



Sandwell Local Plan 2024-2041 - Examination

Inspector
Mrs Catherine Jack

Programme Officer
Ms Louise St John Howe
louise@poservices.co.uk
07789 486419

Examination website
[Examination Overview](#) | [Sandwell Local Plan Examination](#) | [Sandwell Council](#)

Thursday 25 September 2025 starting at 9.30am

Hearing Sessions Agenda

Week 2 Day 3

Please Note:

- All participants are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the hearing statements (and any relevant evidence) produced by the Council and other parties in respect of the matters to be discussed at this session. These are available on the examination website.
- The relevant Matters, Issues and Questions (SA/ED59) for this session are attached to this agenda for ease of reference. The discussion will typically follow the MIQs in order, focused on points upon which the Inspector requires further information or clarification. Some questions will require little discussion, and others may require significant discussion. The Inspector is also likely to have additional associated questions relating to the plan's soundness and/or legal compliance.
- Morning hearing sessions will typically finish no later than 1pm for lunch and will include a mid-morning break. Afternoon sessions will usually finish by 5pm, with a mid-afternoon break.

1. Inspector's Opening and Introductions

Matter 9: Site Allocations

2. Issue 9 – Whether the plan's site allocations are sound (Questions 9.1 and 9.2)

Main areas for discussion:

- Rattlechain (SH35 SH36)
- Cape Arm/Cranford Street (SH55)



- Lion Farm (SM2)
- Friar Park (SH18)
- Brandhall Golf Course (SH34)
- Land off Tanhouse Avenue (SH43)
- Land at Horseley Heath, Alexandra Road and Lower Church Lane (SH19)
- Chances Glassworks (SM1)
- Part of Rowley Regis Golf Course (Proposed MM1) (SA/ED50)
- PAM59 and PAM62 to PAM64, PAM66 and PAM67 (SA/ED3)
- Any other main modifications necessary in relation to the plan's site allocations

3. Close

MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS (MIQs)

MATTER 9: Site Allocations (set out in various Appendices to the Plan)

Issue 9 – Whether the plan’s site allocations are justified, effective, positively prepared and consistent with national policies.

Note: The following question applies to each of the plan’s site allocation policies in Appendix B (housing sites, mixed use sites, and Gypsy and Traveller sites), Appendix C (employment sites), Appendix E (strategic waste sites), and Appendix F (minerals infrastructure sites). In responding, please be clear about the specific site(s) you are referring to by referencing the site name as given in the plan and the relevant site reference. Respondents, other than the Council, should **only** respond to those questions and site allocation that are directly relevant to the representations they made at the Regulation 19 consultation stages. Appendix A habitat bank sites are not included in Matter 9 and instead those will be considered with Policy SNE2 under Matter 4.

Following submission of the plan for examination, the Council has proposed **an additional housing site allocation** which it considers should be added to Appendix B and has carried out an additional Regulation 19 consultation. The additional site reference is SH67 (Part of Rowley Regis Golf Course) and is set out as a Potential Main Modification (MM1) in document SA/ED50. The responses to the additional Regulation 19 consultation are available on the examination website.

Q9.1 Are the site allocations soundly based? In particular:

- a) Is the site allocation consistent with the plan’s overarching strategy for the location of development? Is it of strategic importance to the delivery of the plan’s overarching strategy?
- b) What is the likely effect of the allocation in relation to the following factors, where relevant:
 - i. The highway network and other infrastructure, such as health and education facilities, the national grid electricity transmission network, and open space.
 - ii. Flood risk.
 - iii. Air quality.
 - iv. Land contamination and stability, minerals and waste, and noise.
 - v. Heritage assets and their significance.
 - vi. Local environment and character.



- c) Is the amount of development proposed for the allocation justified, including having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure and other policy requirements?
- d) Is there evidence that the proposed development of the site allocation is likely to be viable and deliverable in the Anticipated Delivery Timescale indicated, where relevant?
- e) Has any planning permission been granted and, if so, what are the details?
- f) Are any site-specific policies or policy requirements necessary for the soundness of the site allocation?

Q9.2 In terms of this issue, are any main modifications necessary for soundness?