCS Policy MIN1 and in response to representation from Mineral Products Association (441). Other constraints identified were omitted in error from Publication Draft SAD.	The Modification is likely to improve the resilience of new developments to the unavoidable effects of climate change, by ensuring that significant risks from fluvial flooding have been taken into account in the site selection process and in the design and delivery of planned developments. By identifying sites that include or are adjacent to canals, SLINCs, greenways and PROWs, the Modification will also will ensure that effects on species and habitats, amenity, heritage assets, townscape, and accessibility are taken into account in the design and delivery of developments, reducing the risk of significant harmful effects and increasing the likelihood of positive effects.	Yes	+	Overall effects are likely to be positive. The Modification will ensure that the occupiers of sites allocated for new pitches and plots for these communities will be less vulnerable to flooding and the associated costs and risks (SA3, SA4, SA6, SA7, SA8, SA9, SA14), that development of the larger sites (possibly as part of a wider general housing development) will not lead to needless sterilisation of mineral resources of potential economic value (SA10), and that the layout of sites will address the potential impacts on public rights of way (PROWs) (SA13) and canal corridors which are also identified as SLINCs and greenways (SA2, SA9, SA13).

4. Providing for Industrial Jobs and Prosperity							
MMSAD8	IND1: Existing High Quality Industry Site IN93.1	Amend Assets and Constraints information for Site IN93.1: Access 10, to clarify that it is partly within Flood Zone 2, and to include a reference to the mitigation measures required to address risks of fluvial flooding from the River Tame which is adjacent to the site. Details of flood risk for a number of other sites listed under policies IND2, IND3 and IND4 are also proposed to be amended to take account of the latest available information, but these are factual changes only so are not listed as Main Modifications.	For consistency with the Policies Map and in response to comments by the Environment Agency (2658) in relation to Site IN93.1 (Policy IND2) which is part of the same site. Flood risk constraints affecting this site were omitted from the Policy in error. Modification also responds to Environment Agency advice about flood risk mitigation requirements for the Access 10 site.	The Modification is likely to improve the resilience of this site to the unavoidable effects of climate change, by ensuring that significant risks from flooding are taken into account in the design and delivery of any new industrial developments on the site.	Yes	+	Overall effects are likely to be positive. The Modification will ensure that the businesses and people occupying this site will be less vulnerable to flooding and the associated costs and risks (SA3, SA4, SA6, SA14). The easement only affects a small proportion of the site so has little impact on the overall supply of 'Potential High Quality' industrial land (SA6). Indeed, ensuring the riverside remains open will help to enhance the landscape quality of this site, including the potential for biodiversity (SA2, SA9). The whole of the remainder of the site is in Flood Zone 2. However, most employment uses are classed as 'Less Vulnerable' under current national policy guidance on flood risk (NPPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change, 25. Flood Risk and Flood Risk Tables), so industrial use would remain acceptable in principle, provided that an effective flood management regime is in place.
MMSAD9	IND2: Potential High Quality Industry	Amend text to refer to the policies map	For clarification.	This Modification is for clarification only, therefore no significant effects are likely.	No	N/A	This Modification does not require SA because it is for clarification only and does not change the policy therefore no significant effects are likely to arise.
MMSAD10 MMSAD11	IND3: Retained Local Quality Industry IND4: Local Industry Consider for Release and Policies Map	Amend designation of Site IN6: Hall Lane, Walsall Wood – change area west of Hall Lane from 'Local Industry Consider for Release' to 'Retained Local Quality Industry,' and amend Assets and Constraints to include adjacent permitted minerals site (MP9: Highfields North). Also amend designation of Site IN8: Birch Lane, Stonnall from 'Local Industry Consider for Release' to 'Retained Local Quality Industry,' and amend Assets and Constraints to include adjacent Area of Search (MXA1: Birch Lane). As the part of Site IN6 east of Hall Lane is not adjacent to Highfields North it could be developed with housing without affecting the implementation of the mineral permission, so this part of the site is to be retained as 'Consider for Release.'	In response to concerns by Mineral Products Association (441) and Parkhill Estate (2597) about land use conflicts where development is proposed near to potential mineral working sites. Site IN6 is adjacent to Highfields North Permitted Minerals Site (MP9) and Site IN8 is adjacent to the Birch Lane Area of Search for sand and gravel extraction (MXA1) – see SAD Policies M4 and M8. It is agreed that it is not appropriate to designate sites adjacent to potential future mineral working areas as 'Consider for Release' to housing because of the risks of conflict, and that it is preferable to designate them as Retained Local Quality Industry.	The Modification will prevent the land use conflicts likely to arise if Sites IND3 and IND4 are allocated as 'consider for release' sites for housing development. This will in turn help to minimise the significant harmful effects on amenity that could arise if housing is developed adjacent to the permitted site at Highfields North (MP9) and the Birch Lane Area of Search (MXA1), and may also prevent the potentially significant harmful effects on sand and gravel supply and brick clay supply that could arise if proximal housing development were to compromise future mineral extraction.	Yes	+	Overall effects are likely to be positive. The Modification will ensure that new residential development avoids areas at risk of disturbance from mineral working, and mineral working is not likely to be prejudiced by nearby residential development (SA4, SA8, SA10). However, the Modification also potentially removes the opportunity for existing employment uses within these sites to relocate to more suitable, more accessible or higher quality locations, meaning that it could be less easy to address the existing effects of the industry on air quality, climate change and energy/fuel consumption (SA1, SA3, SA6, SA11 SA13).

MMSAD12	IND4: Local Industry Consider for Release Site IN44.1 (part) SAD Policies Map	Amend boundary of Site IN44.1 to exclude Burleigh House which is subject to a prior notification for conversion from offices to housing (planning application reference 16/0595).	This site consists of B1 offices rather than industry. NB this slightly affects the overall land total and the total figures on p67 of the plan.	The Modification is unlikely to have significant effects, as the rest of the site is identified in the SAD as 'consider for release' to housing which would be compatible with the proposed conversion scheme.	No	N/A	This Modification does not require SA because it reflects a change of the planning status of the site and does not affect the long term strategy for the whole site. The conversion of an office block (Use Class B1a) to housing is permitted development, and only certain details require approval by the Council. The proposed conversion scheme is therefore also outside the scope of the SAD.
MMSAD12	IND4: Local Industry Consider for Release Minerals Safeguarding Constraints Heritage Assets Constraints	Amend Assets and Constraints information for the following sites: Sites IN77.1, IN77.3, IN77.4, IN77.5, IN77.6, IN77.14, IN77.17, IN77.20, IN221, IN222: East Central Willenhall Sites and IN102 Franchise Street Darlaston - add MSA (site of more than 5ha within MSA therefore subject to BCCS Policy MIN1) Sites IN35.1, IN36 and IN37 – conservation area (CA)	For consistency with Policy IND5 and to respond to objections from Mineral Products Association (441) that impact of new non-mineral development on mineral resources and potential future mineral working has not been given sufficient weight in the plan. The sites identified are within the MSA and taken together are more than 5ha in size, albeit that they could come forward in a piecemeal manner. Development would therefore be subject to the requirement in BCCS Policy MIN1 to demonstrate that mineral resources have not been needlessly sterilised. Assets and Constraints also updated to include sites within a conservation area.	The Modification will reduce the risk that redevelopment of large 'consider for release' sites with housing will needlessly sterilise mineral resources of potential economic value, by ensuring that the potential for 'prior extraction' is considered. This should help to prevent significant harmful effects on supply of mineral resources. By identifying 'consider for release' sites within the Walsall Locks Conservation Area, the Modification will also ensure that the effects on heritage assets and the townscape are taken into account in the design and delivery of new housing development on these sites, reducing the risk of significant harmful effects and increasing the likelihood of positive effects.	Yes	?	Overall effects are uncertain. The identification of the Walsall Locks Conservation Area as a constraint is more likely to result in development on sites in the area having a positive relationship to heritage assets/ the local townscape (SA5, SA9). However, the identification of the minerals safeguarding constraint for the larger sites in East Central Willenhall and Darlaston could have negative effects on delivery of new development on these sites, and short-term negative effects on amenity of nearby residents and business and townscape quality if 'prior extraction' takes place (SA4, SA6, SA8, SA9), as well as positive effects in terms of conserving mineral resources (SA10). The objective of the BCCS minerals safeguarding policy (MIN1) and the SAD policy that supports it (M1) is to ensure that mineral resources of potential economic value are not needlessly sterilised by new development. However, mineral extraction in Willenhall and Darlaston is rarely likely to be feasible in practice due to other site constraints, for example, the likelihood that no winnable minerals remain due to previous mining and quarrying, the likelihood that development on the sites identified in East Central Willenhall could come forward in a piecemeal manner, remediation strategies required to address industrial and mining 'legacy' problems may also not be compatible with further mineral extraction. Even where prior extraction is feasible, it is likely to cause disruption to surrounding residents and businesses (although this should only be short-term), and potentially delay the redevelopment of sites for beneficial after-uses. The added costs of designing a scheme around 'prior extraction' could also prevent delivery of any development on these sites, particularly if the development is already of marginal viability due to other constraints.
MMSAD13	IND5: New Employment Opportunities Site IN122 and Policies Map Natural Environment Constraints	Amend Assets and Constraints information for Site IN122: Former Moxley Tip, to reflect that only a small part of the site is affected by Walsall Canal SLINC, also amend north-western boundary of site to exclude the adjacent Ward's Pool SINC which is to be allocated as Open Space.	In response to objection from Catalyst Capital (1820). It is agreed that only a small part of this site is affected by the Walsall Canal SLINC and that the constraint should therefore be indicated in the policy as lower case. The SINC (Ward's Pool) covers a small part of IN122 and larger part of the housing site to	The Modification will exclude the designated areas of Walsall Canal SLINC and Ward's Pool SINC from Site IN122, and will identify the adjacent designated sites as assets/ constraints to development. This will ensure that the effects of the adjacent planned industrial	Yes	+	Overall effects are likely to be positive. There would be positive effects on biodiversity, the landscape and water bodies are likely (SA2, SA9, SA14), as the Modification clarifies that the Ward's Pool SINC is not part of the Moxley Tip site allocation. While the Modification would remove the SINC from the site boundary, this would not affect the delivery of industrial development on the site as in practice, it would not be possible to develop on the area of the SINC as it is a water body. The Modification also clarifies that only a small part of the Walsall Canal

			the north (HO303). As the SINC is a water body it is not developable and therefore not appropriate to include it in the site allocations for housing and industry. It is therefore proposed to exclude this from the site and allocate this area for leisure and recreation.	development on species and habitats within the SINC and SLINC, links to other habitats, and the amenity and townscape value of the SINC and SLINC are taken into account in the design and delivery of the development, reducing the risk of significant harmful effects and increasing the likelihood of positive effects.			SLINC is within the site, meaning that there is likely to be greater scope for enhancement of the canal corridor and related benefits through the design and layout of the scheme (SA2, SA4, SA7, SA8, SA9, SA13, SA14). Effects on other SA objectives are likely to be neutral.
5. Strengthening Our Local Centres							
No Main Modifications to Policies SLC1 and SLC2 are proposed.							
6. Open Space, Leisure and Community Facilities							
MMSAD4 and MMSAD13	Policy OS1: Open Space, Sport and Recreation and Policies Map Ward's Pool SINC	Add area of Ward's Pool SINC forming part of Site HO303: Former AP UK and a small part of Site IN122: Former Moxley Tip to the open space network on SAD Policies Map. This modification is also appraised under MMSAD4 in chapter 3	To avoid overlap and conflict between housing allocation and SINC designation. The SINC, in particular the pool, is potentially unsuitable for residential development. Part of the SINC is the subject of an existing planning permission. The precise boundary of the approved development site is to be confirmed.	The Modification will mean that Ward's Pool SINC is identified as an area of Open Space rather than forming part of Sites HO303 and IN122. This will ensure that the effects of the adjacent planned housing and industrial developments on species and habitats within the SINC, links to other habitats, and the amenity and townscape value of the SINC are taken into account in the design and delivery of the development, reducing the likelihood of significant harmful effects and increasing the likelihood of positive effects.	Yes		The SINC is affected by planning permission 08/0394/FL. The modification will affect the amount of land available for residential development, although much of this land is potentially not appropriate for development as it includes an existing pool, is affected by Flood Zone 3, a pylon and overhead power lines. The main effect will be positive as the modification will safeguard a site of nature conservation value that could also continue to provide informal open space for the amenity and health and well-being of residents, particularly as it is in an area where there is a deficiency of accessible open space provision.
MMSAD14	Policy OS1: Open Space, Sport and Recreation and Policies Map Site OS5003	Site OS5003: Alexandra Road Allotments - add access to allocation on SAD Policies Map.	The site is only accessible from Alexandra Road. Access road forms part of the allocation.	The Modification is to correct an anomaly on the Policies Map, and does not affect the designation of the site, so no significant effects are likely.	No	N/A	This Modification does not require SA because it is to correct an anomaly on the Policies Map and does not affect the designation of the site.
MMSAD15	Policy OS1: Open Space, Sport and Recreation and Policies Map Site OS5012	Site OS5012: Trees Road Allotments - add car park and access to allocation on SAD Policies Map.	The site is only accessible from Trees Road. Access road forms part of the allocation.	The Modification is to correct an anomaly on the Policies Map, and does not affect the designation of the site, so no significant effects are likely.	No	N/A	This Modification does not require SA because it is to correct an anomaly on the Policies Map and does not affect the designation of the site.
MMSAD16	Policy OS1: Open Space, Sport and Recreation and Policies Map	Add land at corner of St Anne's Road and Stringes Lane, Willenhall to Open Space designations shown on SAD	Site was omitted from the Open Space network identified in the Publication Draft SAD in error. Site has significant value as	The Modification is likely to have positive effects on the amenity, well-being and health of local people and	Yes		The Modification is likely to have positive effects on the amenity, well-being and health of local people and accessibility

		Policies Map.	open space as it includes a greenway.	accessibility, as the site is well connected to the rest of the Open Space network via the greenway, although the overall effects of this change are not likely to be significant.			
MMSAD17	Policy LC5: Greenways Paragraph a)	Add the following bullet to paragraph a) of policy: “iv. the Metropolitan Strategic Cycle Network”	Update to take account of the Metropolitan Strategic Cycle Network, in response to representations by West Midlands ITA (2275).	The Modification identifies the Strategic Cycle Network as a priority element of the greenway network. This is likely to have positive effects on the amenity, well-being and health of local people and accessibility/promotion of active travel modes, although the effects are unlikely to be significant.	No	N/A	This Modification does not require SA because it makes no changes to the allocated greenways on the Policies map and recognises that some of them form part of or link into the Metropolitan Strategic Cycle Network
MMSAD18	Policy LC5: Greenways and Policies Map Site IN315	Alteration to greenway designation on Policies Map at Site IN315: Cinema & Casino, Bentley Mill Way, to make it run along the edge of the employment site rather than through the south of the site, and change greenway to proposed and not completed.	To more accurately reflect the potential for the route on the ground on Policies Map	By designating the greenway to the south of the site and identifying it as not completed, there is greater potential for it to be delivered without compromising the industrial development. The Modification could therefore have significant positive effects on the amenity, well-being and health of local people and accessibility.	No	N/A	This modification does not require SA because it is an adjustment of a short length of the route of a proposed greenway to make it follow an existing desire line, and the proposed greenway is no longer accessed from the entrance to the Casino (IN315) avoiding the potential for conflict with this use..
MMSAD19	Policy UW1: University of Wolverhampton, Walsall Campus Paragraph b)	Amend bullet point ii to clarify that any harmful effects on the open space, sport and recreation network must be found to be acceptable having been assessed in accordance with SAD Policy OS1.	For clarification.	The Modification is for clarification, and does not affect the overall requirements of the policy so there are unlikely to be any significant effects.	No	N/A	This Modification does not require SA because it is for clarification only and does not affect the overall requirements of the policy or how it is applied.
7. Environmental Network							
MMSAD20	Policy GB2: Control of Development in the Green Belt and Countryside Paragraph b)	Add requirement in paragraph b) bullet point iv for converted redundant buildings in the Green Belt to be of ‘permanent and substantial construction.’	Change required bringing policy into conformity with NPPF paragraph 90.	Significant effects are unlikely as the NPPF requirement already applies so there would be no change to the approach.	Yes	+	Modification is to reflect national Green Belt policy. Effects are likely to be positive overall along with some neutral effects. Positive effects are recorded for SA1-5, 9 and 13 these are reached largely as a result of avoiding inappropriate development and promoting urban regeneration.
MMSAD21	Policy GB2: Control of Development in the Green Belt and Countryside Paragraph b)	Re-number paragraph b) bullet point ix as x, and insert new bullet ix in front of it, referring to accessibility - to a range of employment, service and other opportunities - by a choice of means of transport, with the	Addition proposed to emphasise the need to consider accessibility in Green Belt locations, following suggestion from Friends of the Earth (758).	The Modification could have positive effects on the accessibility of development proposed in the Green Belt by requiring this to be considered, although in	Yes	+	Modification is likely to have positive effects in terms of SA1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11 and 13. The modification is likely to achieve these outcomes by ensuring that proposals for development in the Green Belt are considered in relation to how accessible they are, particularly as some locations within the Green Belt are less accessible than others.

		potential to use sustainable means of transport as a factor that will be taken into account when evaluating proposals for development in the Green Belt.		practice the scope for such developments to be accessible to sustainable transport is likely to be limited.			
MMSAD22	Policy EN1: Natural Environment Protection, Management and Enhancement Paragraph a)	Add text to paragraph a) to clarify that the Council will protect, manage and enhance sites within, around and beyond the borough boundary, also add reference to 'saved' UDP policies.	Clarification that there is a need to recognise the potential for developments within Walsall borough to have impacts further afield.	The Modification could reduce the potential harmful effects on nature conservation sites outside the borough boundary that may arise indirectly as a result of development in Walsall, although the effects over and above the policy as it stands need not significant. However, the same effect would be achieved from application of BCCS Policy ENV1.	Yes	0	No effects beyond that which were previously identified when appraising SAD Policy EN1. This modification is made to clarify that the policy will apply to nature designation sites beyond Walsall. The effects of which have been appraised as neutral as the previous Draft Plan version of the policy stated that proposals will be assessed in accordance with BCCS ENV1 - which makes provision for the protection of Nature Conservation sites beyond Walsall. Consequently no further appraisal assessment is made of its implications as the initial appraisal was based on the same understanding.
MMSAD23	Policy EN1: Natural Environment Protection, Management and Enhancement Paragraph b)	Add text to paragraph b) to clarify that it applies only to harmful development where there is no alternative to reduce or eliminate harmful effects, also add requirement for compensation as well as mitigation.	Change proposed comes from the Environment Agency's (2658) suggestion to reflect the requirements of NPPF paragraph 152 for consideration of alternatives prior to consideration of mitigation or compensatory measures.	The Modification could reduce the harmful effects of development on the natural environment by highlighting to developers best practice according to NPPF para 152 to demonstrate they have considered alternatives that would avoid harmful effects, as prevention is preferable to allowing harmful development that will require mitigation and/ or compensation.	Yes	0	No effects beyond that which were previously identified when appraising SAD Policy EN1. This modification is included following a representation from the Environment Agency (2658) to take into account NPPF paragraph 152. SAD Policy EN1 set out that the protection of nature conservation sites will be in accordance with the NPPF, amongst other local plan policies. Therefore the modification only serves to emphasise what is best practice according to the NPPF - to ensure alternative options or site layout are considered first before mitigation is considered as an option. Consequently no further appraisal assessment is made of its implications as the initial appraisal was based on the same understanding.
MMSAD24	Policy EN1: Natural Environment Protection, Management and Enhancement 7.4.1 Policy Justification	Addition of text explaining how the Council is proposing to acknowledge the SAC Partnership's approach to collect contributions to mitigate the effects of residential development on Cannock Chase SAC, in the light of recent correspondence with the SAC Partnership, and the council's interpretation of advice obtained from legal advisors. It has been agreed that financial contributions for mitigation measures are collected from housing developments within 8km of the SAC boundary. However, as there are no SAD	In response to representations received from Natural England (2240), Lichfield District Council (774), Cannock Chase AONB (3565), and Cannock Chase District Council (1812). To ensure that the Council fulfils its responsibilities as a 'competent authority' under the Habitats Regulations.	The Modification does not have an effect on the SA of the policy previously undertaken, as it involves alterations only to Policy Justification which explains the Council's approach to the SAC. For more information on the approach opted for in relation to Cannock Chase SAC and Cannock Extension Canal SAC please refer to the council's HRA report.	No	N/A	The modification provides explanation of the approach that has been opted for in relation to the protection of Cannock Extension Canal and Cannock Chase SAC. It does not alter the SA undertaken at the Draft Plan stage as the level of protection afforded by SAD policy EN1 is not altered.

		<p>allocations for housing development within 8km of the SAC, SAD policy EN1 does not make specific reference to a requirement for financial contributions. As a result SA has been undertaken in respect of a newly identified option (option 2a) to mitigate the potential for effects to the SAC as a result of windfall housing development within 8km of the SAC. BCCS Policy ENV1 is considered to provide sufficient justification to request financial contributions, or appropriate information to inform a bespoke Habitat Regulations Assessment from developers proposing windfall housing development within 8km of the SAC. This is anticipated to be a limited number of cases given the characteristics of the affected area.</p> <p>Addition of text to explain the council's approach to protecting Cannock Extension Canal SAC as a result of proposals that might come forward for the land safeguarded as the indicative route of the Lichfield and Hatherton Canal Restoration in the SAD Policy EN4, and possible minerals extraction mentioned in SAD Policy M9.</p>					
MMSAD25	Policy EN3: Flood Risk Paragraph d)	<p>Add new point e) of policy setting out requirements for flood risk assessments in support of planning applications for development in Flood Zones 2 and 3, including the need to assess the vulnerability of the development as well as the flood risk, and the need for 'major' developments to include an allowance for the effects of climate change and appropriate mitigation, and for 'minor'</p>	<p>In response to a representation from the Environment Agency (2658) that the flood risk areas identified on the Publication Draft SAD and AAP Policies Maps do not take into account the latest flood risk modelling and do not include Climate Change Allowance.</p>	<p>The Modification is likely to improve the resilience of new developments to the unavoidable effects of climate change, by ensuring that flood risk assessments have regard to the most up-to-date flood risk mapping and the potential effects of climate change, and that risks from flooding and the vulnerability of the development are taken into account in the design and</p>	Yes	0	<p>The addition of policy and justification text results in some positive effects to SA3, 8 and 14 however overall the effects of the proposed modification are neutral. However, the modification does provide additional support for the SA of the policy overall.</p>

		developments to set finished at an appropriate freeboard above the relevant climate change level according to the vulnerability of the development.		delivery of the development.			
MMSAD26 and MMSAD27	Policy EN4: Canals Paragraph a)	<p>Modification to Policy EN4:</p> <p>Amend sections a) and b) of Policy:</p> <p>a) The position and extent of the canal network within Walsall is shown on the Policies Map. Also shown on the Policies Map is the safeguarded indicative route of the Hatherton Branch Canal restoration project.</p> <p>b) Proposals for the restoration of the Hatherton Branch Canal will be required to be supported by technical work demonstrating that:</p> <p>i. there will be no adverse impact on the Cannock Extension Canal SAC / SSSI. A detailed Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be required, having regard to the HRA screening assessment already undertaken by the Council (2016). The detailed HRA should evaluate the implications of the proposals for the site in view of its conservation objectives, demonstrate that the project would not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC contrary to the Habitats Directive, and take into account the cumulative impacts from other development that could affect the canal, such as mineral extraction in the Yorks Bridge area.</p> <p>ii. an adequate water supply can be provided to support its use, including consideration of potential implications for the</p>	To make it clear in the policy that the line of the Hatherton Canal is only safeguarded and not allocated. Proposed Modification to Policy in response to objection from Natural England (2274) who objected to canal restoration proposal and suggested alternatives to safeguard the indicative line of the project.	The Modification is not likely to have significant effects on its own. The safeguarding of the line will not result in any significant effects, and the modification will set the requirements for the project should proposals come forward. It clarifies the status of the indicative canal alignment shown on the SAD Policies Map. Provisions are also made to ensure combined effects of other projects and policies referred to in the SAD are considered.	Yes	+	The proposed modification has positive effects overall in relation to the SA objectives. It does so by clarifying the basis on which the Lichfield and Hatherton Canal restoration project features in the SAD and providing a policy framework should proposals come forward in respect of the restoration project; along with an alternative to safeguard the indicative route of the project should the technical evidence not support it. This framework will assist with the development management process to ensure that the legislative requirements for the SAC form part of the decision making process. Consequently, the modification has removed some of the uncertainty that was identified initially following the SA of the 'Draft Plan' SAD EN4 policy.

		<p>wider canal network;</p> <p>iii. additional boat movements along the Cannock Extension Canal SAC can be prevented; and</p> <p>iv. any significant adverse impacts on the functions and ecology of the wider canal network can be avoided or that satisfactory mitigation can be secured and maintained.</p> <p>Should the technical work be unable to demonstrate that the project is deliverable and significant adverse effects cannot be avoided or mitigated, proposals to designate the line of the restoration project as a heritage trail and / or green corridor will be supported providing proposals would not preclude future proposals to restore the canal network.”</p> <p>Add text 3rd paragraph: “...subject to the necessary technical work being in support of both projects. While the council recognises the support for the restoration of canal links provided in BCCS Policy ENV4, in the event that the necessary technical work does not support the project, the council will be supportive of alternatives to safeguard the land identified on the Policies Map as a green corridor and / or heritage trail.”</p> <p>Amend second bullet point of paragraph 7.7.3: “Partnership working with the Canal & River Trust (CRT) and local canal groups on specific canal schemes and planning applications”.</p>					
MMSAD28	EN5: Development in Conservation Areas	The policy has been slightly reworded to comply with text in the NPPF.	To comply with the NPPF	The additional wording does not change the policy approach as is simply for clarification	No	N/A	The additional wording does not change the policy approach as is simply for clarification
MMSAD29	Policies Map:	Update Policies Map to reflect	To update the information	The Modification is to update/	No	N/A	This modification does not require SA because it is only

	Listed Buildings	the latest designations of Listed Buildings and to remove the Locally Listed Buildings that have since been added to the National Heritage List for England.	shown on the SAD Policies Map because several buildings that were originally on the 'Local List' have been re-designated as Listed Buildings by Historic England (e.g. the Romping Cat Public House). To avoid confusion we are removing the symbols that correspond to these buildings from the 'Local List' mapping shown on the Policies Map.	improve the accuracy of the information shown on the SAD Policies Map. While it may not in itself have significant effects, accurate mapping will ensure that harmful effects on listed buildings are more likely to be avoided, therefore the effects should be appraised.			an update to factual information. The listing process takes place outside the main planning legislation.
MMSAD30	Policy EN7: Great Barr Hall and Estate and St Margaret's Hospital and Policies Map 7.10 Policy Justification	Replace Introduction, Policy and Justification text with an updated version and add map to Policy Justification showing the area covered by the policy. Amend area covered by EN7 on SAD Policies Map to include the triangle adjacent to the borough boundary south of Chapel Lane on the west of the policy area.	Great Barr Hall has been revised by Historic England from Grade II* to Grade II. Policy has also been rewritten to make the aims and approaches clearer and easier to understand. Including this additional area within the boundary of the policy would avoid its future being considered in isolation.	The Modification has rewritten the policy therefore appraisal is necessary. The revised policy has clarified the approach towards development at Great Barr Hall and Estate (in particular, the approach towards 'enabling development') and it is also proposed to include an additional area within the site allocation which could otherwise be developed in isolation. The resulting policy is therefore less likely to result in piecemeal/ inappropriate development that would have harmful effects on the Hall and Estate, and is more likely to result in a comprehensive scheme with an overall positive outcome.	Yes	+	Overall effects of the revised policy in combination with BCCS Policies ENV2 and ENV3 are likely to be positive, and would be very similar to the Publication Draft version of the policy. The main differences are the improved clarity of the policy requirements and the reasons, and the inclusion of an additional parcel of land. The revised policy is therefore more likely to encourage a comprehensive approach towards development of the Hall and Estate, rather than piecemeal development which is likely to further erode the relationship between the Hall and Park. While the effects on SA Objectives 5 and 9 would be positive, some uncertainties inevitably remain, as the effects of new development will mostly be site-specific and can only be determined through the development management process.
8. Sustainable Waste Management							
MMSAD31 (part)	W2: Existing Waste Management Sites – Flood Risk Constraints Sites WS9 and WS10	Amend annual throughput figure for Site WS9: Biffa Aldridge MRF from 'up to 250,000 TPA' to 'around 160,000 TPA.' Amend annual throughput figure for Site WS10: Highfields South Landfill Site from '110,000 TPA' to '130,000 TPA.'	To update annual throughput figure in line with estimated annual throughput published on operator's website. In response to representation by Cory Environmental (481) – it is agreed that the throughput figure in the policy is based on out-of-date information and should be updated to reflect anticipated infill rates over the rest of the plan period.	The Modification is to correct a factual inaccuracy/ update the annual throughput information for this site, and is therefore not it itself likely to have significant effects.	No	N/A	This Modification does not require SA because it is to correct a factual inaccuracy/ update the annual throughput information for this site, and does not affect the designation of the site as a Strategic Waste Site.
MMSAD31 (part)	W2: Existing Waste Management Sites	Amend Assets and Constraints information for Site WS11:	For consistency with Proposed Modification OMSAD12 (Policy	The Modification is likely to improve the resilience of new	Yes	+	Overall effects are likely to be positive. This site is part of Potential High Quality Industry Site IN88 and is

	– Flood Risk Constraints Site WS11	Veolia Recycling Darlaston, Holland Industrial Park, to clarify that it is partly within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and to include a reference to the mitigation measures required to address risks of fluvial flooding from the Darlaston Brook and River Tame which are adjacent to the site.	IND2), which is in response to advice from the Environment Agency (2658) about flood risk mitigation requirements for the site. The Environment Agency has advised that new developments on this site should include an 8 metre easement.	development at this site to the unavoidable effects of climate change, by ensuring that significant risks from flooding are taken into account in the design and delivery of such development.			adjacent to Darlaston Brook. The Modification will ensure that the existing paper recycling facility and the people working on the site will be less vulnerable to flooding and the associated costs and risks (SA3, SA4, SA6, SA14). The easement required by the Environment Agency would only affect a small proportion of the site, and would therefore have limited impact on proposals to redevelop or expand the existing waste facility (SA6, SA10). As the requirement in this location relates to an open river (Darlaston Brook), ensuring the riverside remains open will help to enhance the landscape quality and ecological value of the site (SA2, SA9). Waste management sites are classed as 'Less Vulnerable' under current national policy guidance on flood risk (NPPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change, 25. Flood Risk and Flood Risk Tables), so this type of use would remain acceptable in principle, provided that an effective flood management regime is in place.
MMSAD32 and MMSAD35	W3: New Waste Management Development – Waste Treatment and Transfer	Amend wording of policy requirement in respect of fire risk	In response to comments from the Environment Agency (2658) that the policy is inconsistent with Policy W2 in not addressing fire risk. While this is addressed in paragraph h) in relation to unenclosed sites (as this is where the main risks are likely to arise), it is accepted that enclosed facilities could sometimes be at risk and that to cover all eventualities, the requirement should apply to all types of waste treatment and transfer facilities. New paragraph b) will cross-refer to requirement in paragraph c) of Policy W2 to minimise duplication.	The Modification would address an inconsistency with Policy W2. The requirement for fire risk assessment in paragraph h) of the Publication Draft SAD only applies to new waste facilities on open land, whereas with the proposed amendments, the requirement would apply to all new waste treatment and transfer facilities. It is therefore likely to significantly reduce the vulnerability of new waste management facilities to fire risk, and will also help to protect adjoining land, buildings, people and infrastructure.	Yes	+	Overall effects are likely to be positive as the Modification will ensure that all waste treatment and transfer proposals are subject to fire risk assessments. In recent years there have been a number of large fires at waste management sites. By including this requirement, the Modification will reduce the risks of fire, which will in turn help to reduce the risks to people working on waste management sites and occupiers of surrounding land from the fire and the indirect effects of pollution and disruption (SA4, SA7, SA8), as well as reducing the risks to other property and infrastructure near to waste sites (SA10, SA11, SA13). There would also be indirect benefits in terms of reducing risks from air, soil and water pollution caused by fires (SA1, SA12, SA14). Any increased costs to waste operators (SA6, SA10) from having to carry out risk assessments would also be offset by the reduced risks. Effects on other SA objectives are uncertain as they would depend on the location of the site and whether sites of value for biodiversity, cultural heritage and landscape would be affected.
MMSAD33 (part)	W3: New Waste Management Development – Waste Treatment and Transfer Site WP11	Amend Assets and Constraints information for various sites in relation to flood zones	For consistency with proposed modification to sites that are also referred to in the Industry chapter, in response to advice from the Environment Agency (2658) on flood risk constraints (omitted in error) and flood risk mitigation requirements.	The Modification is likely to improve the resilience of any waste management development proposed on the sites to the unavoidable effects of climate change, by ensuring that significant risks from flooding are taken into account in the design and delivery of the projects.	Yes	+	Overall effects of the Modification are likely to be positive. The Modification will ensure that any waste management infrastructure developed on the site will be less vulnerable to flooding and the associated costs and risks (SA3, SA4, SA6, SA14). Some of the sites require an easement relating to an open river, ensuring the riverside remains open will help to enhance the landscape quality and ecological value of the site (SA2, SA9). Although the site is mainly within Flood Zone 3, most waste management sites are classed as 'Less Vulnerable' under current national policy guidance on flood risk (NPPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change, 25. Flood Risk and Flood Risk Tables), so this type of use

							would remain acceptable in principle, provided that an effective flood management regime is in place.
MMSAD34	W3: New Waste Management Development – Waste Treatment and Transfer Site WP13	Delete Site WP13: Former McKechnie’s Site from the policy and delete Potential Waste Sites symbol from the SAD Policies Map.	Site owner (St Francis Group) (2121) does not support the development of the site with waste management uses, on the grounds of potential land use conflict. This Modification also responds to similar concerns by the Environment Agency (2658). This Modification does not affect the industrial designation of the site (IN12.8).	The main effect of this Modification is to reduce the number of Potential Waste Sites identified in the plan. As several others are still identified, the overall effect on delivery of the BCCS waste capacity requirements will not necessarily be significant, but should be evaluated.	Yes	0	Overall effects are likely to be neutral. The Modification will prevent any harmful effects on the amenity of nearby communities and transport infrastructure that might otherwise have been caused by movements of significant tonnages of waste to and from the site by road and would therefore have positive effects on SA4 and SA13. While the effects on delivery of the BCCS waste capacity requirements (BCCS Policies WM1 and WM3) are uncertain (SA10), the overall effects are unlikely to be significant, because it is one of a number of sites identified as Potential Waste Sites in the plan and it is not proposed to remove any of the others. Effects on all other SA objectives would be neutral.
MMSAD33 (part)	W3: New Waste Management Development – Waste Treatment and Transfer Site WP17	Amend Assets and Constraints information for Site WP17: Access 10 East to clarify that the site is partly within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and to include a reference to the mitigation measures required to address risks from fluvial flooding.	For consistency with Proposed Modification to Site IN93.2 in Policy IND2, in response to advice from Environment Agency (2658) on flood risk constraints (omitted from Policy in error) and flood risk mitigation requirements. They have advised that new developments on this site should include an 8 metre easement.	The Modification is likely to improve the resilience of any waste management development proposed on this site to the unavoidable effects of climate change, by ensuring that significant risks from flooding are taken into account in the design and delivery of the project.	Yes	+	Overall effects of the Modification are likely to be positive. The Modification will ensure that any waste management infrastructure developed on the site will be less vulnerable to flooding and the associated costs and risks (SA3, SA4, SA6, SA14). The easement required by the Environment Agency would only affect a small proportion of the site, and would therefore have limited impact on proposals to redevelop or expand the existing waste facility (SA6, SA10). As the easement relates to an open river, ensuring the riverside remains open will help to enhance the landscape quality and ecological value of the site (SA2, SA9). Most waste management sites are classed as 'Less Vulnerable' under current national policy guidance on flood risk (NPPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change, 25. Flood Risk and Flood Risk Tables), so this type of use would remain acceptable in principle, provided that an effective flood management regime is in place.
MM36	W4: New Waste Management Development – Waste Disposal	Update of factual information on baseline data and planning permissions	To ensure the plan is as up-date as possible	This is factual information only and does not change the policy approach	No	N/A	This is factual information only and does not change the policy approach
9. Sustainable Use of Minerals							
MMSAD37 (part)	Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources Paragraph a) SAD Policies Map Map 9.4	Replace MSA shown on SAD Policies Map with the MSA identified on the BCCS Key Diagram, including the ‘buffers’ around the mineral resource areas. Amend paragraph a) of Policy M1 to refer to revised minerals safeguarding area (MSA) and to include cross-reference to new Map 9.4, which shows indicative MSA(s) for each	To respond to objection from Mineral Products Association (441) that the identification of a single minerals safeguarding area (MSA) on the Publication Draft SAD Policies Map is not in accordance with the advice in the NPPF and current good practice guidance on minerals safeguarding. Map 9.4 is a new map proposed to replace Map 9.1 of the Publication Draft SAD.	The Modification reflects the replacement of the MSA currently shown on the SAD and AAP Policies Maps with the MSA identified on the BCCS Minerals Key Diagram. The indicative MSA(s) for each mineral commodity identified in the technical work for the BCCS are to be shown on a new Map 9.3, which will replace the existing Map 9.1.	Yes	?	Overall effects are uncertain. While the expanded MSA would in theory give greater protection to mineral resources and greater confidence to the minerals industry that mineral extraction can take place without being compromised by proximal non-mineral development (SA10), it would also impose further constraints on large scale non-mineral developments in Walsall. The effects on delivery of new housing and employment development (SA4, SA6) are unlikely to be negative in the short-term as BCCS Policy MIN1 will still apply and does not rule out non-mineral development in the MSA where it is justified. However, the effects could be negative in

		mineral commodity in Walsall (see MMSAD52).	N.B. Consequential Modifications to AAP Policy AAPINV7 and the AAP Policies Map are also proposed, to reflect the revised MSA boundary – see Modifications to AAP for further details.	The MSA(s) cover(s) a larger area because there are ‘buffers’ around the mineral resource areas. The result is to increase the total area covered by the MSA(s) to the extent that very few areas of the borough are excluded. While this would in theory give greater protection to mineral resources, it would also impose further constraints on large scale non-mineral developments in Walsall. This could have significant negative effects in the long-term if it is a barrier to delivery of Walsall’s development requirements beyond the plan period.			the long-term, as the MSA(s) will be a constraint to delivery of the borough’s requirements for housing, employment, transport and other infrastructure beyond the plan period. This could have disproportionate effects on Walsall residents who are already disadvantaged by not having sufficient access to homes, jobs, transport and social infrastructure (SA7, SA8). Nevertheless, it must also be recognised that MSAs have an important role in safeguarding mineral resources that could be needed to support planned non-mineral development in the future, such as sand and gravel and brick clay, as development cannot take place without a steady and adequate supply of these materials. Effects on other SA objectives are likely to be neutral, as a MSA does not in itself confer any protection on sites of importance for biodiversity, heritage assets, areas of landscape and townscape value, soils, and water resources.
MMSAD37 (part)	Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources Paragraph c)	Delete paragraph c) and re-number following paragraphs of the policy. The paragraph to be deleted states that non-mineral development will be supported within the MSA where it can be demonstrated that ‘prior extraction’ is not feasible, because it is rarely likely to be feasible on small urban sites in Walsall. It is proposed to move the statement and the justification for it to the Policy Justification (see MMSAD39).	To respond to objections from Mineral Products Association (441) and Coal Authority (681) that the paragraph is inconsistent with paragraphs a) and b) and with BCCS Policy MIN1. See also similar Modification proposed to AAP Policy AAPIN7.	No significant effects are likely as the approach towards minerals safeguarding has not changed, and is consistent with BCCS Policy MIN1.	Yes	0	Modifications MMSAD37 and MMSAD39 have been appraised together as they all relate to the approach towards minerals safeguarding and the evidence supporting the approach. Overall effects are likely to be neutral. While in theory the Modifications will remove an apparent inconsistency with BCCS Policy MIN1 and paragraphs a) and b) of Policy M1, this change will make no difference to the approach towards minerals safeguarding in practice, as the modified SAD Policy M1 will be in conformity with BCCS Policy MIN1. The Modifications will therefore not have any material effects on local plan policy towards minerals safeguarding.
MMSAD37 (part)	Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources Paragraph e) (now to be paragraph d)	Amend sub-heading to refer to development near to Areas of Search, and amend paragraph accordingly to refer to development in close proximity to Areas of Search.	To respond to objections from Mineral Products Association (441) that non-mineral development proposed in peripheral locations could compromise future mineral working in adjacent areas.	The Modification could have significant positive effects, as it will encourage mineral production in appropriate locations and prevent harmful effects on amenity that could arise if new housing is developed near to potential future mineral working areas.	Yes	+	Overall effects are likely to be positive. With the Modification, mineral working within the Areas of Search is less likely to be compromised by proximal non-mineral development, and mineral extraction projects are therefore more likely to come forward, increasing production (SA10). The risk of land use conflict and associated effects on amenity is also likely to be reduced, as developers will be discouraged from bringing forward schemes near the Areas of Search (SA4, SA6). Effects on other SA objectives would be neutral, as the Modification is specifically concerned with the relationship of non-mineral development to the Areas of Search.
MMSAD39 (part)	Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources	Amend paragraphs 2 and 3 on page 170 to explain how the MSA shown on SAD and AAP Policies Maps and the	To provide justification for the Modifications proposed to Policy M1, the MSA designation shown on the SAD Policies Map,	The Modification relates to expansion of explanatory text to support Policy M1, and is therefore not in itself likely to	Yes	?	See MMSAD37.

	9.2.1 Policy Justification Map 9.4	indicative MSAs shown on Map 9.4 have been developed and the evidence used to define the safeguarded areas, and to explain more clearly why it is not a reasonable option to have a complete ban on non-mineral development within the MSA in Walsall.	and Map 9.3, including the new MSA for fireclay, and to explain how further sterilisation of mineral resources has been avoided through the site allocation process for the SAD and AAP, in response to objections from Mineral Products Association (441).	have any significant effects.			
MMSAD39 (part)6	Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources 9.2.1 Policy Justification	Amend paragraph 2 on page 171 to expand on approach towards minerals safeguarding, explaining how site selection process has been influenced by MSA and potential future working areas, and how minerals safeguarding constraints have been addressed elsewhere in the site allocation policies.	To explain how further sterilisation of mineral resources has been avoided through the site allocation process for the SAD and AAP and how this constraint has been taken into account in the sites identified for non-mineral development, in response to objections from Mineral Products Association (441) and Parkhill Estates (2597).	The Modification relates to expansion of explanatory text to support Policy M1, and is therefore not in itself likely to have any significant effects.	Yes	0	See MMSAD37.
MMSAD39 (part)	Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources 9.2.1 Policy Justification	Add new paragraph between the 3 rd and 4 th paragraphs on Page 171, in place of statement in paragraph c) of policy, to explain the evidence in support of the Councils' view that 'prior extraction' of minerals is rarely likely to be feasible on small urban sites in Walsall.	Consequential changes arising from deletion of paragraph c), in response to objections from Mineral Products Association (441) and Coal Authority (681). Wording of paragraph has been expanded to identify other evidence that supports the Council's view that 'prior extraction' of minerals is rarely likely to be feasible on small, previously-developed urban sites in Walsall.	The Modification relates to expansion of explanatory text to support Policy M1, and is therefore not in itself likely to have any significant effects.	Yes	0	See MMSAD37.
MMSAD38	Policy M2: Safeguarding of Minerals Infrastructure Paragraph b)	Add reference to infrastructure in paragraph b) as follows: “...provided that potentially harmful effects on health, the environment, or local amenity <u>or infrastructure</u> will be effectively managed...”	To address an omission/ inconsistency with other minerals policies, and to ensure that potential impacts on infrastructure (including highways) can be properly addressed.	The Modification is to correct an inconsistency with other minerals policies. This will ensure that impacts on other infrastructure are taken into account when planning applications for new or expanded minerals infrastructure are considered and is therefore likely to have positive effects on maintaining accessibility, although the effects will not necessarily be significant.	Yes	+	Overall effects are likely to be positive. The additional requirement is likely to have positive effects on SA objectives towards safeguarding and maintaining access to social infrastructure, utilities infrastructure and transport infrastructure, such as SA4, SA6, SA7, SA8, SA10, SA11, SA13 and SA14, as impacts on such infrastructure are required to be effectively managed. Effects on other SA objectives would be neutral.
MMSAD40 (part)	Policy M7: Brick Clay Extraction –	Add new map to Policy Justification:	To respond to concerns by Natural England (2274) about the potential mineral working	The Modification is proposed for clarification to show which sites the policy relates to, and	Yes	+	The overall effects of the Modification are likely to be positive, as Map 9.1 shows the extent of designated nature conservation sites, canals, residential and

	Stubbers Green Policy Justification New Map 9.1	Map 9.1: Stubbers Green Area - map showing Stubbers Green Area of Search, Permitted Minerals Sites referred to in Policy M7, and designated nature conservation sites/ other constraints.	sites/ areas to which the policy relates, and designated nature conservation sites/ other constraints.	the relationship to designated sites that could be significantly affected by mineral development, in more detail than can be easily shown on the SAD Policies Map. Appraisal is necessary, as the relationship between these sites needs to be clear to prevent avoidable harmful effects on sites of national and local importance, contrary to other local plan policies and national policy guidance.			industrial areas, greenways, flood risk and potential climate change vulnerability, and the relationship of these assets and constraints to the Stubbers Green Area of Search (MXA3), the Atlas and Sandown Brickworks and Permitted Minerals Sites (MP2, MP7, MB2 and MB3) and the Recordon Land Potential Minerals Site (MXP3). The insertion of the map into the plan is therefore likely to have positive effects on SA Objectives SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, SA6, SA9, SA13 and SA14, as it will ensure that new or revised brick clay extraction proposals in Stubbers Green pay due regard to the assets and constraints identified, and demonstrate their acceptability, which will also have positive effects on SA Objective SA10 and increase the likelihood of overall positive outcomes.
MMSAD41	Policy M8: Brick Clay Extraction – Other Areas Site MP9: Highfields South – Restoration Requirements Paragraph g) xv.	Amend bullet point xv of paragraph g) to require the entirety of any worked areas covered by the SSSI designation to be restored as re-created habitats of similar/ enhanced value to those currently present within the SSSI, and to remove references to end uses other than publicly accessible natural green space that re-instates existing pedestrian links/ PROW, also to require operator to consider transferring ownership of the restored site to a conservation trust or similar body able to accept responsibility for long-term management of re-created habitats.	In response to changes suggested by Natural England (2274) following discussions with them subsequent to their representation.	The Modification is aimed at minimising the effects on Jockey Fields SSSI as far as possible in the event that the 'dormant' permission is implemented, but even with the Modification it would not be possible to prevent significant harm to the special features of the SSSI.	Yes	+	Modification MMSAD41 and MMSAD44 have been appraised together, as they relate to changes to minimise the harmful effects of mineral working on Jockey Fields SSSI. The overall effects of the Modifications are likely to be positive, as the revised requirements for restoration and after-use are aimed at minimising harm to the Jockey Fields SSSI as far as possible, and ensuring that the site is restored as closely as possible to its existing condition. This approach is consistent with SA2 and will also support SA9, while having no significant effects on the other SA Objectives. Any losses of agricultural land and horse grazing land (SA12), which would not be re-instated under the modified policy, are likely to be offset by the benefits of re-created habitats and landscape areas in the long-term and compensatory measures in the short to medium-term. As the restored site would still have to re-instate any PROWs affected by mineral extraction, public access would also be able to resume once the final restoration is complete, although the site would not be restored as formal public open space.
MMSAD42	Policy M8: Brick Clay Extraction – Other Areas Brick Clay Extraction – New Sites Paragraph j)	Amend bullet point ii of paragraph j) to clarify the need for an agreement to revoke the existing 'dormant' permission at Highfields North and to refer to the registered permission to be revoked (EB3410), and to remove the reference to minimising loss of habitats within the Jockey Fields SSSI, retaining the reference to preventing loss only.	To correct inaccuracies and in response to suggested amendment by Natural England (2274), following discussions with them subsequent to their representation.	The Modification is aimed at ensuring that harmful effects on Jockey Fields SSSI are prevented as part of the justification for allowing brick clay extraction outside the permitted Highfields North site. The effects of the change therefore need to be appraised.	Yes	+	The overall effects of the Modification are likely to be positive, as the revised requirements do not permit any mineral extraction outside the permitted Highfields North site that would harm the Jockey Fields SSSI. This would therefore have positive effects on SA2 and SA9 compared to the policy without the Modification.
MMSAD43 (part)	Policy M8: Brick Clay Extraction – Other Areas	Add new map to Policy Justification: Map 9.2: Highfields North and	To respond to concerns by Natural England (2274) about the potential mineral working	The Modification is proposed for clarification to show which sites the policy relates to, and	Yes	+	As they relate to different policies, the effects of this part of MMSAD43 has been appraised separately from the others (Maps 9.1 and 9.3), and are summarised below

	Policy Justification New Map 9.2	Highfields South – map showing Highfields North Permitted Minerals Site (MP9) and the surrounding area, including Highfields South (MP6) and Jockey Fields SSSI and SLINC/ other constraints.	sites/ areas to which the policy relates, and designated nature conservation sites/ other constraints.	the relationship to designated sites that could be significantly affected by mineral development, in more detail than can be easily shown on the SAD Policies Map. Appraisal is necessary, as the relationship between these sites needs to be clear to prevent avoidable harmful effects on sites of national and local importance, contrary to other local plan policies and national policy guidance.			(N.B. the SA scoring in the preceding column also relates to Map 9.2 only, and not to Maps 9.1 and 9.3). The overall effects of the Modification are likely to be positive, as the map shows the extent of designated nature conservation sites, canals, residential and industrial areas, greenways, flood risk and potential climate change vulnerability, and the relationship of these assets and constraints to the Highfields South and Highfields North sites (MP6 and MP9) and the surrounding brick clay resource areas. It is therefore likely to have positive effects on SA Objectives SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, SA6, SA7, SA8, SA9, SA13 and SA14, as it will ensure that new or revised mineral developments in this area have regard to the assets and constraints identified, and will therefore be acceptable, also having positive effects on SA Objective SA10. As a result of this, it is more likely that significant harmful effects can be avoided wherever possible.
MMSAD44	Policy M8: Brick Clay Extraction – Other Areas 9.4.1 Policy Justification	Amend 3 rd paragraph on page 204, 2 nd sentence, to explain that the requirement for restoration as re-created habitats applies to the whole of the worked areas that are subject to the SSSI designation, and that the end uses identified in the policy are consistent with those identified in the previous S106 agreement, and are supported by Natural England as being the most appropriate end uses for the site in view of its SSSI status.	Consequential change to reflect modification to paragraph h) xv of policy in response to suggestions by Natural England (2274).	The Modification is to explain the reasons for the approach towards restoration of the Highfields North site in the event that the ‘dormant’ permission is implemented. While this would not in itself have any significant effects, the policy to which it relates could, and the effects of both Modifications need to be appraised together.	Yes		See MMSAD41
MMSAD45	9.5 Energy Minerals Coal and Fireclay Extraction - Brownhills Introductory Paragraphs	Amend introductory paragraphs to Policy M9 on page 208 as follows: 1 st paragraph – add cross-reference to indicative MSA for fireclay shown on Map 9.3 between 1 st and 2 nd sentences, in 2 nd sentence, delete ‘therefore’ and add text to explain that the Yorks Bridge Area of Search was a recommendation in the BCCS Inspectors’ Report. 2 nd paragraph –amend 4 th sentence by deleting reference to the difficulty of defining a meaningful boundary for an Area of	To update/ expand on the information on which the policy is based, reflecting information provided by Resource UK on behalf of Potters Clay & Coal Company (219) and discussions with Natural England (2274) following Publication. The Modification explains the background to the Yorks Bridge Area of Search for fireclay extraction identified in the BCCS, and why it is considered preferable to identify an indicative MSA in the SAD on Map 9.4 rather than to designate the Yorks Bridge site promoted by Resource UK on behalf of Potters Clay & Coal	This Modification is mainly to update the introductory paragraphs to Policy M9, to explain the approach in the Policy, and is not in itself likely to have ‘significant’ effects. However, the combined effects of these changes and other related Main Modifications could be significant and therefore require appraisal.	Yes		See MMSAD46

		Search and replacing it with reference to lack of evidence that a fireclay extraction project is viable and deliverable, amend last sentence to explain that even so, to provide flexibility, Policy M9 includes guidance for fireclay extraction proposals that may come forward at Yorks Bridge in the long term.	Company Ltd (219) as the Area of Search. It also explains why the policy includes guidance on applications for fireclay extraction at Yorks Bridge, even though the site is not designated as an Area of Search. There is also a non-Main Modification the 2 nd paragraph to remove a duplicate reference to MC1 (Swan Works).				
MMSAD46	Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction – Brownhills Paragraph a) Yorks Bridge Map 9.3	Add new text at the beginning of paragraph a) to explain that there are potentially winnable coal and fireclay resources in the Brownhills area, and that an indicative MSA for fireclay is shown on Map 9.4. The indicative MSA includes areas containing fireclay resources that could be worked within the plan period, including the sites/ areas identified in this policy.	To respond to representations by Resource UK on behalf of Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd (219). Due to the uncertainties about viability and deliverability of a suitable fireclay extraction scheme, it is not appropriate to identify the Yorks Bridge site they are promoting as an Area of Search for fireclay in the SAD. However, it is accepted that there is likely to be a need for fireclay beyond the plan period to provide for the long-term supply requirements of Swan Works and possibly other end users, and that there are fireclay resources in the Brownhills area which could meet this need. It is therefore proposed to identify an indicative MSA for fireclay on SAD Map 9.3 which includes the Yorks Bridge site and the Permitted Minerals Sites at Birch Coppice and Brownhills Common (MP3 and MP5). This will prevent needless sterilisation of the fireclay resources underlying these sites, allowing a suitable extraction proposal to come forward in an appropriate location if it proves viable.	This Modification relates to a change in approach towards provision for future fireclay extraction in the plan – the identification of an indicative MSA for fireclay rather than an Area of Search as proposed in the BCCS. Although there is no presumption that the minerals within a MSA will ever be worked, there is potential for significant harmful effects on the environment, amenity and transport infrastructure if it encourages fireclay extraction outside the sites identified in the BCCS. The Modification therefore needs to be appraised together with other related Modifications to the introductory paragraphs, Policy and Policy Justification.	Yes	+	MMSAD45, MMSAD46, MMSAD48 and MMSAD51 have been appraised together as they relate to changes to the approach towards identifying areas for potential future fireclay extraction in the plan, and supporting justification for the changes. Although the combined effects of these Modifications on most SA Objectives will be neutral, the overall effects are likely to be positive, as the amendments will clarify the Council's approach and provide greater certainty to prospective developers and mineral operators about where fireclay extraction could take place. The effects on SA10 would therefore be broadly positive - although no Area of Search will be identified, Map 9.3 of the SAD will identify the Yorks Bridge site promoted by Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd and the Little Wyrley Estate (for information only), and Map 9.4 of the SAD will identify the broad extent of potentially winnable fireclay resources in Brownhills and an indicative MSA around them, ensuring that these resources are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development in the future. This will give greater protection to the fireclay resources in this area, by alerting prospective developers/ mineral operators to its existence. Effects on SA2 would also be positive, as the Modifications include further clarification of the relationship between the Yorks Bridge site and designated nature conservation sites in the area. This should reduce or minimise the risk that fireclay extraction will have harmful effects on these sites if it takes place. There is some uncertainty about the effects on SA4 and SA6, as the Modifications could affect delivery of new housing in the Brownhills area in the long-term if they mean that options within the fireclay resource area / indicative MSA for fireclay have to be ruled out.
MMSAD47	Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction – Brownhills Paragraph f)	Amend paragraph f), bullet point vii by adding a further requirement to implement the proposed greenway, which would rationalise sections of three of the public rights of	To address omission from the policy. The Publication Draft version of the policy does not mention the proposed greenway, shown on the SAD Policies Map and Map 9.3,	The policy already refers to the PROWs but not to the proposed greenway, so the Modification will address this omission/ inconsistency. Although it is not likely to	Yes	+	The overall effects of the Modification are likely to be positive. The additional requirement will ensure that a long-standing aspiration to create a greenway across the Common will be delivered if the 'dormant' mineral permission is implemented, even though it would probably have to be on a different alignment to that

	MP5: Land at Brownhills Common	<p>way (PROWs) referred to, in accordance with SAD Policy LC5.</p> <p>Insert new point xi) and amend start of following point (now point xii.): in order to ensure an assessment is made of the potential for impacts to Cannock Extension Canal SAC.</p> <p>Alterations to what is now xii. To ensure consideration of cumulative impacts on nature conservation sites.</p>	<p>which would rationalise sections of three of the PROWs mentioned. The greenway will be expected to be delivered if the ‘dormant’ permission is implemented in accordance with Policy LC5. Nor, does the policy recognise the potential for mineral extraction to affect the Cannock Extension canal SAC, particularly via the impact pathway the Wyrley and Essington canal provides.</p>	<p>have significant effects, the Modification should be appraised.</p> <p>There is the possibility of environmental effects as a result of proposals at the site to the Cannock Extension Canal. The proposed modification is intended to ensure that proposals are assessed for their impacts to the SAC at the project stage and any necessary mitigation can be provided and secured to avoid harm to the site.</p>			<p>currently proposed on the 'saved' UDP Proposals Map and the Draft SAD Policies Map. The new greenway would rationalise sections of three of the existing public rights of way (PROWs) referred to in the policy, helping to improve the quality of pedestrian and cyclist routes across the Common, and having overall positive effects on SA4 and SA13 as well as indirect positive effects on SA8 by improving opportunities for local people to use more active transport modes. The effects in respect of the environment are likely to be neutral as a result of consideration being had to the relevant regulations through the application of SAD policy MP5.</p>
MMSAD48	Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction – Brownhills Paragraphs g) and h) Yorks Bridge Map 9.3	<p>Amend paragraph g) and start of paragraph h) as follows:</p> <p>Paragraph g) - amend first three sentences to clarify that the Yorks Bridge Area of Search identified in the BCCS is indicative, that the BCCS Area of Search is based on the Yorks Bridge site promoted by Potters Clay & Coal Company and the Little Wyrley Estate, which is identified on Map 9.3, and that the site is not designated as an Area of Search in the SAD because there is no evidence that a fireclay extraction scheme can be delivered in the plan period. Amend last three sentences on site constraints to indicate that a small part of the site is within the Brownhills Common and the Slough SINC, that the Cannock Extension Canal is designated as a SLINC as well as a SAC/SSSI, and that the site is in the vicinity of Clayhanger SSSI as well as Chasewater and Southern Staffordshire Coalfield Heaths SSSI.</p> <p>Paragraph h) – amend 1st sentence to clarify that SAD policy applies to proposals that come forward within the Yorks Bridge site or other</p>	<p>To clarify which site(s) the policy on Yorks Bridge relates to, and why the SAD does not designate the Area of Search for fireclay extraction identified in the BCCS, and to describe more accurately the relationship of the Yorks Bridge site to designated nature conservation sites, further to discussions with Natural England (2274) following Publication. Information provided by Resource UK on behalf of Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd (219) following their representation on the Publication Draft SAD identifies the boundary of the Yorks Bridge site they are promoting for future fireclay extraction, and confirms that this is not economically viable at the present time. As it is not proposed to designate the site as an Area of Search in the SAD for that reason, the site is to be identified on Map 9.3 for information purposes. The Modification also clarifies that BCCS Policies MIN3, MIN4 and MIN5 and paragraph h) of SAD Policy M9 will apply to other unpermitted sites in the surrounding area.</p>	<p>The Modification relates to changes to the Policy to clarify which site the Yorks Bridge policy relates to. The site in question is the Yorks Bridge site proposed by Resource UK on behalf of Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd in their representations on the BCCS and SAD. For information, it is proposed to identify the site on a map within the Policy Justification, although it is not proposed to designate it as an Area of Search for fireclay extraction for the reasons stated. The Modification is not in itself likely to have significant effects as it is mainly to explain the reasons for the approach chosen by the Council and to clarify which site paragraphs g) and h) of the policy relate to. However, the combined effects of these changes and other related Main Modifications could be significant and therefore require appraisal.</p>	Yes		<p>See MMSAD46</p>

		unpermitted sites in the surrounding area (with cross-reference to Map 9.3).					
MMSAD49	Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction – Brownhills Paragraph h) xi. and xii. Yorks Bridge	Amend paragraph h) xi. of Policy Statement to clarify that planning applications for fireclay extraction in the Yorks Bridge area must be supported by a detailed HRA of effects on Cannock Extension Canal SAC/ SSSI/ SLINC, having regard to HRA screening assessment already undertaken by the Council in 2016. The HRA should evaluate the implications of development for the SAC in view of its conservation objectives, and demonstrate that it would not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC contrary to the Habitats Directive. Amend paragraph h) xii. of Policy Statement to include a reference to the Clayhanger SSSI.	Bullet point xi. - to clarify that a detailed Habitats Regulations Assessment will be required at the project stage having regard to the high level HRA screening assessment carried out by the Council, in response to representations/ further advice from Natural England (2274). Policy wording has also been amended to more accurately reflect the requirements of Article 6 of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). Bullet point xii - to address an omission from bullet point - Clayhanger SSSI is also in close proximity to the Yorks Bridge site, therefore effects on this SSSI will require evaluation and where necessary, mitigation.	This Modification is aimed at preventing the significant harmful effects on the SAC that could arise if no HRA is carried out at the appropriate stages in the development process. The effects of this change need to be appraised separately from the effects of the other Modifications to the policy relating to the overall approach towards fireclay extraction.	Yes		MMSAD49 and the relevant part of MMSAD51 have been appraised together as they relate to changes to the requirements for HRA of the effects of potential future fireclay extraction on the Cannock Extension Canal SAC, in response to representations from Natural England, and supporting information to justify the approach. The overall effects of the Modifications are likely to be positive, as the revised requirements will ensure that the requirements of the Habitats Directive are met, and that further screening of the effects of fireclay extraction at Yorks Bridge on Cannock Extension Canal SAC is carried out at an appropriate time and to an appropriate level of detail, before any fireclay extraction is allowed to take place. This should therefore have positive effects on the SAC as it will prevent any direct or indirect harmful effects on its integrity.
MMSAD51 (part)	Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction – Brownhills 9.5.1 Policy Justification Map 9.4	Amend last paragraph on page 215 to clarify that the indicative Area of Search for fireclay was included in the BCCS because of a recommendation in the Inspectors' Report, and is based on a site identified in a coal prospecting notice served on the Council in 1990. Also amend information on land owning/ mineral interests in Brownhills Common and Yorks Bridge sites, and include update on fireclay reserves within the Birch Coppice stockpile and year's supply currently available to Swan Works, the reasons why the stalled ROMP application for conditions to be applied to Birch Coppice and Brownhills Common has not been taken forward, and reliance on third parties to bring forward a new	To explain the background to the Yorks Bridge proposal, and update other information in the Policy Justification, reflecting further information provided by Resource UK on behalf of Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd (219) following their original submission on the Publication Draft SAD. The Modification provides a more accurate statement on the land owning interests at Brownhills Common and Yorks Bridge, provides an update on the baseline evidence on fireclay reserves at Birch Coppice and the extent to which they will meet the future supply requirements of Swan Works, confirms the current position on the 'stalled' ROMP application for conditions to be applied to Birch Coppice (MP3) and Land at Brownhills Common (MP5), and updates the evidence in support of the	This Modification is to update/ further clarify the justification for the approach towards future fireclay extraction in the policy, and to provide additional background information. While this would not in itself have significant effects the policy to which it relates could, so the effects of all of the related Modifications need to be appraised together.	Yes		See MMSAD46

		fireclay extraction scheme.	Council's views on the likely viability and deliverability of fireclay extraction.				
MMSAD51 (part)	Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction – Brownhills 9.5.1 Policy Justification	Amend 2 nd paragraph on page 216 to explain that the 'Choices Site' proposed for non-mineral development by the site owner (St. Modwen) is separate from the Yorks Bridge site being promoted by Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd (219), that one of the Options considered for the Yorks Bridge Area of Search at the Issues & Options stage (Option 4c) included this site, to explain that the owner considers coal and clay working unviable because of the ratio of overburden to coal seams, and because the site is relatively small/ constrained, and to summarise the outcome of further work carried out by Amec Foster Wheeler on behalf of the Council in 2016, which confirms that the coal/ fireclay seams underlying Brownhills Common and Yorks Bridge are also at considerable depth below the ground surface.	To clarify the relationship between 'Choices Site' CH94: Land at Yorks Bridge promoted for non-mineral development by St. Modwen and the Yorks Bridge site promoted by Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd and the Little Wyrley Estate, and to explain more clearly why the 'Choices Site' is not identified for coal and clay extraction in the plan. St. Modwen declared that they were the sole owner of the site in their 'call for sites' submission in 2011. Further information has also been added to explain the outcome of further research into coal and fireclay seams carried out in 2016 as part of the work to define the MSA for fireclay. Non-Main Modifications (editorial changes) also proposed to correct reference to SAD & AAP Minerals Project and correct a typographical error.	This Modification is to update/ further clarify the justification for the approach towards future fireclay extraction in the policy, and to provide additional background information on the depth of coal and fireclay seams and the implications for viability/ feasibility of fireclay extraction at Brownhills Common and Yorks Bridge. While this would not in itself have significant effects the policy to which it relates could, so the effects of all of the related Modifications need to be appraised together.	Yes		See MMSAD46
MMSAD51 (part)	Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction – Brownhills 9.5.1 Policy Justification	Amend text from final paragraph on page 215 to end of section on page 217: to refer to Yorks Bridge site rather than Yorks Bridge area, and to delete the reference to the former 'Choices Site' (CH93: Land at Yorks Bridge) identified in the SAD Issues & Options Report (April 2013). Reflect the latest position in respect of the potential to extract minerals from the Yorks Bridge area, and the requirement for detailed HRA.	For clarification and to remove a reference to an adjacent site, to avoid confusion. The Modification refers to the Yorks Bridge site shown on Map 9.3 rather than a general 'Yorks Bridge area,' and proposes to delete the reference to the 'Choices Site' identified in the SAD Issues & Options Report (CH93: Land at Yorks Bridge), as this is not allocated for development in the SAD and is not part of the Yorks Bridge site shown on Map 9.3. There are also non-Main Modifications to improve flow and correct inaccuracies in the terminology used to refer to 'dormant' mineral permission at	This Modification is to update/ further clarify the justification for the approach towards future fireclay extraction in the policy, and to provide additional background information. While this would not in itself have significant effects the policy to which it relates could, so the effects of all of the related Modifications need to be appraised together.	Yes		See MMSAD46

			Brownhills Common.				
MMSAD51 (part)	Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction – Brownhills 9.5.1 Policy Justification	Amend 3 rd paragraph on page 216 to explain the reasons for requiring detailed HRA at project stage, in particular, that any harmful effects from mineral extraction. The effects on the SAC also cannot be determined with confidence until a specific working site has been identified, and details of the method and timescale for working, restoration and aftercare are known.	To explain the reason for the requirement for a detailed HRA in paragraph h) xi of the policy, in response to representations/ further advice from Natural England (2274), and additional supporting information on potential impacts on the SAC provided by Resource UK on behalf of Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd (219).	This Modification is to provide further explanation / justification for the approach towards HRA of the impacts of coal and fireclay extraction on the Cannock Extension Canal SAC. While this would not in itself have significant effects the policy to which it relates could, so the effects of both Modifications need to be appraised together.	Yes	+	See MMSAD49
MMSAD51 (part)	Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction – Brownhills 9.5.1 Policy Justification	Amend 2 nd – 4 th paragraphs on page 217 to update the status of the Staffordshire Minerals Local Plan (which has now progressed through the Examination stage and Proposed Modifications were published in July 2016), to explain the reasons why it is proposed to identify an indicative MSA for fireclay in the SAD, rather than to designate the Yorks Bridge site promoted by Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd (219) and Little Wyrley Estate as an area for future fireclay extraction, and to update sources of evidence used to identify site constraints, including a cross-reference to Section 2.3 of the plan which lists the types of constraints that have been taken into account when preparing the plan.	To update reference to Staffordshire Minerals Local Plan, which has progressed since the Publication Draft SAD, to explain the reasons why the latest evidence (including evidence that has become available following Publication) supports the approach now proposed in the SAD towards identifying areas where fireclay extraction could take place in the future, and to update the sources of evidence used to identify site constraints, including post-Publication discussions with statutory bodies. Some non- Main Modifications are also proposed to these paragraphs, to correct references to the SAD & AAP Minerals Project.	This Modification is to update/ further clarify the justification for the approach towards future fireclay extraction in the policy, and to provide additional background information. While this would not in itself have significant effects the policy to which it relates could, so the effects of all of the related Modifications need to be appraised together.	Yes	+	See MMSAD46
MMSAD50	Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction - Brownhills 9.5.1 Policy Justification New Map 9.3	Add new map to Policy Justification: Map 9.3: Brownhills Area including Yorks Bridge - map showing Yorks Bridge site, Birch Coppice (MP3) and Brownhills Common (MP5), and designated nature conservation sites and other constraints in and around the area, including Brownhills	To respond to concerns by Natural England (2274) about the potential mineral working sites/ areas to which the policy relates, and designated nature conservation sites/ other constraints. Map 9.3 is also intended to clarify the extent of the site being promoted for fireclay extraction by Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd and	The Modification is proposed for clarification to show which sites the policy relates to, and the relationship to designated sites that could be significantly affected by mineral development, in more detail than can be easily shown on the SAD Policies Map. Appraisal is necessary, as the relationship between these	Yes	+	The overall effects of the Modification are likely to be positive, as the map shows the extent of designated nature conservation sites, heritage assets, canals, residential and industrial areas, greenways, the rail and road network, flood risk and potential climate change vulnerability, and the relationship of these assets and constraints to the Birch Coppice and Brownhills Common sites (MP3 and MP5) and the Yorks Bridge site promoted for fireclay extraction by Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd and the Little Wyrley Estate. It also shows the proximity of these sites to Cannock Chase District in Staffordshire and

		Common and The Slough SINC, Cannock Chase SAC/ SSSI/ SLINC, Clayhanger SSSI, Chasewater and the Southern Staffordshire Coalfield Heaths SSSI.	the Little Wyrley Estate, which is not proposed for designation as an Area of Search for fireclay extraction in the SAD, although an indicative Area of Search is identified in this broad location in the BCCS.	sites needs to be clear to prevent avoidable harmful effects on sites of national and local importance, contrary to other local plan policies and national policy guidance.			therefore supports the requirement in the policy for cross-boundary effects to be addressed. It is therefore likely to have positive effects on SA Objectives SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, SA6, SA7, SA8, SA9, SA13 and SA14, as it will ensure that new or revised mineral developments in this area have regard to the assets and constraints identified, and will therefore be acceptable, also having positive effects on SA Objective SA10. As a result of this, it is more likely that significant harmful effects can be avoided wherever possible.
MMSAD52	Map 9.1: Proposed Minerals Safeguarding Area Map 9.4	Replace existing Map 9.1 with a new Map 9.4 showing indicative minerals safeguarding areas (MSAs) for each mineral commodity (including 'buffers'), replicating the indicative MSAs shown on Mineral Commodity Maps MC1 – MC3 in BCCS Appendix 7, and also showing a new MSA for fireclay in Brownhills which has been identified using evidence obtained from relevant mineral operators following the adoption of the BCCS.	To respond to objection from Mineral Products Association (441) that the identification of a single minerals safeguarding area (MSA) on the Publication Draft SAD Policies Map is not in accordance with the advice in the NPPF and current good practice guidance on minerals safeguarding. Also to respond to representations by Resource UK on behalf of Potters Clay & Coal Company Ltd (219) in support of the designation of an Area of Search for fireclay extraction at Yorks Bridge, and evidence provided by them on the extent of potentially winnable fireclay resources in this location.	The Modification reflects the replacement of the MSA currently shown on the SAD and AAP Policies Maps with the MSA identified on the BCCS Minerals Key Diagram. The indicative MSA(s) for each mineral commodity identified in the technical work for the BCCS are to be shown on a new Map 9.3, which will replace the existing Map 9.1. The indicative MSA(s) include 'buffers' around the mineral resource areas. The result is to increase the total area covered by the MSA(s) to the extent that very few areas of the borough are excluded. While this would in theory give greater protection to mineral resources it would also impose further constraints on large scale non-mineral developments in Walsall. The effect could be significant if it discourages non-mineral development.	Yes	?	See MMSAD37
MMSAD53	Policy M2: Mineral Infrastructure Sites Site MI1 Site MI7 SAD Policies Map	Modifications to site boundaries of Mineral Infrastructure Sites MI1: Former Bace Groundworks and MI7: Interserve Recycling Centre, which are adjacent to each other, to reflect changes to the site boundaries following the implementation of the Interserve development.	To correct the site boundaries of Sites MI1 and MI7. A small parcel of land has been excluded from Site MI1, as this has been incorporated into the adjacent Site MI7. Site MI1 now includes the full extent of the ownership area shown in application 11/0493/FL.. A consequential Modification is also proposed to the boundary of Site MB1: Aldridge Brickworks (see below), as Site MI11 was developed on part of	This Modification relates to correction of site boundaries. Although it is unlikely to have significant effects, the overall effects should be evaluated, as it is important that the boundaries are shown accurately on the Policies Map to prevent proximal non-mineral development that could compromise continued operation of these facilities, contrary to Policy M2.	Yes	0	The largest area of land affected by this modification is the enlargement of site MI1 onto the adjacent brickworks, site MB1. As both uses are mineral related, the effect on sustainability is neutral. The modification is also only a factual correction relating to an existing planning permission, so does not comprise a "new" proposal.

			the former stockyards belonging to the brickworks.				
MMSAD54	Policies M4 – M9: Sites MP1 - MP9, MC1 and MB1 – MB3 SAD Policies Map	Amend boundaries of the Permitted Minerals Sites and Brickworks shown on the SAD Policies Map.	To correct errors in the plotting of the site boundaries of permitted minerals sites and brickworks on the Publication Draft SAD Policies Map. The amended boundaries include the full extent of the 'red line' areas of the relevant mineral permissions. It should be noted that the permitted areas of Atlas Quarry (MP2) and Sandown Quarry (MP7) also include the curtilages of the associated brickworks (MB2 and MB3), and that Highfields North (MP9) partly overlaps with adjacent industrial and commercial development. See related Modifications to Site HO58: Walsall Road, Walsall Wood (Policy HC1) and Site IN6: Hall Lane, Walsall Wood (Policies IND3 and IND4).	This Modification relates to correction of site boundaries. Although it is unlikely to have significant effects, the overall effects should be evaluated, as it is important that the boundaries are shown accurately on the Policies Map to prevent proximal non-mineral development that could compromise future mineral working or continued operation of the brickworks, contrary to Policy M1.	Yes		The amendments are factual changes to reflect existing planning permissions rather than "new" proposals in the SAD. Most of the changes are minor or involve the adjustment of boundaries between mineral sites and adjacent works. The only significant changes are in respect of sites MP7 and MP9. The planning permission for MP7 includes Swan Pool, Stubbers Green Bog SSSI and Sandown Works, whilst the planning permission for MP9 includes land closer to existing industry on Hall Lane and Walsall Road. The latter boundary alteration adds to the justification for the proposal to delete housing site HO58 and amend the allocation of site IN6 from a consider for release to a retained industry site. These modifications would therefore have adverse effects on biodiversity (SA2) and communities and population (SA4)
10. Transport and Infrastructure							
MMSAD55	Policy T4: The Highway Network Paragraph g)	Amend paragraph g) of policy to comply with wording in NPPF paragraph 32, including reasons for requirement for transport assessments, requirement for such assessments to consider opportunities for sustainable transport modes, and qualification of requirement to contribute towards off-site transport improvements, where they would cost effectively limit the impact of the development.	Amendments to comply with wording in NPPF paragraph 32.	No significant effects likely as the proposed changes reflect existing national policy guidance which would apply to major traffic-generating developments in any case.	Yes	0	The overall effects of the Modification are likely to be neutral, as it relates to changes to bring the policy into conformity with paragraph 32 of the NPPF. The NPPF guidance would be applied when determining applications for major traffic generating developments in any case, even without the Modification. This means that the Modification will cause no significant change to the effects of the policy as a whole.
MMSAD56	Policy T5: Highway Improvements SAD Policies Map	Show location for proposed upgrade area to M6 Junction 10 on the Policies Map.	For consistency with the Black Country Core Strategy (BCCS) which identifies this project (see BCCS Transport Key Diagram and BCCS Policy TRAN1), and to make clear the existence of the proposal.	No significant effects likely as the proposed changes are for clarification/ consistency, and reflect existing BCCS policy which would apply to major traffic-generating developments in any case.	Yes	+	The overall effects of the Modification are likely to be positive as identifying the junction improvement area on the SAD Policies Map will provide greater certainty to developers meaning that development nearby is less likely to compromise the improvement project, having positive effects on SA6 and SA13. However, effects on other SA objectives would be neutral as the Modification is mainly for clarification/ consistency, to bring the policy into conformity with BCCS Policy TRAN1. The BCCS policy would be applied in any case, even without the

							Modification, when determining applications for the junction improvement proposals and other development in the vicinity. This means that the Modification will cause no significant change to the effects of the policy as a whole.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

66Table Q2: Pre-Submission Main Modifications to Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) – Screening and Appraisal of Effects (July 2016)

Modification Reference	Policy/ Section Reference	Summary of Modification	Reasons for Modification	Screening - Likelihood of Significant Effects	SA Required?	Appraisal – Overall Score	Appraisal of Modification – Summary of Effects/ Reasons for Not Appraising the Modification
2. Walsall Town Centre							
No main modifications proposed							
3. A Place for Shopping							
No main modifications proposed							
4. A Place for Business							
MMAAP1	Policy AAPB2 Part a)	Additional part to policy to allow residential uses where buildings within the Social Enterprise Zone are historically listed if it can be demonstrated this is the best approach to maintaining the character of the buildings and that any proposal will not jeopardise the delivery of a Social Enterprise Zone.	In response to consultation representation from Planning Prospects Ltd on behalf of Norton & Proffitt Developments Ltd.	The additional policy text ensures that any residential uses will not jeopardise the delivery of a social enterprise zone resulting in the modification having no adverse impact on the aim or delivery of the policy.	Yes	+	The additional policy text ensures that any residential uses will not jeopardise the delivery of a social enterprise zone resulting in the modification having no adverse impact on aim or delivery of the policy. It is possible that there will be some conflict between residential uses and social enterprise uses in terms of noise but as the policy states the residential uses should not compromise the delivery of a social enterprise zone we would expect any residential proposals to be designed in a way to mitigate any potential conflict.
MMAAP2	Policy AAPB3 Part b)	Additional column to explain that 'consider for release' are allocated for an alternative use to industry should the policy texts of DEL2 be met.	To make it clear that a site has allocation as both consider for release and a suitable town centre use should the industry vacate the site.	The modification was for clarification only and does not change any allocations or policy meaning.	No	N/A	This approach is already established through the BCCS and will have been appraised through this plan making process. Also the change to the policy is for clarity rather than a change to the policy approach and as such has been appraised through the previous SA stages.
5. A Place for Leisure							
MMAAP3	Policy AAPLE1 New Part g) of policy:	Additional policy text to ensure that leisure uses are well integrated into the town centre.	To reflect current policy and ensure schemes are well integrated providing wider advantages to the centre as whole.	No significant effects as already part of policy approach and also ensures that schemes have positive not negative impacts on the centre as a whole	Yes	+	The addition to the policy will have an overall effect of ensuring leisure uses are well integrated with the rest of the centre. This will have the knock on impact of ensuring footfall from the leisure use is directed to other town centre uses such as retail. It will also ensure that leisure uses are accessible by public transport reducing the need to travel by car and making development in the centre more sustainable. The better integration of developments should also have a positive impact on the townscape of the centre.
MMAAP4	Policy AAPLE4 Part e)	Additional policy wording to strengthen wording around the environmental network.	In response to requests from the Environment Agency	The strengthening of the policy only looks to ensure the policy has a positive impact on the environment	No	N/A	The incorporation of green infrastructure has already been subject to appraisal the wording just provides further clarification of examples of green infrastructure and cross references to another AAP Policy which has been appraised.
6. A Place for Living							
No main modifications proposed							
7. Transport, Movement and Accessibility							
MMAAP5	AAP Policies Map	Show as an allocation on the Policies Map Walsall Bus Station	To be consistent with how we are showing the sites where	The plan always looked to improve the station in terms	No	N/A	St Paul's bus station was included in policy AAPT3 at Publication stage and has therefore already been subject

	Walsall Bus Station	as an ‘Opportunities for public transport investment (AAPT3)’	improvements to public transport are proposed. Site reference added for clarity.	of customer experience and safety. The modification to show the site on the policies map does not therefore change the approach to the site.			to an appraisal.
MMAAP6	Policy AAPT3 Part b)	Amend policy to include reference to the efficient operation of buses.	In response to ongoing discussions with Transport for West Midlands (TfWM) formally Centro around bus capacity in the centre.	The additional wording is simply to clarify the intention of improvements at the site.	No	+	St Paul’s bus station was included in the policy at Publication stage and has therefore already been subject to an appraisal. The policy has been reappraised to assess the impact on enhanced bus operations. The main difference is that it may result more buses and therefore an increase in air pollution at the station especially. This is however counterbalanced to some extent by the reducing to car journeys and the increased accessibility to the centre by residents.
MMAAP7	Policy AAPT3 Part e)	Modification to ensure policy promotes the linking of all modes of public transport in the centre.	In response to representations from Transport for West Midlands (TfWM)	This is a new part of the policy included to ensure that public transport is well connected, accessible and easy to use promoting the further use of sustainable travel and also creating a town centre that is easy to navigate and accessible to all.	Yes	+	The overall effect is likely the new part of the policy looks to ensure that public transport is well connected, accessible and easy to use promoting the further use of sustainable travel and also creating a town centre that is easy to navigate and accessible to all.
MMAAP8 and MMAAP9	Policy AAPT4 Parts a) and b)	Clarification in policy that Developments on the town centre ring road or development that will result in significant traffic being directed to the ring road will be expected to contribute to the identified improvements in order to maintain an efficient road network. The policy was also modified to include improvements to the road network to allow for public transport.	Outcomes of the traffic modelling have allowed for further work to be progressed on these schemes.	The modification makes the policy clearer and more specific but does not change the impact of the policy.	No	N/A	The proposed modification makes the policy more explicit in terms of the methods by which developer contributions will be sought. The approach to seeking developer contributions was included in the Publication policy and has therefore already been appraised. The approach of allowing highway improvements for improvements in public transport is included in the publication policy T3 and has therefore already been appraised.
MMAAP10 and MMAAP11	Policy AAPT4 Policy Justification	Further details have been added around seeking developer contributions and also around the highway schemes. Junctions that no longer require improvements have been removed from the policies map.	In response to further details being known around the schemes	The modifications simply add detail to what was proposed at the publication stage so are unlikely to have a significant effect. The removal of some junctions will not impact on the overall effect of the improvements.	No	N/A	The proposed modification makes the policy justification more explicit in terms of the methods by which developer contributions will be sought. The approach to seeking developer contributions was included in the Publication policy and has therefore already been appraised. The proposed junction improvements were included in the publication policies map and have therefore already been appraised.
MMAAP12	Policy AAPT5 Part a ii)	Modification of the policy to remove short stay from text	To ensure the policy covers all form of parking required in the	This is a tweak to the policy wording and doesn’t change	No	N/A	The widening of the policy to cover all parking does not change the aim or purpose of the policy which is to

			town centre.	the way the policy was intended to be implemented			ensure that car parking in the centre supports the centre as a whole.
8. A Place for Investment							
MMAAP13	AAPINV3 – Policies Map	Add boundary called Walsall Gigaport including all sites with the outline permission and also TC37, TC47 and TC55.	For consistency with the AAP Policies Map and policy AAPLV1.	No effect as this is for clarity only.	No	N/A	The policy and allocation have already been appraised
MMAAP14	AAPINV4 Part d)	Remove of sites listed as being suitable for housing only in the policy test	For consistency with the AAP Policies Map and policy AAPLV1	Housing was assessed in general at this location rather than at individual sites so the removal of some will not change the assessment. The sites are allocated for mixed use which was also assessed in the area and shown to have no significant impact.	No	N/A	This was a correction of a error in the policy. The SA considered the principle of residential in this area so the removal of one site from being purely a residential site does not impact on the aim and purpose of the policy.
MMAAP15	AAPINV4 Addition to last section of policy	Addition to text to make the connection between this policy and requirements for green infrastructure	In response to representations from the Environment Agency	This is required elsewhere in the plan so the modification is unlikely to have any further effect	No	N/A	This additional text has been appraised as part of the Green Infrastructure and Canal policy so does not need to be assessed again.
MMAAP16	AAPINV7 Part f)	Reword policy and policy justification text to be consistent with SAD, to amend errors in references to the names of resources and to make the policy less negative in wording.	For consistency with Proposed Modification to SAD Policy MIN1 in response to representations from the Mineral Products Association (441) and Coal Authority (681). Also to correct inaccuracies in bullet point i (there are no bedrock sand and gravel resources in the Town Centre) and to correct a typographical error (bullet point iv should be bullet point iii).	No significant effects are likely as the approach towards minerals safeguarding has not changed, and is consistent with BCCS Policy MIN1.	Yes	+	
MMAAP17 and MMAAP18	AAPINV7 Part f)	Replace MSA shown on AAP Policies Map with the updates area.	Policies Map – replace existing MSA designation with the MSA designation shown on BCCS Minerals Key Diagram.	No significant effects are likely as the approach towards minerals safeguarding has not changed, and is consistent with BCCS Policy MIN1.	Yes	+	
MMAAP19 and MMAAP20	AAPINV7 New Part g)	New policy part to cross reference to nature conservation policies within the current policy framework such as the BCCS	To ensure that any proposal in the town centre takes due regard to the policies that protect the nature environment including protected species	No significant impact as the policy refers to policies that are already in place and would be applied anyway through the planning application process	No	N/A	Cross references policies that are already adopted and have therefore be subject to appraisal already.

Table Q3: SAD & AAP Sustainability Objectives

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

Walsall SAD & AAP Pre-Submission Main Modifications - Key to Options Appraisal Scoring

Symbol	Meaning	Reasons for Scoring Selection
++	Likely to have strong positive effects	This score has been applied where a Modification 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 a Modification 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 a Modification 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 a Modification 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 a Modification 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 a Modification 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 – Modification not subject to appraisal	This score has been applied where the Modification has not been subjected to SA because there would either be no effects on sustainability or any effects are likely to be negligible.