

**SANDWELL LOCAL PLAN 2024-41 EXAMINATION****INSPECTOR'S SCHEDULE OF ACTION POINTS FOR THE COUNCIL****Week 1 Hearing Sessions (V.1 8.9.25)****Day 1- Matter 1**

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>TARGET DATE</b>	<b>EXMAINATION DOCUMENT</b>
1.1	Upload script of Cllr Smith's Opening Statement	25/7/25	<a href="#">SA/ED57</a>
1.2	Produce a list of documents which were not consulted on prior to submission	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED62</a>
1.3	Confirm that the SCI 2022 is the most up to date	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED63</a>
1.4	Update the SA (Vol 2, region of Table 5.8 and para 5.6.7) to include and assessment the 'hybrid' Balanced Green Growth option alongside and with the same level of analysis as for Options A to D.	05/09/25	<a href="#">SA/ED64</a>
1.5	Update SA to cover the EA's response to flood risk and the updated SFRA2. Include date when the SFRA2 was published.	05/09/25	<a href="#">SA/ED64</a>
1.6	Place Appendices 2, 3a and 3b to the Council's Matter 1 hearing statement with the DTC Statement (DtC001) in the Examination Library along with a Note explaining to the public how they came to be created. Add 2023 BC DtC meeting notes to appendix 3b (or as appendix 3c).	30/7/25	<a href="#">SA/ED65</a> <a href="#">SA/ED65A</a> <a href="#">SA/ED65B</a> <a href="#">SA/ED65C</a> <a href="#">SA/ED65D</a>
1.7	Telford Plan contribution to housing need – check the figure in the Reg 19 Reps.	For Week 2 hearings	<a href="#">SA/ED66</a>
1.8	Include a Main Mod (MM) to acknowledge that the Air Quality loading factors have changed (see the EA's Reg 19 Reps). Also acknowledge in the updated SA.	Post EiP	

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>TARGET DATE</b>	<b>EXAMINATION DOCUMENT</b>
1.9	If appropriate, At the point of adoption ensure that the Council reaches a clear conclusion on the 'integrity test' in the Habitats Regs (likely to be set out in the Officer Report recommending adoption and the draft resolutions for the Council).	Post EiP	
1.10	Confirm the details of the engagement with South Staffs Water (see HRA para 6.3.4) and any response. Include any contact under the Infrastructure Delivery Plan process.	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED67</a>
1.11	MM – include list of superseded policies. Reference in text to a list in appendix.	Post EiP	
1.12	Check Appx N to the submitted plan is 100% accurate.	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED68</a>

**Day 2 – Matter 2**

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>TARGET DATE</b>	<b>EXAMINATION DOCUMENT</b>
2.1	Plan para 89f. AM to reference emergency services and utility companies	Post EiP	
2.2	Inform the inspector of the arrangements for regularly updating the IDP	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED69</a>
2.3	Housing requirement in SDS1. Update the figure of 10,434 and trace through in the rest of the plan to update other textual references, housing trajectory, 5YS etc. Make it clear the requirement figure is 'across the plan period'.	Post EiP	
2.4	In time for the public to understand the position prior to drafting Phase 2 hearing statements, update to 2025 the housing trajectory (spreadsheet with column for each year of the plan with sources/sites in rows), 5YHLS on adoption and rolling 5YHLS. Assume the inclusion of the 250 unit site as a MM.	5/9/25 MM- post EiP	<a href="#">SA/ED70</a>
2.5	Policy SHO10. MM to include the level of need for older persons accommodation (not a target or requirement).	Post EiP - MM	
2.6	Check the 3 sites contended for by the police are included in Appx B and shown on both policies maps (pdf and interactive).	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED71</a>

2.7	Check to see if any other sites have been left out of Appx B by mistake.	5/9/25 and Post EiP – MM	<a href="#">SA/ED72</a>
2.8	Gateway constraints – list the number of sites that ‘failed’ a gateway test and why.	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED73</a>
2.9	Produce an electronic map of the Green Belt with other land use constraints (gateways and others) to assist in the “what if” GB analysis.	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED74</a>
2.10	Explain the reason why G&T sites to 2041 is ‘+1’ on the total in the GTAA to 2039.	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED75</a>
2.11	MM to update policy SHO9 to set out more clearly (a) what the plan is seeking to achieve, (b) the level of need, (c) what the 5YS is. Explain the supply position in the supporting text. Add information on Travelling Show People.		
2.12	Signpost the inspector to evidence of demand for offices and what the trend might be across the plan period. Include any evidence that shows the need is elsewhere in the Black Country.	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED76</a>
2.13	See the Dudley MBC Matter 2 hearing statement that 169ha should be 185ha. Check for other references in the plan that need changing.	Post EiP	
2.14	Provide a brief / concise note from Regeneration Officers on the demand for vacant land for clean / tech industry.	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED77</a>
2.15	West Midlands Strategic Interchange. See Econ 006a. What is the extent of the contribution? How will delivery be monitored? When is the first occupation expected?	5/9/25	<a href="#">SA/ED78</a>
2.16	Begin a list of changes needed to the Policies Map. Do not make any changes yet (wait for the inspector to say “go”)	Post EiP – accompanying the MM	
	Note: any multiple changes needed to an individual policy should be in a single MM.		

## Day 3 – Matter 3

	ACTION	TARGET DATE	EXAMINATION DOCUMENT
3.1	MM for SDS1, para 3 and update to para 3.12 to 3.19. Inspector will give details / guidance in a post hearing letter.	Post EiP	
3.2	MM to SDS1.1.i to include a reference to Nature Recovery.	Post EiP	
3.3	MM to SDS1.3 to make it clear how the plan makes allocations (see also SHO1). Also note that allocations are not the only source of meeting housing needs.	Post EiP	
3.4	MM to SDS1.1.c to reflect the changes made to para 89f	Post EiP	
3.5	MM to SDS1.2 to add a reference to designing out crime, safety etc.	Post EiP	
3.6	MM to SDS.1.h to make it consistent with the NPPF. Make PAM18 a MM.	Post EiP	
3.7	MM to SDS1.1.b to add a signpost for the 1,221ha to SEC1-3 (note – not to SEC4)	Post EiP	
3.8	MM to SDS1.2 to redraft to remove references to “allocating”.	Post EiP	
3.9	MM to SDS2.2. e – review reference to “all developments”. Does it apply to even the smallest extension? What about circumstances where SUDS is not suitable? See NPPF 175. Perhaps insert at the start “where relevant”?	Post EiP	
3.10	Will all of the criteria in SDS2.2 always apply?	Possible mods	
3.11	Will SDS2.2.b really apply to “all” sections of the community for any /all development proposals?		
3.12	MM to SDS2.2. i – “unacceptable level of harm” is not consistent with NPPF. Bring PAM19 into a MM.	Post EiP	
3.13	MM to SDS2.2.j – delete “setting” insert “significance”. The 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence requirement to minimise harm is not consistent with the NNPF. Needs redrafting.	Post EiP	
3.14	SDS2.2.h – why only applications for planning permission. What about other decisions where the development plan is relevant?		
3.15	SDS3.3.b – add reference to the masterplan to explain meaning / vision of “transformational”	Post EiP	
3.16	SDS3.6.b – Policies Map not Policies Plan.	Post EiP	

	SDS3.8.e – remove reference to “discounted” For future discussion.	Post EiP	
3.17	Para 3.53 – delete “that generally accompany these operations”.	Post EiP	
3.18	Table 4 (p65) – the dates in the last column need updating.	Post EiP	
3.19	SDS4.1.a.i – review the reference to “call for sites”. Are we planning another? (and in SDS4.1.a.i remove “minimum 474”.	Post EiP	
3.20	SDS5.1 – add a reference to other design codes produced by third parties with oversight from the Council. Add reference to the national design code before the Council produces its own?	Post EiP	
3.21	SDS6 – should the title also reference Community Facilities. Signpost somewhere in the policy to SDM9.	Post EiP	
3.22	SDS6.6 – amend to make clear the position where a facility becomes redundant to the current user? Preference to keep in use with another user? What marketing to find an alternative user will be required before the change of use is acceptable?	Post EiP	
3.23	SDS6.14 – amend with an AM in accordance with the Council’s Hearing Statement p25.	Post EiP	
3.24	SDS7 – (Green Belt) rewrite completely to simply say that in decision-taking the Council will apply National policy (either in the NPPF or its successor- which might be National Development Management Policies!). What is now SDS7.3 can remain along with any other local priorities. Also rewrite the whole of the supporting text to support the revised policy.	Post EiP	
3.25	SDS8 – para 3.104. amend in line with PM28. The capitalize Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Add a definition in the plan’s Glossary to refer to the current LNRS or its successor.	Post EiP	