

Your ref
Our ref
Ask for Christine Lewis
email Christine.lewis@lichfielddc.gov.uk

**District Council House, Frog Lane
Lichfield WS13 6YU**

Switchboard +44 (0) 1543 308000
Fax +44 (0) 1543 309899
Direct Line +44 (0) 1543 308065
Minicom only +44 (0) 1543 308078

8th March 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

**ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY)
COMMITTEE**

A meeting of the above mentioned Committee has been arranged to take place on **WEDNESDAY 16th MARCH 2016 at 6.00 PM** in the **COMMITTEE ROOM**, District Council House, Lichfield, to consider the following business.

Access to the Committee Room is via the Members' Entrance.

Yours faithfully



Strategic Director

**To: Members of Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview and Scrutiny)
Committee**

Councillors Cox (Chairman), Mrs Baker (Vice Chairman), Mrs Barnett, Mrs Boyle, Drinkwater, Mrs Eagland, Mrs Evans, Mills, Mosson, Rayner, Miss Shephard, Smedley and Mrs Stanhope MBE.

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interest
3. To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on the 27th January 2016 (copy attached)
4. Work Programme and Forward Plan (copy attached)
5. Biodiversity & Development – Supplementary Planning Document (copy attached)
6. Trees and Development – Supplementary Planning Document (copy attached)
7. Review of Effectiveness of the Pre-Application Charging Regime (copy attached)
8. Activity and Performance Indicators 2016/17 (copy attached)
9. Overview & Scrutiny Review (copy attached)

Briefing Papers to be issued separately:

- Development Control Performance
- Review of The Lichfield District's 2015 Festivals and Events Programme and Preview of 2016 Programme
- Lichfield District Economic Development Performance
- Friarsgate Update
- Local Plan Update
- Lichfield City Centre Business Improvement District

*Briefing Papers were introduced after the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Co-ordinating Group requested that the length and volume of agendas be addressed. Briefing papers, which are intended to provide Members with information on relevant issues, are an alternative to placing items on the Agenda. If Members wish a paper to be discussed it can be included on the Work Programme and scheduled for a future meeting.



**ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT & DEVELOPMENT
(OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
27th JANUARY 2016**

PRESENT

Councillors Cox (Chairman), Mrs Baker (Vice-Chairman), Mrs Barnett, Mrs Boyle, Drinkwater, Mrs Evans, Mills, Rayner, Smedley and Mrs Stanhope MBE

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: were received from Councillor Mrs Eagland, Mosson and Miss Shepherd

(In accordance with Council Procedure Rule No.17 Councillor Pritchard attended the meeting).

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

Councillor Mrs Boyle declared a non-pecuniary interest in any reference to the southern by-pass.

MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 23rd September 2015 as circulated were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

WORK PROGRAMME AND FORWARD PLAN

Details were requested regarding development proposals for an improved retail offer in Burntwood and when a task group would be arranged. It was reported that one would be as soon as information was available for a task group to consider and that the group would be politically balanced.

It was requested that with regard to Landscaping, trees are not disposed of before development and it was noted that this was controlled by planning conditions.

RESOLVED: That the Work Programme and Forward Plan be noted.

LOCAL PLAN UPDATE REPORT

Members considered a report updating them on progress with the Lichfield District Local Plan, Duty to Co-operate matters, the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans and the production of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule.

It was reported that there was still an outstanding legal challenge to the Local Plan Strategy which would be heard at the Court of Appeal on the 25th February 2016. It was noted that the District Council had been successful on all of the other court cases held to date on the matter.

The newly adopted policy requiring affordable housing to be provided on smaller development sites in areas outside Burntwood and Lichfield City was noted. This had been brought in in response to a successful legal challenge to the Government.

Members were informed however that the Government was currently appealing that challenge.

It was then reported that both the Little Aston and Stonnall neighbourhood plans would be going forward to local referendums on the 25th February 2016. When asked, it was noted that a yes vote from 50% of the turnout would be required. It was also reported that discussions with Alrewas regarding its plan were ongoing.

Finally it was reported that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would be subject to examination by the Planning Inspectorate on the 28th January 2016.

When discussing the Duty to Cooperate and cross boundary issues, the Committee were concerned that the Birmingham Development Plan would dictate the amount of houses Lichfield District would have to find for their benefit. There were concerns that in time, due to this and general rises in population, a review of the district's green belt would be required. The Cabinet Member for Economic Growth and Development reported that this may be the case but he would try and minimise the numbers and impact on the district.

The Committee agreed that an outstanding Supplementary Planning Document relating to the Borrowcop Lane area of Lichfield, no longer applied as it linked to the old Local Plan. It should therefore be withdrawn.

RESOLVED: (1) That the update in relation to the Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy and Sites Allocation Plan, Neighbourhood Plan preparation, work to progress the Community Infrastructure Levy, Duty to Cooperate obligations and Supplementary Planning Documents be noted;

(2) That Council be recommended to withdraw the existing Supplementary Planning Document guidance relating to Borrowcop Lane, Lichfield.

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The Committee received a report on a new proposed Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which set the standards which could be expected by the public and statutory consultees for community involvement in the planning process. It was noted that the Council was required to produce such a document.

It was requested whether the Planning Committee leaflets as shown in the SCI could also be updated to be in line with the more modern looking SCI and it was agreed to look into this.

The Committee discussed how best to ensure the public were aware of the SCI and how they could contribute in the planning process, particularly taking account of situations where access to the Council's website were poor or people were not able/willing to use technologies of this kind. It was agreed that this should be investigated further by Officers.

RESOLVED: That the draft Statement of Community Involvement be published for the purposes of public consultation.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICE REVIEW

The Committee received a report giving an update on progress made with the Fit for the Future (F4F) programme review of the Economic Development Service and approval was sought for taking forward a draft Economic Development Strategy for consultation.

Members asked where the stated 79.1 hectares of allocated employment land would be and whether any would be in Fradley and it was noted that this referred to what was already committed.

The Committee agreed that employment and young people were very important and that apprenticeships should be encouraged and supported as it allowed people to remain in the area and giving a better age mix. When asked, it was noted that investment in training was also very important and Members suggested including parents in this.

It was asked how the Lichfield Business Improvement District worked with the City Centre Development partnership and it was reported that they worked in tandem with many of the same people on both.

When asked, it was reported that the County Council had identified a general need for infrastructure at Sankeys Corner however no details had been given at this time.

It was reported by the Chairman that there was a desire by the residents of Armitage to have a train station back and this was noted by Officers

- RESOLVED:** (1) That the progress of the review be noted;
- (2) That the draft Economic Development Strategy be approved for the purpose of consultation.

DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS SPD

The Committee received a report on the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which was part of a suite of SPD's which supported the adopted Local Plan Strategy.

Members were pleased to see that the SPD gave a clear description of Affordable Housing.

It was noted that there had been a recent quote from the Secretary of State saying that council tax should be increased for residents living in areas prone to flooding to help cover the costs of improving flood defences. The Committee felt this was grossly unfair if true.

When asked, it was confirmed that the SPD would be updated to include any further Air Quality Management Areas as and when designated in the future.

The Committee was disappointed that there had been no Member involvement in the creation of the SPD although noted its technical nature and hence the reason why this was.

- RESOLVED:** That the draft SPD on Developer Contributions be approved for the purpose of consultation.

UPDATE ON THE PROGRESS TOWARD A FORMAL PARKING STRATEGY FOR LICHFIELD DISTRICT

The Committee received a report on the progress with the preparation of a draft Parking Strategy and Options report for Lichfield District. It was reported that the District Council was likely to remain responsible for managing the car parks estate particularly having regards to the desire to control parking arrangements in respect of the new Friarsgate Development. It was also reported that the introduction of a pay on foot system had been ruled out due to cost although Officers continued to explore other systems that utilised new technology that would give users similar benefits.

Some Members expressed that their views regarding charging for blue badge holders had changed since becoming badge holders themselves or with family members being one. They said they understood the challenges of purchasing tickets when disabled and felt the current policy of not charging should remain.

Some Members had concerns that the new strategy could be purely just to raise income and did not encourage monthly permits. There were also concerns that income could in fact drop with less people inclined to use the car parks. There was also a fear that the increased charges could provide barriers for economic development. It was noted that charges had not been put up since 2008.

Members agreed that there should not be any charges for using Council owned car parks in Burntwood as it assisted footfall in the area. It was asked if partnerships could be set up with private land owners to provide car parking.

The Committee agreed to set up a Member Task Group consisting of Councillors Cox, Smedley, Mrs Evans, Mrs Stanhope and Mrs Boyle to give views as part of the public consultation.

RESOLVED: (1) That the District Council continue in its role as the major parking provider in the City and this operation continue to be managed in house at this time given the need to control the supply of parking and to exercise control over parking during the critical time of the Friarsgate development;

(2) That the option of a large scale conversion to Pay on Foot operation be ruled out due to cost, legal and traffic management issues but officers continue to explore alternative offers using new technology in an attempt to deliver methods of payment with similar benefits to Pay on Foot;

(3) That the Increases in parking charges as stated in the report be brought in and it be noted that the modelling for these sums assumes that business levels will continue at the current level with no long term fall in occupancy;

(4) That an extensive stakeholder engagement process be undertaken to gain the views of other interested parties such as the BID group, City Development Partnership, Chambers of Trade and Commerce, Friends of the Park, Employee Liaison Group and City Council before taking the charging proposals forward for the approval of full Council;

(5) That a public consultation be carried out via the Council website;

(6) That a Member Task Group be arranged to give its views as part of that consultation; and

(7) That Lichfield District Council continue to operate the existing arrangements for off street enforcement in those car parks operated by the District Council for a further year to enable a review of all options to be considered.

MID YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT – ONE YEAR ACTION PLAN 2015/16 FOR DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

The Committee received a report on the progress against the activities and projects set out on the Directorates' One Year Action Plan for 2015/16.

It was asked why performance had dropped for determining planning applications and it was noted that it was due to capacity issues however this was now back on target.

It was then asked how the number of vacant retail premises compared in Lichfield to nationally and it was reported that the District was better than national figures and was improving further.

RESOLVED: That the mid-year performance report for 2015/16 be noted.

DIRECTORATE TOP 10 – 2016/17

The Committee received a report on the top ten issues that the Development Directorate would be focusing on during the 2016/17 financial year in support of the Strategic Plan.

It was asked if there were sufficient resources in the Enforcement department and it was reported that it was realistic for the climate.

RESOLVED: That the top ten issues for the Development Directorate be noted.

(The Meeting closed at 8.15pm)

CHAIRMAN

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2015-16

Item	27 Jan	16 Mar	Details/Reasons	Link to 2015/16 One Year Action Plan	Officer	Member Lead
Policy Development						
Terms of Reference					Christine Lewis	

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2015-16

Item	27 Jan	16 Mar	Details/Reasons	Link to 2015/16 One Year Action Plan	Officer	Member Lead
<p>Local Plan – Strategy, Land Allocations and Monitoring.</p> <p>Associated Neighbourhood Plans and Community Infrastructure Levy</p>	✓	✓	<p>To receive reports on the preparation and implementation of the Lichfield District Local Plan, associated Neighbourhood Plans and infrastructure delivery mechanisms</p> <p>The Lichfield District Local Plan when finalised and adopted will establish spatial policy for Lichfield District. An overarching Strategy has been adopted. A detailed land allocations document with development management policies is now scheduled to be prepared.</p> <p>To receive reports on progress with Neighbourhood Plans which are being prepared by designated neighbourhood areas.</p> <p>In agreeing a Development Strategy for Lichfield District it is important to identify related infrastructure requirements and the means by which these will be delivered including using developer contributions obtained under the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p>	<p>Prepare a Local Plan including principles of sustainable development and the protection of key built and natural environmental assets</p> <p>Deliver increased levels of affordable housing to meet varied requirements across the District</p>	Craig Jordan	

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2015-16

Item	27 Jan	16 Mar	Details/Reasons	Link to 2015/16 One Year Action Plan	Officer	Member Lead
Biodiversity & Development – Supplementary Planning Document		✓	<p>To receive reports on the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document related to Biodiversity and Development.</p> <p>The SPD would provide detailed guidance on what the District Council as Local Planning Authority seeks in terms of protecting, enhancing and creating nature conservation habitats linked to development proposals.</p>	<p>Prepare a Local Plan including principles of sustainable development and the protection of key built and natural environmental assets</p> <p>Deliver new/enhanced areas of nature conservation value.</p> <p>Promote the protection of valuable areas of open space and nature conservation in new schemes in line with the District’s Biodiversity Action Plan</p>	Justine Lloyd	Cllr Eric Drinkwater
Trees and Development – Supplementary Planning Document		✓	<p>To receive reports on the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document related to Trees and Woodland.</p> <p>The SPD would provide detailed guidance on how Trees and woodland should be considered as part of any future development proposals in the District.</p>	<p>Prepare a Local Plan including principles of sustainable development and the protection of key built and natural environmental assets</p>	Portia Howe	Cllr Eric Drinkwater

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2015-16

Item	27 Jan	16 Mar	Details/Reasons	Link to 2015/16 One Year Action Plan	Officer	Member Lead
Developer Contributions – Supplementary Planning Document	✓		<p>To receive reports on the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document on Developer Contributions</p> <p>The SPD would provide detailed guidance on how developer contributions would contribute towards delivering key local infrastructure also also explain the relationship between CIL and S106.</p>		Craig Jordan	
Statement of Community Involvement	✓		<p>To receive and consider a revised version of the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement setting out how the Authority intends to engage with residents and stakeholders in the operation of the planning system in Lichfield District. To approve a draft SCI for the purposes of public consultation.</p>		Heidi Hollins	
Pre-Application Charging Regime		✓	<p>To receive a report on the effectiveness of the Pre-Application Charging regime part of the Development Management process</p>		Sean Coghlan	

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2015-16

Item	27 Jan	16 Mar	Details/Reasons	Link to 2015/16 One Year Action Plan	Officer	Member Lead
High Speed 2 – Phases 1 and 2	*		<p>To receive information in respect of the proposals for a High Speed rail line which as a first phase would run between the West Midlands and London with a second phase providing links to Manchester and Leeds</p> <p>The Government has confirmed its support for a High Speed rail network with the initial focus being on developing a high-speed link between London and the West Midlands known as HS2. A Hybrid Bill was deposited in Parliament in November 2013 seeking the necessary approvals and is currently going through the House of Commons Select Committee stage. Proposals and consultation in respect of Phase 2 will be published in due course.</p>	<p>Whilst maintaining a fundamental objection to HS2, the District Council via the Local Plan for Lichfield recognises the need to identify local transport priorities. If HS2 gains the necessary parliamentary approvals the District Council working with partners will need to consider how best to maximise any benefits and these will be dependent upon improved transport connectivity</p>	Craig Jordan	
Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans		✓	<p>To receive reports relating to the preparation of Conservation Area Appraisals and CA Management Plans</p> <p>The Authority is under a duty to review its Conservation Areas to ensure they appropriately reflect their intended status.</p>	<p>Conservation areas that are properly managed and that are recognised and realised, in terms of their potential, provide better places to live, can help to improve quality of life and contribute to a thriving economy.</p>	Claire Hines	

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2015-16

Item	27 Jan	16 Mar	Details/Reasons	Link to 2015/16 One Year Action Plan	Officer	Member Lead
Performance monitoring	✓		To consider the performance of the Directorate against the 14/15 Action Plan (June meeting) and the 15/16 Action Plan top 10 for Development (January meeting)	N/A	Richard King	TBA
Friarsgate Scheme		✓	To receive updates on progress of the project	Work with developers to move forward the Friarsgate Shopping Centre Scheme	Helen Cook	
Lichfield City Centre Business Improvement District		✓	To receive reports and briefing papers on the progress of BID proposals relating to Lichfield City Centre.		Elizabeth Thatcher	
Lichfield District Economic Development Performance		*	To receive update reports/briefing papers on the economic performance of Lichfield District in 2015/16.		Craig Jordan/James Roberts	
GBSLEP Development Management Project		✓	To receive a report on an initiative led by the GBSLEP looking at improving Development Management procedures and processes across the LEP geography		Sean Coghlan	

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2015-16

Item	27 Jan	16 Mar	Details/Reasons	Link to 2015/16 One Year Action Plan	Officer	Member Lead
Review of The Lichfield District's 2015 Festivals and Events Programme and Preview of 2016 Programme		*	To outline to the Committee the extent and success of the Lichfield District 2015 Festivals and Events Programme and to outline the proposed 2016 programme.	s that we will help 'boost business' and the local economy by supporting and delivering an extensive programme of events and festivals that builds upon the district's cultural reputation, the enthusiasm of local organisations and people and realise the potential of our historic assets and iconic locations.	Lizzie Thatcher	
Economic Development Service Review	✓	✓	To receive reports on a review of the Council's Economic Development Service		Richard King/Craig Jordan	
Car Parks Management Review	✓	✓	To receive reports on a review of the Council's car parks management arrangements		Richard King/Craig Jordan	
Car Park Management	✓		To receive reports and briefing papers on the operation of the Council's Car Parks and Car Parking Strategy. To receive reports and briefing papers on on-street Car Parking Enforcement following the transfer of responsibilities to Staffordshire County Council		John Roobottom	

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2015-16

Item	27 Jan	16 Mar	Details/Reasons	Link to 2015/16 One Year Action Plan	Officer	Member Lead
Development Control Performance		*	To brief the Committee on Development Control performance		Claire Billings/Se an Coghlan	

LICHFIELD DISTRICT COUNCIL

FORWARD PLAN

Updated: 19.02.2016

Effective for the Period 01.03.2016 – 30.06.2016

Representations in respect of all the matters shown should be sent in writing to the contact officer indicated at Lichfield District Council, District Council House, Frog Lane, Lichfield, Staffs. WS13 6YU no later than one week before the decision is due to be made. Copies of documents can also be obtained by contacting the relevant Officer. Facsimile: 01543 309899; Telephone: 01543 308000

- Key decisions are:
1. A decision made in connection with setting the Council Tax
 2. Expenditure or savings if they exceed £50,000
 3. A decision which significantly affects the community in two or more wards

MATTER FOR CABINET DECISION (PLEASE MARK KEY DECISIONS WITH AN ASTERIX) ^{(1) (*)}	CONFIDENTIAL YES/NO ⁽⁸⁾	DECISION EXPECTED TO UNDERTAKE ⁽²⁾	DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY AND DATE ⁽³⁾⁽⁶⁾	CONSULTATION ⁽⁴⁾ INCLUDING CONSULTATION WITH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (If no consultation has been undertaken please briefly explain why)	DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE ⁽⁵⁾	CONTACT OFFICER/CABINET MEMBER ⁽⁷⁾
*Strategic Plan 2016-2020	No	To approve the Strategic Plan	Council 23/02/2016	Consultation with Strategic O&S in November 2015 and January 2016	Final draft Strategic Plan	OFFICER: Mrs H Titterton (01543) 308700 CABINET MEMBER: Councillor D Pullen 07817 105542

* DENOTES KEY DECISION

MATTER FOR CABINET DECISION (PLEASE MARK KEY DECISIONS WITH AN ASTERIX) ^{(1) (*)}	CONFIDENTIAL YES/NO ⁽⁸⁾	DECISION EXPECTED TO UNDERTAKE ⁽²⁾	DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY AND DATE ⁽³⁾⁽⁶⁾	CONSULTATION ⁽⁴⁾ INCLUDING CONSULTATION WITH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (If no consultation has been undertaken please briefly explain why)	DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE ⁽⁵⁾	CONTACT OFFICER/CABINET MEMBER ⁽⁷⁾
Annual Action Plan 2016/17	No	To approve the Annual Action Plan	Council 23/02/2016	Extensive consultation as part of preparation of the Strategic Plan Report to Strategic O&S @ 02/02/2016	Final draft Plan	OFFICER: Mrs H Titterton (01543) 308700 CABINET MEMBERS: Leader – Mike Wilcox (01543) 309609 Councillor D Pullen 07817 105542
Withdrawal of Borrowcop Lane Area Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	No	To agree to the withdrawal of the SPD	Council 23/02/2016	Reported to EG,E and D O&S in January 2016		OFFICER: Craig Jordan (01543) 308202 CABINET MEMBER: Councillor I Pritchard (01543) 472232

* DENOTES KEY DECISION

MATTER FOR CABINET DECISION (PLEASE MARK KEY DECISIONS WITH AN ASTERIX) ^{(1) (*)}	CONFIDENTIAL YES/NO ⁽⁸⁾	DECISION EXPECTED TO UNDERTAKE ⁽²⁾	DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY AND DATE ⁽³⁾⁽⁶⁾	CONSULTATION ⁽⁴⁾ INCLUDING CONSULTATION WITH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (If no consultation has been undertaken please briefly explain why)	DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE ⁽⁵⁾	CONTACT OFFICER/CABINET MEMBER ⁽⁷⁾
*Proposal for changes to the management structure of Lichfield District Council	No	Approval of proposals for formal consultation to restructure the top three tiers of management in Lichfield District Council	Council 23/02/2016	Cabinet on 28 th January Employment Committee on 11 February		OFFICER: Diane Tilley (01543) 308001 CABINET MEMBER Leader – Mike Wilcox (01543) 309609
*Money Matters Reports: Medium Term Financial Strategy (Revenue and Capital) 2016-19 (MTFS) R&C) 2016-19	No		Council 23/02/2016			OFFICER: Mrs J Kitchen (01543) 308770 CABINET MEMBER: Councillor C Spruce (01543) 258120
*Council Tax Resolution	No		Council 23/02/2016			OFFICER: Mrs J Kitchen (01543) 308770 CABINET MEMBER: Councillor C Spruce (01543) 258120

* DENOTES KEY DECISION

MATTER FOR CABINET DECISION (PLEASE MARK KEY DECISIONS WITH AN ASTERIX) ^{(1) (*)}	CONFIDENTIAL YES/NO ⁽⁸⁾	DECISION EXPECTED TO UNDERTAKE ⁽²⁾	DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY AND DATE ⁽³⁾⁽⁶⁾	CONSULTATION ⁽⁴⁾ INCLUDING CONSULTATION WITH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (If no consultation has been undertaken please briefly explain why)	DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE ⁽⁵⁾	CONTACT OFFICER/CABINET MEMBER ⁽⁷⁾
*Procurement of Contract Hire Vehicles for the Joint Waste Service	YES	To approve the prepayment of the contract hire payments in order to reduce payments.	Council 23/02/16	Consultation has been undertaken with the Chairman of the Strategic and Leisure, Parks and Waste Management (Overview and Scrutiny) Committees	Working papers for the calculation of the overall saving over the contract term.	OFFICER: Jane Kitchen (01543) 308770 CABINET MEMBERS: Councillor C Spruce Councillor I Eadie
Empty Homes Policy	No	Approval of an Empty Homes Policy 2016	Cabinet 08/03/2016	Consultation with Community Housing and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee 20.1.16	Report to Community Housing and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee 20.1.16	OFFICER: Mr C Gibbins (01543) 308702 CABINET MEMBER: Councillor C Greatorex (01543) 416677
*Leisure Review: To review the current arrangement for the provision of leisure services in Lichfield District	YES	To determine the future & shape of the Council's leisure services	Cabinet 08/03/2016	Leisure, Parks & Waste Management (O&S) Committee 14/1/16. Consultation with outside consultants, Stakeholders and Partners.	Options appraisal evidence base	OFFICER: Mr N Turner (01543) 308761 CABINET MEMBER: Councillor A Smith (01543) 4106885

* DENOTES KEY DECISION

MATTER FOR CABINET DECISION (PLEASE MARK KEY DECISIONS WITH AN ASTERIX) ^{(1) (*)}	CONFIDENTIAL YES/NO ⁽⁸⁾	DECISION EXPECTED TO UNDERTAKE ⁽²⁾	DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY AND DATE ⁽³⁾⁽⁶⁾	CONSULTATION ⁽⁴⁾ INCLUDING CONSULTATION WITH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (If no consultation has been undertaken please briefly explain why)	DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE ⁽⁵⁾	CONTACT OFFICER/CABINET MEMBER ⁽⁷⁾
Letting of Pest Control Contract *	YES	Approve the recommended supplier	Cabinet 08/03/2016	Options report taken to Community Housing and Health O&S Committee 7 th September 2015		OFFICER: Mr Gareth Davies (01543) 308741 CABINET MEMBER: Councillor C Greatorex (01543) 416677
*Disposal of property acquired through compulsory Purchase	No	Agree to and method of disposal of the Property	Cabinet 08/03/2016			OFFICER: Mr C Gibbins (01543) 308702 CABINET MEMBER: Councillor C. Greatorex (01543) 416677
Asset Management – Establishing a Limited Liability Partnership	No	To approve the establishment of a Limited Liability Partnership between the Council and Public Sector Plc.	Cabinet 08/03/2016	Report submitted to the Asset Strategy Group on 16 April 2015.	Prospect Review Report	OFFICER: Mr R King (01543 308060) CABINET MEMBER: Councillor C Spruce (01543) 258120

* DENOTES KEY DECISION

MATTER FOR CABINET DECISION (PLEASE MARK KEY DECISIONS WITH AN ASTERIX) ^{(1) (*)}	CONFIDENTIAL YES/NO ⁽⁸⁾	DECISION EXPECTED TO UNDERTAKE ⁽²⁾	DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY AND DATE ⁽³⁾⁽⁶⁾	CONSULTATION ⁽⁴⁾ INCLUDING CONSULTATION WITH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (If no consultation has been undertaken please briefly explain why)	DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE ⁽⁵⁾	CONTACT OFFICER/CABINET MEMBER ⁽⁷⁾
Customer Promise	No	To approve the Customer Promise	Cabinet 08/03/2016	Included in a report to Strategic (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee November 2015	The Customer Promise	OFFICERS: Mrs H Titterton (01543) 308700 Ms Ysanne Williams CABINET MEMBER: Councillor D Pullen (07877) 105542
*Re-procurement of Planning, Building Control, Licensing, Gazetteer Management and Street Naming, Numbering software suite, Land charges, Planning Portal Connector, National Land Information services connector and Public Access for Planning	No	To approve the decision of software provider and costs for the procurement of Planning, Building Control, Licensing, Gazetteer Management and Street Naming, Numbering software suite, Land charges, Planning Portal Connector, National Land Information services connector and Public Access for Planning	Cabinet 05/04/2016	Evaluation of tender responses	ITT and Tender documents	OFFICERS: Mr G Thomas (01543) 308181 Mr K Sleeman (01543) 308120 CABINET MEMBER: Councillor D Pullen (01532) 300075

* DENOTES KEY DECISION

MATTER FOR CABINET DECISION (PLEASE MARK KEY DECISIONS WITH AN ASTERIX) ^{(1) (*)}	CONFIDENTIAL YES/NO ⁽⁸⁾	DECISION EXPECTED TO UNDERTAKE ⁽²⁾	DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY AND DATE ⁽³⁾⁽⁶⁾	CONSULTATION ⁽⁴⁾ INCLUDING CONSULTATION WITH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (If no consultation has been undertaken please briefly explain why)	DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE ⁽⁵⁾	CONTACT OFFICER/CABINET MEMBER ⁽⁷⁾
Adoption of Community Infrastructure Charging Schedule	No	Adoption of CIL Charging Schedule and agreement to implement	Cabinet 05/04/2016	Consultation has taken place throughout the development of the CIL Charging Schedule including with the EGED (O&S) Committee	CIL Charging Schedule Examiners Report	OFFICER: Mr C Jordan (01543) 308202 MEMBER: Councillor I Pritchard (01543) 472232
* Land Charges – Expanding the shared service.	YES	Delegate authority to prepare and approve a detailed business case.	Cabinet 05/05/2016	Members of the shared service Partnership Board.	Land Charges – Outline Business Case	OFFICER: Mr G Cooper CABINET MEMBER: Councillor I Pritchard (01543) 472232
The Civic Function – proposals for change 2016/17	No	Proposals for changes to how the Civic Function is undertaken; events attended and held and transport provided to ensure it proactively supports the delivery of the strategic priorities of the Council. To be	Council 19/04/2016	Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Task Group reported to Committee on 9 th September 2015	Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Committee report dated 9 th September 2015	OFFICERS: Ms D. Tilley and Mrs J. Jones (01543 308001/3) CABINET MEMBER: Councillor M. J. Wilcox (01283) 791761

* DENOTES KEY DECISION

MATTER FOR CABINET DECISION (PLEASE MARK KEY DECISIONS WITH AN ASTERIX) ^{(1) (*)}	CONFIDENTIAL YES/NO ⁽⁸⁾	DECISION EXPECTED TO UNDERTAKE ⁽²⁾	DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY AND DATE ⁽³⁾⁽⁶⁾	CONSULTATION ⁽⁴⁾ INCLUDING CONSULTATION WITH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (If no consultation has been undertaken please briefly explain why)	DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE ⁽⁵⁾	CONTACT OFFICER/CABINET MEMBER ⁽⁷⁾
		implemented in Civic year 2016/17				
Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	No	Approve and formally adopt the Developer Contributions SPD	Cabinet 10/05/2016	Consultation has taken place on a draft SPD with comments taken into account in presenting a final version for approval. The draft SPD was approved for the purposes of consultation by the EGED (O&S) Committee	Final Draft SPD and comments received on the consultation draft document	OFFICER: Mr C Jordan (01543) 308202 MEMBER: Councillor I Pritchard (01543) 472232
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)	No	Agree to the adoption of the Statement of Community Involvement 2016 and the withdrawal of the Statement of Community Involvement April 2006	Cabinet 10.05.2016	Consultation has taken place in accordance with the existing SCI and the results reported to Special EG, E and D O and S in April 2016.		OFFICER: Mr C Jordan (01543) 308202 MEMBER: Councillor I Pritchard (01543) 472232

* DENOTES KEY DECISION

MATTER FOR CABINET DECISION (PLEASE MARK KEY DECISIONS WITH AN ASTERIX) ^{(1) (*)}	CONFIDENTIAL YES/NO ⁽⁸⁾	DECISION EXPECTED TO UNDERTAKE ⁽²⁾	DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY AND DATE ⁽³⁾⁽⁶⁾	CONSULTATION ⁽⁴⁾ INCLUDING CONSULTATION WITH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (If no consultation has been undertaken please briefly explain why)	DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE ⁽⁵⁾	CONTACT OFFICER/CABINET MEMBER ⁽⁷⁾
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Governance arrangements	No	Approve Governance arrangements	Cabinet July 2016	Consultation on the proposed governance arrangements has taken place with the EGED (O&S) Committee	Proposed CIL Governance arrangements document	OFFICER: Mr C Jordan (01543) 308202 MEMBER: Councillor I Pritchard (01543) 472232
Amendments to the Constitution regarding the dismissal of Statutory Officers	No		Council October 2016	Full Council		OFFICER: Mr R King (01543) 308060 CABINET MEMBER: Councillor C J Spruce (01543) 258120

1. The matter in respect of which the decision is to be made
 2. What decision the Council will be asked to make
 3. A date on which, or period within which, the decision will be made
 4. What groups of people and/or organisations will be consulted before the decision is made and how the consultation will be carried out.
 5. What background documents will be available to the person or Committee making the decision
 6. Who will make the decision, i.e. the Cabinet, Council a Cabinet Member alone, an Officer under Delegated Powers
 7. The Officer or Member who should be contacted regarding the matter under consideration.
 8. Indicate whether the report will be confidential.
- * Denotes Key Decision

* DENOTES KEY DECISION

MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

Leader of Cabinet
Deputy Leader of Cabinet and
Cabinet Member for Economic Growth, Development and Environment
Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks
Cabinet Member for Housing & Health
Cabinet Member for Waste Management
Cabinet Member for Finance and Democracy
Cabinet Member for Tourism and Communications
Cabinet Member for Community

Councillor M. J. Wilcox

Councillor I. M. P. Pritchard
Councillor A. F. Smith
Councillor C. Greatorex
Councillor I. M. Eadie
Councillor C. J. Spruce
Councillor Mrs H. E. Fisher
Councillor D. R. Pullen

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Allsopp, Mrs J A
Awty, R J
Bacon, Mrs N.
Baker, Mrs D F
Bamborough, R. A. J.
Banevicius, Mrs S W
Barnett, Mrs S A
Boyle, Mrs M G
Constable, Mrs B L
Constable, D H J
Cox, R E
Drinkwater, E N
Eadie, I M

Eagland, Mrs J M
Evans, Mrs C D
Fisher, Miss B
Fisher, Mrs H E
Greatorex, C
Hassall, Miss E A
Humphreys, K P
Leytham, D J
Marshall, T
Matthews, T R
Mills, J
Mosson, R C
O'Hagan, J P
Powell, J J R

Pritchard, I M P
Pullen, D.R.
Pullen, Mrs N I
Rayner, B L
Salter, D F
Shepherd, Miss O J
Smedley, D
Smith, A F
Spruce, C. J.
Stanhope MBE, Mrs M
Strachan, R W
Tittley, M C
Tranter, Mrs H
Warfield, M A

White, A. G.
Wilcox, M J
Woodward, Mrs S E
Yeates, A
Yeates, B W

Supplementary Planning Document – Biodiversity and Development

Cllr Pritchard – Cabinet Member for Economy

Date: 16th March 2016

Agenda Item: 5

Contact Officer: Craig Jordan

Tel Number: 01543 308202

Email: craig.jordan@lichfielddc.gov.uk

Key Decision? NO

Local Ward Members ALL



**ECONOMIC GROWTH,
ENVIRONMENT AND
DEVELOPMENT**

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was consulted upon in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement between 2nd July and the 13th of August 2015. Attached at **Appendix A** to this report is a summary of the representations received and the actions proposed in light of the comments made.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee agrees to the report and recommends to Cabinet the approval and adoption of the SPD on Biodiversity and Development

3. Background

- 3.1 Consultation on the Biodiversity and Development SPD started on 2/7/2015 and ran for 6 weeks until 13/8/2015. A press notice was placed in the Lichfield Mercury and a press release circulated. The document was advertised on the Council's website and local planning consultation system as well as an email being sent to all those registered on the consultations system which includes statutory consultees. The consultation resulted in 12 representations being received.
- 3.2 The main points can be summarised as follows:
- The final version of the SPD should include an executive summary;
 - Further detail and clarification regarding Biodiversity Offsetting schemes should be included within the final version of the SPD;
 - A number of corrections, typos and name changes should be included in the final version of the SPD;
 - The quality of the maps should be improved in the final version of the SPD;
 - All references to Geodiversity to be removed in the final version of the SPD;
 - The naming and description of the "first impression survey" to be amended in the final document so to make clear: what it is; what it is intended to achieve; what information it cannot provide; and its distinctiveness from a Phase 1 habitat assessment
 - Additionally it is recommended that the Biodiversity Net Gain Value a development must achieve is reduced from + 25% to + **20%** above the biodiversity unit value of the habitats lost;
 - Additionally it is recommended that the requirement that the developer complete and submit the "Delivered Net Gains for Biodiversity from" be removed from the SPD;
 - Additionally a description of what constitutes a "None-protected site", as referred to in Policy NR3, is recommended to be included.
- 3.3 In response to the representations received certain changes to the document are being proposed to address the matters raised and these are listed in **Appendix A and Appendix B**. The SPD is available to view by following this

link: <https://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/Council/Planning/The-local-plan-and-planning-policy/Supplementary-planning-documents/Downloads/Biodiversity-Development/draft-biodiversity-and-development-spd.pdf>

3.4 Subject to the proposed changes being deemed acceptable, the Committee is asked to recommend to the Cabinet that the SPD be formally approved and adopted.

Alternative Options	1. The Committee could decide to not accept any or all of the suggested changes. It could also recommend approval and adoption of the SPD without amendment.
Consultation	1. Consultation has taken place throughout the preparation of the SPD including with key stakeholders. The results of public consultation are now reported.
Financial Implications	1. None from this report.
Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	1. The SPD is amongst a suite of guidance prepared to help in the implementation of the Council's adopted Local Plan Strategy, a major element of the Council's Strategic ambitions.
Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	1. An Equalities Impact Assessment checklist exercise has been carried out and is attached at Appendix C .
Crime & Safety Issues	1. None.

	Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
A	That the SPD does not provide the necessary guidance to assist in interpreting agreed policy.	Setting up of the Task Group involving members and officers has allowed for the individual topics to be considered in detail and issues Identified. Consultation has provided those with concerns to raise them and have them considered.	Green

Background documents The Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy- adopted 17th February 2015

Relevant web links

Appendix A Biodiversity and Development Supplementary Planning Document, August 2015, -Summary of Representations

Name	Summary of The Main Issues	How those issues have been addressed
Alrewas Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments to raise on the individual sections. • Executive Summaries should be a key part of these documents providing a clear guide to the reader but we consider that the Executive Summaries, where they exist, are not in fact Executive Summaries and need to be improved considerably. 	An executive summary will be included in the final document.
Burntwood Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection as long as the policy improves the level of design and consistency of planning applications. 	No Changes Proposed.
Cannock Chase AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome some references to the AONB at various points in the documents but consider that a more consistent treatment would properly recognise the (national) importance of the AONB in terms of planning policy and decisions. • That the AONB Management Plan (2014 -19) is referred to as policy context in each of the SPDs at the appropriate point(s). • That the AONB Partnership is listed in the “Further contacts” sections of each of the SPDs. 	AONB Partnership’s contact details to be added Appendix B of the final document.
Deanslade Park Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Biodiversity & Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is designed to provide guidance on maintaining biodiversity within any proposed development. It aims to minimise fragmentation of existing habitats, incorporate conservation features into the development and to deliver a net gain for biodiversity. In order to comply with these aims, it is imperative to know how the important sites/features/species will be impacted and how these impacts, if any, can be mitigated for. These impacts may apply to sites within 	Comments are noted, no changes required.

	<p>the zone of influence of the development which may be well outside of the development boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>International and European Sites</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sites with international protection and designated under the 'Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (Habs. Regs.)' are known as Special Areas of Conservation (SAC's). As noted within the SPD, it is possible for development to have a negative impact on a SAC whilst being a significant distance from it. LDC's Local Plan Strategy (Policy NR7) in conjunction with partner LPA's, indicates that any development within a 15km radius of [Cannock Chase] SAC (nearest boundary) will have an adverse impact upon it, unless or until satisfactory avoidance and/or mitigation measures have been agreed. The development site is located within 13km of the SAC and therefore within the 15km zone of influence. • <i>National Sites</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's) are designated by Natural England and encompass the best examples of a particular habitat or populations of protected species. There is 1 SSSI partially within a 2km radius of the site designated for its population of native white clawed crayfish. Again the SPD makes the point that a development can have a negative impact on a SSSI whilst being a significant distance away from it and advises that Natural England's Risk Impact Zone GIS System should be consulted if a development is close to a SSSI. However as this site is located within the centre of Lichfield and separated from the development site by extensive housing and road infrastructure with no connectivity between 	
--	---	--

	<p>them, the development is considered to be sufficiently isolated as to have no impact upon the SSSI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>County/District Sites</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These sites are important on a regional level and support uncommon habitats/species which includes UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats and species. In Staffordshire these are termed Sites of Biological Importance (SBI's) and Biodiversity Alert Sites (BAS'S). There are 4 SBI's within 2km of the development site, the closest being 1.6 km from the site, encompassing a variety of habitats including lowland heath, grassland, wetland and ancient woodland. These sites, although not statutorily protected, are a material consideration in the planning process. • <i>Impacts on Protected Species</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The presence of a protected species is also a material consideration in determining a planning application. This is a statutory requirement and is therefore a reasonable inclusion in the SPD. • <i>Monitoring net loss</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SPD states that all development should deliver a net benefit for biodiversity Protected Species, even where there is no impact on biodiversity under the proposal. On sites with negligible impact, a net gain could simply be achieved through additional tree planting or the provision of bird boxes. Net benefits of the development are demonstrated by means of Lichfield District Councils' <i>'Delivered Net gains for Biodiversity'</i> form (Appendix A of the SPD). 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • <i>Compensation/enhancement</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Compensation is the process of providing species and/or benefits to make up for the loss of biodiversity to the development. According to the SPD, compensation schemes must produce habitats of greater biodiversity value than that which will be lost. LDC considers this to be set at 25% above the biodiversity unit value of the habitats lost. The SPD also states that the value of the habitat(s) lost to the development must be calculated before compensation can occur, a process by which the net gain in biodiversity, already evident, can be substantiated. 	
Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments at this time. 	No Changes Proposed.
Health and Safety Executive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have concluded that we have no representation to make at this stage of your local planning process. This is because there is insufficient information in the consultation document on the location and use class of sites that could be developed. In the absence of this information, the HSE is unable to give advice regarding the compatibility of future developments within the consultation zones of major hazard installations and MAHPs located in the area of your local plan. 	Comments are noted, no changes required.
Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome the production of this SPD which we believe succeeds in its objective to <i>'add further information to the policies within the Local Plan which relate to biodiversity and to aid in their interpretation and help make successful applications'</i>. • Pre-application discussions - Natural England notes the document's reference to the importance of early discussions regarding draft planning proposals and the opportunities this presents to avoid adverse impacts and maximise opportunities for protection, enhancement and creation of environmental assets 	<p>Comments are noted, reference to <i>"Cannock Chase SAC Interim guidance to mitigate the impact of new residential development"</i> to be replaced with reference to adopted document.</p> <p>All maps within the final document to be amended and their clarity improved.</p> <p>All references to Geodiveristy to be</p>

	<p>where appropriate. This approach serves to support the effective use of the 'mitigation hierarchy' as described in section 6 of the SPD₁.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannock Chase SAC - We welcome the inclusion within Appendix B of a link to your '<i>Cannock Chase SAC Interim guidance to mitigate the impact of new residential development</i>' but please note that a revised guidance has now been produced so the link is likely to need updating. • Geodiversity - is often treated as part of biodiversity and it isn't clear from the current draft of the SPD whether this is the intention. We acknowledge that geodiversity interests are often revealed within mineral extraction sites and that these are permitted through the county minerals planning authority. Nonetheless Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS) may exist within the district and we advise that this is clarified before finalising the document so that appropriate text may be included. • We note the reference to the Staffordshire County planning applications validation guidance. In order to help the Council assess submitted planning applications with potential impacts on Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) the LPA may wish to download our SSSI impact risk zones dataset. • SSSI Impact Risk Zones The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, which came into force on 15 April 2015, has removed the requirement to consult Natural England on notified consultation zones within 2 km of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (Schedule 5, v (ii) of the 2010 DMPO). 	<p>removed to aid clarity of the final documents intent.</p> <p>All typos highlighted to be corrected.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>The requirement to consult Natural England on “<i>Development in or likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest</i>” remains in place (Schedule 4, w). Natural England’s SSSI Impact Risk Zones are a GIS dataset designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help local planning authorities decide when to consult Natural England on developments <i>likely to affect a SSSI</i>. The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the gov.uk website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maps in the appendices are illegible. • 4.9 – Typo – ‘Cannock Chase SAC’ rather than Cannock Chase Heaths SAC 	
Network Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network Rail has no comments to make 	No Changes Proposed
National Farmers Union	<p>Stage A4 Compensation and Biodiversity Offsetting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offsite biodiversity offsetting is an interesting proposition for the farming community. We would be very interested to learn more about how you feel the concept would work in Lichfield District. One of our key aims would be to ensure that the contribution of the landowner is adequately valued and that the costs of maintaining the asset are fully covered by the developer. Therefore, we do not think that this element of the SPD should be adopted in advance of the production of the Biodiversity Offsetting Strategy. There is not enough information on the implementation of offsetting and no guarantee that the concept as laid out is practical or deliverable. • Biodiversity offsets formally place a value on biodiversity. However, indications from the early drafts of the National Ecosystem Assessment show that there are considerable evidence 	Comments are noted, further detail and clarification regarding Biodiversity Offsetting Schemes to be added to section “ <i>Stage 4A Compensation and Biodiversity Offsetting</i> ” in the final Document

	<p>gaps for the value of ecosystem services provided by biodiversity. Any calculation of credits would need to adopt a consistent and transparent methodology.</p> <p><u>Practical constraints</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for regulation - any offsetting scheme would inevitably need some form of regulation to ensure fair processes and facilitate brokers for transaction of monies. Some potential “brokers” are already actively vying for this role. Given the potential for farmers/landowners to undervalue the financial costs of any habitat creation or restoration agreement entered into, then a third party or broker may be essential to carry risk and ensure realistic estimates are agreed. They would also be necessary to make sure that only appropriate offset projects are targeted and agreed. Local Wildlife Trusts and partnerships have been suggested as a possible candidate for this role. However, there is a danger here that not all LWT’s be equally well placed to carry out this responsibility and a join-up with regional and national strategic plans and priorities would be essential. • Achieving perpetuity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are already examples of covenants being used to guarantee specific long-term management of land (e.g. Westcountry Rivers Trust). Given that agreements of in excess of 20/25 years are being mentioned, then this could be an attractive option for some of our members, but it’s a long-term commitment in volatile times for markets. Land tenure could also present a problem for those with tenancies interested in offsetting or with a landlord who is considering entering land into an offset agreement. • Is there sufficient demand - given the fact that this should only be 	
--	---	--

	<p>a mechanism of last resort when existing regulation and consultation have failed to reach a solution, is there sufficient demand to create a market? Defra have indicated that they don't expect this to be an exchange of large areas of land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We note that you would be using the Staffordshire and Lichfield Biodiversity Opportunity Map. However, it's still not clear whether the offsetting be a proactive process (i.e. going out and actively approaching farmers and landowners with potentially suitable candidate habitat for offsetting) or a reactive process (i.e. using what is offered onto the market or effectively banked by farmers and landowners)? Would sufficient land be available within Lichfield District? 	
Office of Rail and Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ORR has no comment to make 	No Changes Proposed
Staffordshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We support the preparation of these SPDs in providing further guidance and advice to developers on the application of policies within the Local Plan. All five of the SPDs in our opinion have been prepared in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance. As a general point it is felt that there is a need to cross reference between the different SPD's to highlight the links to potential developers and ensure that they have a full understanding of potential constraints and potential benefits. <p>The Biodiversity and Development SPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Biodiversity and Development SPD is generally a good model but there are some concerns over factual issues and wording that is unclear or misleading. Overall – reference to BS42020:2013 Biodiversity: Code of practice 	<p>Comments are noted; reference to the mitigation hierarchy to be included in the executive summary and/or section 2, Introduction in the Final Document.</p> <p>All references to Geodiveristy to be removed to aid clarity of the final documents intent.</p> <p>All suggested corrections, typo amendments and name changes to be incorporated in the Final Document.</p> <p>The naming and description of the “first impression survey” to be amended in the final document so to make clear: what it is; what it is intended to achieve; what</p>

	<p>for planning and development is recommended throughout the SPD. It is suggested that the mitigation hierarchy of avoid-minimise-mitigate-compensate-enhance should be made clear early in the SPD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definition of nature conservation in the SPD includes geological interest and natural and historic landscape character but these are not included in guidance which refers to habitats and species only in most aspects. • Section 3.0 Habitats Regulations: the reference should be to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 which overrides the 1994 Regulations and includes the provisions relating to strategic plans not included in the 1994 Regulations. Reference to The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 should state “as amended.” It is suggested that the SPD should add Protection of Badgers Act 1992 as the SPD refers to badgers. Additionally, suggest Hedgerow Regulations 1997 is added. • In relation to International and European Sites it should perhaps be made clear that other Natura 2000 sites may need to be considered in addition to those within or close to the District. E.g. air quality effects, hydrological effects, can be wide ranging. • Section 4.2 – it is recommended that ecological connectivity be given more explanation and clarity – this is an element that is frequently ignored in planning applications. • Section 4.9 - Name correction: Cannock Chase SAC does not have word “Heaths” in the title. • Section 4.10 - SACs are designated by the European Commission 	<p>information it cannot provide; and its distinctiveness from a Phase 1 habitat assessment</p>
--	--	---

	<p>not Natural England.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4.13 - SSSI name correction: Chasewater and Southern Staffordshire Coalfield Heaths SSSI. This includes the old Biddulphs Pool SSSI so that does not need to be listed separately. • Name correction: Stowe Pool and Walkmill Claypit SSSI (Walkmill Claypit section is in Cannock Chase District but part of same SSSI.) • Section 4.16 - Suggest SBI and BAS be defined by their importance level for clarity of guidance. • Section 4.24 - Suggest that the SPD refers to the Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Ecosystem Action Plans which explanatory text and to Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping referred to later in 6.27. • Table1 - It is recommended that assessment of off-site impacts should be explicitly included in guidance here and elsewhere and reference to impacts on ecological connectivity which are covered in stage A5 but not well elsewhere. • Stage A: Preparing to submit a planning application • Stage A1- Whilst it is appreciated that there is an effort to use user-friendly language but this does give rise to concerns that this will lead to misunderstandings. Reference to a “first impressions” survey is potentially misleading as the term is not used by any planning or biodiversity guidance. Perhaps rather than “first impressions” survey refer to assessment of site in regard of Validation requirements to determine what survey and assessment is required. [This] can be carried out by non-ecologists. Clarity is 	
--	--	--

	<p>essential at this stage. The SPD goes on to describe to “first impressions” survey in a way that would normally refer to Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, which is the next stage after the check against validation requirements and which must be carried out by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist, not by a developer, member of the public etc. This really needs clarification if the LPA wishes to ensure that ecology surveys received are valid. For example could a member of the public or developer decide whether bats might be using a built structure or assess whether a grassland is unimproved, semi-improved or improved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage A2 – Protected/Priority species and Habitat Surveys <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggest include standards/guidance for ecological reports covering information that should be included, limitations, author identity etc – see CIEEM Guidelines on ecological reports and BS42020. • Section 6.47 - There appears to be a typo which indicates that no translocation would be allowed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ translocation of habitats or species to sites ○ Suggested addition: ○ translocation of habitats or species to sites if this would adversely affect existing habitats of importance on or close to that site • With regard to strategic planning for biodiversity, a modification is recommended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ creation of habitats outside the District boundary unless part of a Lichfield approved strategy and/or no suitable sites can be found in the District to account for partnership projects such as Connecting Cannock Chase and the proposed NIA/Biosphere Reserve 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 6.55 – it is suggested reference to geology/geomorphology is included here. 	
Mrs Wendy Taylor (member of the public)	<p>Regarding Stage A1 6.8 which states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of developments in the Lichfield District have no significant effect on existing nature conservation features. I think this is a rather sweeping statement. A development that may appear to have no significant effect on species at a national or even district level, may well affect habitats and species that are of local importance. This may be in terms not only of importance for the wildlife itself but also as part of the bigger ecological picture by providing perhaps a different gene pool from elsewhere. Local naturalists and other members of the public who appreciate wildlife may well consider say the loss of the only local colony of Common Blue butterflies as a significant effect. <p>Regarding Stage A4 Compensation and Biodiversity Offsetting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I may be wrong but I was under the impression that since the Biodiversity Offsetting consultation closed at the end of 2013, the Government has made little progress in finalising and implementing an offsetting policy with the results of the consultation yet to be published. The decision as to how – or if – biodiversity offsetting is put into practice in England has yet to be agreed. Any offsetting policy must be informed by scientific evidence and use a consistent mechanism for calculation and evaluation based on sound ecological science, but biodiversity offsetting units have not yet been agreed nationally as far as I am aware and there is 	<p>No Changes proposed.</p> <p>The guidance within the SPD complies with current legislation and policy. Further to this it takes account of and requires applicants to adhere to all current best practice approaches to the maintenance and improvement of nature conservation features as well as biodiversity value within a development scheme.</p> <p>The SPD is to provide further information to assist developers; detailing how to adhere to national guidance and provides interpretation of local and national policies. It cannot alter or amend policy or national guidance and legislation, or create new policies.</p>

	<p>concern that the procedure could cause risks to the environment. I do not understand how LDC can propose this when no national policy has been agreed on this controversial subject.</p> <p>Regarding 6.36 which states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.36 Compensation and Irreplaceable Nature Conservation Features <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is not practically possible to compensate for the loss of some nature conservation features. Applications involving proposals to compensate for loss or damage to the following nature conservation features will be refused unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location has been demonstrated to outweigh their loss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ancient woodland ○ veteran trees ○ ancient hedgerows • These ancient parts of our natural heritage should not be available under any circumstances for development. There is no way their loss can be compensated for either by translocation or by the creation of new nature conservation habitats. Red lines should be drawn around all these features as being unavailable for development of any form. The same should apply to ancient grassland that has never seen the plough as the biodiversity on these is also irreplaceable. It is well known that we have lost 95% of our old meadows nationwide so any that remain are far too precious to destroy. Developers will become adept at proving the benefits of their proposal, especially now the national planning framework has shown that growth of the economy is all that seems to matter and so supports development over retaining 	
--	---	--

	<p>biodiversity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In my view, planning applications for SSSIs and the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation should also be refused at the outset. It is clear that large, landscape scale habitats are more likely to sustain species populations as climates change so these larger areas of biodiversity should not be reduced in size at all.	
--	--	--

Appendix B - Biodiversity and Development Supplementary Planning Document, August 2015, Additional recommended amendments

Additional recommended amendments	Summary of reasoning for amendment
Removal of requirement that the applicant complete and submit the "Delivered Net Gains for Biodiversity from"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National recognised metrics to provide this information (i.e. quantitative assessments of biodiversity value) are now available and are already being utilized by the Ecology Team within the planning system. Removal of the requirement to complete this addition form is to reduce any unnecessary burden upon applicants and so assist future development within the district.
Reduction of Biodiversity Net Gains Value from + 25% to + 20% above the biodiversity unit value of habitats lost.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is based on the Ecology Teams increased experience as to what level of net gain is both achievable and realistic for developer to provide.
Inclusion of a description (within section 4.23/4.24) of what a constitutes a "None-protected site", as referred to in Policy NR3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since adoption of the Lichfield District Local Plan the type of habitat referred to under this description has been found to be too ambiguous; clarification by developers has be requested.

equality impact assessment stage 1 quick check questionnaire



If you are planning on making a change to an existing service or policy, or launching something new, fill out this quick questionnaire to find out if you need to complete a full equality impact assessment. You can also use this form to check your current services or policies.

To find out more about the legal background to equality impact assessments, or for advice on which of your current services should be assessed, read our equality impact assessment help notes.

Section 1: About you and your service area

Your name:	Justine Lloyd
Your service area:	Spatial Policy and Delivery
Your director/line manager:	Craig Jordan
Your cabinet member:	CLlr I. Pritchard

Section 2: About your plans

Name of service/policy you are assessing:	Biodiversity and Development Supplementary Planning Document
---	--

Is it? (please delete as appropriate)

- A new policy/planned service

Who are the main users of your service/policy? (please delete any that are not appropriate)

- All residents
- Visitors to the district
- Mixture of residents and visitors
- Users of a specific service (e.g. leisure centre customers)
- Internal (employees)
- Disability specific groups
- Race specific groups
- Gender specific groups
- Religious groups
- Sexual orientation groups
- Older people
- Young people
- Other (please specify)

Please briefly describe why you are creating a new service/changing an existing service or reviewing current policy/service (where appropriate, include sources of evidence such as customer feedback):

To provide guidance to assist in the implementation of adopted Local Plan policies. Implementation of policies using the SPD will impact upon residents and visitors to the District.

1 For help or guidance contact Colin Cooke on 01543 308121 or Alison Bowen on 01543 308129 or email colin.cooke@lichfielddc.gov.uk or alison.bowen@lichfielddc.gov.uk

Section 3: Will your plans impact on any particular groups?

3a: Please fill in all boxes that apply in the table below. If any boxes don't apply, please leave blank.

Hints & tips Think about who will benefit from or be affected by your plans/policy. Will any particular group be negatively affected, or not able to use the service? For further guidance please see Section 3 of the help notes.

Impact of plans	Will your plans have a positive impact on this group? If so please explain why?	Will your plans have a negative impact? If so please explain why? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If there is a negative impact on any group(s), please complete section 4 for each group.
Groups of users		
Age ranges (indicate range/ranges)	Yes. The guidance will help people of all ages to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on biodiversity and nature conservation across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new habitats and support particular species.	No
Disability (physical, sensory or learning)	Yes. The guidance will help people whether disabled or able bodied to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on biodiversity and nature conservation across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new habitats and support particular species.	No
Gender/sex	Yes. The guidance will help people of all gender groups to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on biodiversity and nature conservation across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new habitats and support particular species.	No
Transgender/gender reassignment	Yes. The guidance will help people of all gender groups to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on biodiversity and nature conservation across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new habitats and support particular species.	No
Race (includes ethnic or national origins, colour)	Yes. The guidance will help people of all races to understand the importance	No

or nationality)	of considering the impacts of development on biodiversity and nature conservation across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new habitats and support particular species.	
Gypsies and travellers	Yes. The guidance will help gypsies and travellers to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on biodiversity and nature conservation across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new habitats and support particular species.	No
Refugees / asylum seekers	Yes. The guidance will help refugees/asylum seekers to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on biodiversity and nature conservation across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new habitats and support particular species.	No
Sexual orientation	Yes. The guidance will help people of all sexual orientations to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on biodiversity and nature conservation across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new habitats and support particular species.	No
Religion or belief (includes lack of belief)	Yes. The guidance will help people of all or no religious beliefs to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on biodiversity and nature conservation across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new habitats and support particular species.	No
Other (please specify)	None.	

3b: Further details

Please use this space to provide further details if necessary

Section 4: Can you justify and evidence, or lessen any impact?

4a: If you have identified a negative impact(s) on any group(s) please complete the below table for each affected each group. If any boxes don't apply, please leave blank. If you didn't identify any negative impact(s) on the previous page, skip to section 6.

Hints & tips Is there something you can do to reduce or alter any negative impact you have identified? *For example when we changed waste and recycling collections to kerbside collections, we offered disabled/less able people assisted collections.* Please list all the evidence you have gathered to support your decision(s) – this could include customer feedback, statistics, comparable policies, consultation results. If you don't have any evidence, please carry out appropriate studies and research to gather the evidence you need to support your decision(s). If you have no/insufficient evidence or cannot gather any, you will need to complete a full EIA. For further guidance, see Section 4 of the help notes.

Actions you need to take	We will make the following change(s) to the service/policy to reduce the negative impact. Explain the change(s) and the evidence you have to support your decision? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use section 4b below if you want to give more details.	We won't make changes as we can justify our decision and there are sound reasons behind our decision. Justify why and detail the evidence you have gathered to support your decision. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use section 4c below if you want to give more details.	There is a negative impact, and we cannot justify it and/or have no, or insufficient, evidence to support our decision. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> You will need complete a full equality impact assessment. See the help notes for more details.
Groups of users			
Age ranges (indicate range/ranges)			
Disability (physical, sensory or learning)			
Gender / sex			
Transgender / gender reassignment			
Race (includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality)			
Gypsies and travellers			
Refugees / asylum seekers			
Sexual orientation			
Religion or belief (includes lack of belief)			
Pregnancy and maternity			
Carers or the people cared for (dependants)			
Other (please specify)			

4b: Further details on changes

Please use the space below to give more details on the changes you will make, if necessary:

4c: Further details on justification

Please use the space below to give more details on the justification/evidence you have gathered, if necessary:

Section 5: Your action plan

Help notes If, as a result of this assessment, you are going to adapt your plans or policy, please include details below. Please include a quick action plan and key dates that will show how you will review your decisions and when. Please include responsibility and expected outcomes. For full guidance on how to complete this section, please refer to the help notes.

--

Section 6: Record your actions (delete as appropriate)

I have sent this to Policy and Performance for publication on the intranet and on www.lichfielddc.gov.uk	No	Yes
Date completed:		

Supplementary Planning Document – Trees and Landscape

Cllr Pritchard – Cabinet Member for Economy

Date: 16th March 2016

Agenda Item: 6

Contact Officer: Craig Jordan

Tel Number: 01543 308202

Email: craig.jordan@lichfielddc.gov.uk

Key Decision? NO

Local Ward Members ALL



**ECONOMIC GROWTH,
ENVIRONMENT AND
DEVELOPMENT**

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The Council is preparing a suite of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) to complement and help interpret the adopted Local Plan Strategy. This report covers a draft SPD concerning Trees and Landscape which has been the subject of consultation prior to approval and adoption.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee agrees to the report and recommends to Cabinet the approval and adoption of the SPD on Trees & Landscape and Development subject to modifications being made in accord with **Appendices A and B** to this report.

3. Background

- 3.1 Consultation on the Trees, Landscape and Development SPD was initially undertaken in 2014 starting on 6th February 2014 until 20th March 2014. As this SPD was the most forward of the suite of SPDs being developed a second consultation on this original draft document was undertaken 26 June 2015 until 10 August 2015. This was undertaken so that consultees could view the Trees, Landscaping and Development SPD in context with the other SPDs that were then open for consultation, as they reference and draw upon each other. A press notice was placed in the Lichfield Mercury and a press release circulated on each occasion. The document was advertised on the Council's website and local planning consultation system as well as an email being sent to all those registered on the consultations system which includes statutory consultees. The consultations resulted in 17 representations being received.

- 3.2 The main points can be summarised as follows:

- Broad support for the production of an SPD relating to trees, landscaping and development;
- Clarification of the SPD required in relation to the Council's local planning validation requirements and an identification that the SPD needs to remain flexible in order to remain relevant to any future amendments of the validation requirements;
- The inclusion of an Executive Summary;
- Expansion required regarding trees, woodland, hedgerows and the designed landscape in respect of the historic landscape and the landscape character of the district and reference to the Council's Historic Environment SPD
- Expansion required regarding trees, woodland, hedgerows and veteran trees and their importance within the district for biodiversity and as habitats of principal importance as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework 2012

- Clarification of the scope and purpose of the SPD, in that its primary function is to address existing and new trees, woodlands, hedgerows and associated habitats and features in relation to development. The SPD was not intended to give detailed guidance on other habitats or landscape features such as heathland, wetland or grassland.
- Links required to the council's Sustainable Development SPD in relation to issues raised relating to green infrastructure and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)

3.3 In response to the representations received certain changes to the document are being proposed to address the matters raised and these are listed in **Appendix A**. Additional amendments are proposed at **Appendix B**. The SPD is available to view by following this link: http://lichfielddc.objective.co.uk/portal/planning/trees_spd/treesspd?pointId=2274576#document-2274576

3.4 Subject to the proposed changes being deemed acceptable, the Committee is asked to recommend to the Cabinet that the SPD be formally approved and adopted.

Alternative Options	1. The Committee could decide to not accept any or all of the suggested changes. It could also recommend approval and adoption of the SPD without amendment.
Consultation	1. Consultation has taken place throughout the preparation of the SPD including with key stakeholders. The results of public consultation are now reported.
Financial Implications	1. None from this report.
Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	1. The SPD is amongst a suite of guidance prepared to help in the implementation of the Council's adopted Local Plan Strategy, a major element of the Council's Strategic ambitions.
Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	1. An Equalities Impact Assessment checklist has been carried out and is attached at Appendix C .
Crime & Safety Issues	1. None.

	Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
A	That the SPD does not provide the necessary guidance to assist in interpreting agreed policy.	Setting up of the Task Group involving members and officers has allowed for the individual topics to be considered in detail and issues Identified. Consultation has provided those with concerns to raise them and have them considered.	Green

Background documents The Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy- adopted 17th February 2015

Relevant web links

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

Respondent	Section number	Comment	Response
Alrewas Parish Council	-	No executive summary included	Action: Executive Summary to be added to follow that of other adopted SPDs and Introduction amended / expanded
Burntwood Town Council	-	No comments	Action : None required
Cannock Chase AONB Joint Committee	2.42	Welcomes the emphasis given to native planting and the acknowledgement of the role which heathland plays in the landscape. Requests that the AONB Management Plan (2014 -19) is referred to as policy context in each of the SPDs at the appropriate point(s) That the AONB Partnership is listed in the "Further contacts" sections of each of the SPDs	Comment noted. Action: Reference to Cannock Chase AONB, link to Cannock Chase AONB website and the AONB management plan to be added at 2.42
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	1.7	The requirement for a tree survey and accompanying plan to be submitted with a planning application will be excessive in many circumstances. A blanket requirement does not accord with government guidance that requirements for supporting documentation should be proportionate.	The requirement for a tree survey and plan to be submitted with a planning application is in accordance with the current Lichfield District Council Local Planning Validation Requirements. The validation requirements list the type of planning application that should be accompanied by a tree survey and plan. The tree survey and plan follow best practice as given in British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-Recommendations". Action: None required
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group (2014)	1.4	The requirement for a tree protection plan is excessive.	The requirement for a tree protection plan to be submitted with a planning application is in accordance with the current Lichfield District Council planning application local validation requirements. The tree protection plan follows best practice as given in British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-Recommendations". Action: None required
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group (2014)	3.18	Para 3.18 states that facilitation tree pruning and pruning for health and safety should be undertaken prior to the start of any other work on a development site. The SPD requires that all pruning works must be agreed in writing with the Council. There is	The trees to be removed as part of a development are usually agreed as part of the planning consent. Any additional tree removal beyond that agreed and any pruning of trees that are to be retained is often restricted by a condition attached to the planning consent. Written consent from the Council is required in relation to variations in the trees to be removed or to fulfil the requirements of the planning condition.

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

		no basis on which the second sentence can be justified. Pruning work will often be outside the control of the Council.	Action: Clarify para 3.18 to include reference to planning conditions.
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group (2014)	1.4	The requirement for a tree survey and plan to include off site trees within 15 m of the boundary is excessive. Trees more than 8 metres from a development site are unlikely to be affected and particularly so if small, so a requirement for mandatory documentation where trees are within 15 metres is too draconian. The requirement for such documentation in a Conservation Area, even where no trees are present is obviously unjustified. To refuse validation without such documentation does not accord with government guidance that requirements for supporting documentation should be proportionate	The requirement for information for on-site and off-site trees and sites in Conservation Areas is in accordance with the current Lichfield District Council planning application local validation requirements. Including off-site trees up to a distance of 15 m from the boundary addresses not only the potential tree root protection areas but other tree -related issues that may affect the design and layout of the development - such as excessive shading to gardens and rooms. Action: None required, in accordance with the current local planning validation requirements.
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group (2014)	1.16 - 1.17	The requirement for a Tree Constraints Plan, is excessive, particularly in relation to a shadow path which will rarely be justified.	A Tree Constraints Plan is not listed as a document required in the current Lichfield District Council planning application local validation requirements. Therefore it is given as a “recommended” document in SPD, not a mandatory document. The tree constraints plan is a useful design tool which takes into account all of the constraints that trees may bring to a site such as root and crown protection zones and excessive shading and therefore helps developers and planning officers ascertain the best layout for a site that will reduce later conflicts between the users of the site and trees. A shadow path is particularly useful when designing residential sites as it can assist in the placement of private gardens, amenity space and can show where daylight may be reduced in living spaces. The tree constraints plan follows best practice as given in British Standard 5837:2012 ‘Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-Recommendations’. Action: None required
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison		Advice regarding trees protected by a tree preservation order and trees within a conservation area in respect of permitted	Comments noted. Action: Clarify paragraph 1.27

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

Group (2014)		development is unclear	
<p>WYG on behalf of Development Securities (Lichfield) Ltd</p>	<p>1.4</p>	<p>Practical use of the document would be enhanced if it set out clearly the information the LPA would expect at the pre-application stage, validation requirements for the planning application submission and the level of detail relevant to discharge of conditions.</p>	<p>The information that the Council requires as part of a planning application is given in the Council's 'Planning Application Local Validation Requirements'. This document is reviewed, and where necessary updated, on a regular basis. Therefore applicants should refer to the edition of the Council's planning application local validation requirements that is current at the time of making their application to determine the information that the Council requires.</p> <p>The current list of local validation requirements includes several documents that are related to trees and landscaping. Therefore the SPD gives further guidance in relation to the information required by these local validation requirements.</p> <p>The documents identified as 'mandatory' in para 1.4 of the SPD relate to these requirements as current in 2015. However, consideration is given to the removal of the word 'mandatory' in the list of documents at para 1.4. This would allow for any amendments to the list of required documents in future versions of the planning application validation requirements.</p> <p>Action: Clarification and co-ordination of SPD with local planning validation requirements in consultation with Planning Development Manager.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part 1 throughout- add footnote references to the Council's 'Planning Application Local Validation Requirements' as appropriate. • Para 1.1 Add 'Local' to title 'Planning Application Local Validation Requirements' • Paras 1.4 and 2.45 Add information on Heritage Statements in respect of hedgerows in accordance with current local validation requirements and add information and guidance on historic hedgerows. • Paras 1.24-1.26 and 4.30 clarify requirements for landscaping schemes as given in the current 'Planning Application Local Validation Requirements' and added reference • Amend para 1.4 and 1.24 – 1.26 to reflect local validation requirements, the need to provide flexibility for future amendments of the validation requirements and to ensure longevity of the SPD. • Remove Table 1 '<i>Documents required with your planning application</i>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

			<p><i>or for pre-application advice.</i>’ for clarity in respect of the local planning validation requirements. This table may, however, be incorporated in a future edition of the local planning validation requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 1.25, which addresses the requirement of landscape strategies and masterplans, to be amended to include reference to SuDS provision, to include broad development locations in addition to Strategic Development Allocation sites and a definition of ‘other significant major development sites’ added for clarity.
WYG on behalf of Development Securities (Lichfield) Ltd	4.12	At present, the language of the SPD would appear to unintentionally place additional burdens upon developers that are not necessarily appropriate and seeks to impose requirements more stringent than set out by policies within the NPPF. 4.12 indicates that soft landscaping should aim to enhance the setting of heritage assets; the statutory requirement set out in national legislation is to “preserve or enhance”	<p>Referred to LDC Principal Conservation and Design Officer. They consider that there is sufficient justification within the national planning policy framework and LDC core strategy for 4.12 to remain as original. Also noted support for 4.12-4.14 from Heritage England’s consultation response.</p> <p>Action. Minor amendments as recommended by Principal Conservation and Design Officer to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.12 “soft landscaping within or close to historic buildings, gardens or conservation areas should aim to enhance <i>the heritage asset and/or its setting.</i>” • 4.13 Add “in consultation with the <i>County Archaeologist</i>” • 4.14 Add “early consultation with the Council’s <i>Conservation and Design Officer</i>”
WYG on behalf of Development Securities (Lichfield) Ltd	1.14	1.14 the SPD states: “In Conservation Areas removal of Category C trees should be avoided unless sufficient land for replacement tree planting has been reserved on the site to ensure there is no net loss of tree provision” Suggested rewording: “In Conservation Areas removal of Category C trees should be avoided unless sufficient land for replacement tree planting has been reserved on the site to ensure there is no net loss of tree provision <i>where practicable.</i> ”	<p>Core Policy 14 states ‘In conservation areas, the built form will be protected and enhanced and there should be no net loss of trees’.</p> <p>Action: None required</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>WYG on behalf of Development Securities (Lichfield) Ltd</p>	<p>2.38</p>	<p>2.38 provides a specific requirement regarding spacing distances between trees. It states that: 'In general, no breaks greater than 10m should be proposed without discussion with our Countryside Officer.' WYG is concerned that this fails to appreciate that landscaping schemes for individual sites need to take into consideration the site context (and in particular urban form) and whilst the guidance may be appropriate for a rural or suburban area, it would not necessarily be appropriate for City Centre developments, particularly where trees could interfere with underground infrastructure. Moreover if this requirement were to be imposed it could result in the excessive use of tree planters which are more difficult to maintain.</p>	<p>Para 2.38 relates to the retention of existing linear features – trees and hedgerows- rather than new planting, specifically in relation to the needs of bats and follows guidance in '<i>Habitat Management for Bats: A Guide for Land Managers, Land Owners and their Advisors</i>' Joint Nature Conservation Committee 2001.</p> <p>Action: None required, is in accordance with best practice for protected species. See also response to Staffordshire County Council regarding para 2.38 below.</p>
<p>WYG on behalf of Development Securities (Lichfield) Ltd</p>	<p>2.50</p>	<p>Para 2.50 seeks to enhance the skyline with tree planting; whilst this can create pleasant vistas in rural and suburban locations, but if this requirement is rigorously applied within the city centre it could obscure view of the spires. Suggests that 2.50 should be reworded as follows: "New development should seek to preserve and enhance the skyline views through large tree planting <i>where appropriate</i>"</p>	<p>Para 2.50 addresses the preservation and enhancement of the important skyline of Lichfield city in accordance with core policy CP 14 of the local plan. This states "the skyline of Lichfield city, characterised by the five spires emerging above the roofs and tree canopy will be protected and should inform the height, scale and layout for new developments." This demonstrates that the tree canopy cover of Lichfield city is an important feature of the city and is one of the distinctive components of the city. Many of the trees within the city centre are also part of the Conservation Area and form the setting of the historic environment. Policy CP 14 also addresses the integration of views and vistas. It is considered that tree planting and the respect of existing, and the creation of new, views and vistas are not mutually exclusive if designed creatively.</p> <p>Action: None required.</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>WYG on behalf of Development Securities (Lichfield) Ltd</p>	<p>Table 1 and 1.25</p>	<p>Validation Requirements; WYG are concerned that some of the requirements within the SPD are ambiguous in respect of the validation requirements for major applications. Table 1 suggests that a Landscape Masterplan would be required for strategic allocations and major developments, although paragraph 1.25 suggests that this 'may' be required. Clarify landscape masterplan requirements</p>	<p>Comments noted in respect of the Council's requirement for a coherent and comprehensive landscape / green infrastructure strategy as part of a master plan.</p> <p>Action: Clarify requirements in consultation with Planning Development Manager:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 1.25, which addresses the requirement of landscape strategies and masterplans, to be amended to include reference to SuDS provision, to include broad development locations in addition to Strategic Development Allocation sites and a definition added of other significant major development sites for clarity (i.e. major sites comprising 200+ dwellings or over 4 ha site area or more than 10,000 m² gross floor area). • Amend para 1.4 and 1.24-1.26 to reflect local validation requirements, the need to provide flexibility for future amendments of the validation requirements and to ensure longevity of the SPD. • Remove Table 1 '<i>Documents required with your planning application or for pre-application advice.</i>' for clarity in respect of the local planning validation requirements. This table may, however, be incorporated in a future edition of the local planning validation requirements.
<p>WYG on behalf of Development Securities (Lichfield) Ltd</p>	<p>4.4</p>	<p>Para 4.4 indicates that the Council 'may' require a number of landscape documents. The list provided has been carefully considered and therefore WYG consider that it must be possible for the Council to identify here what types of applications would need to include this information within the planning application submission. This may be a size threshold or tied to the location of the development. WYG considers that the level of information detailed at 4.31 may be appropriate to some planning applications, but not all. The Council may wish to revise the wording of this paragraph to say '...a landscaping condition should where</p>	<p>Para 4.4: LDC current Local Planning Application Validation Requirements states that all planning applications (excluding Householder, Listed Building Consent, Advertisements and change of use) or where a development affects the setting of a designated heritage asset, should be accompanied by hard and soft landscaping details. This document is reviewed, and where necessary updated, on a regular basis. Therefore applicants should refer to the edition of the Council's Planning Application Local Validation Requirements that is current at the time of making their application to determine the information that the Council requires.</p> <p>Action: Add reference to LDC Planning Application Local Validation Requirements</p> <p>Para 4.31: Relates to landscape proposals submitted with a planning application and also to those submitted to fulfil a planning condition. Details</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

		appropriate include a...'	<p>required are in accordance with, and the guidance related to, the current LDC planning application local validation requirements and policies CP14 and BE1. Therefore it is considered that an amendment to 4.31 is not required.</p> <p>Action: None required</p>
WYG on behalf of Development Securities (Lichfield) Ltd	4.55	<p>Para 4.55 states that "On larger sites we require cross sectional plans of typical street layouts including overground and underground section" WYG consider this to be an onerous validation requirement for a planning application, the Council should also consider providing a definition of what is meant by a 'larger site'.</p>	<p>'Larger sites' as per the proposed amended para 2.25 refers to Strategic Development Allocation sites and Broad Development Area sites as given in the Council's Local Plan and major sites comprising 200+ dwellings or over 4 ha site area or more than 10,000 m² gross floor area.</p> <p>Street trees and other large green infrastructure provision on such sites should be regarded as infrastructure of similar importance to highways or utility services, for example. Street trees should be provided with sufficient underground and above ground provision such that they are able to grow to their full potential, exist for their natural life span and/or the lifetime of the development, which may be a substantial period of time, in order to deliver their benefits in respect of amenity, health and climate change adaptation.</p> <p>Street trees are subjected to constraints such as hard surfaces, highway construction and often underground services nearby. Sufficient consideration therefore must be given at the planning stage to ensure all these components can be accommodated without future conflict or damage to any component. Cross sectional street scenes including an underground profile as part of the landscape strategy and masterplan for these large sites allows a realistic assessment of whether sufficient provision for the trees, and any future conflict, has been 'designed-out'.</p> <p>Policy NR4 states ' Sufficient space within development must be reserved for the planting and sustainable growth of large trees in order to retain the important tree canopy cover in conservation areas and the built environment, and to improve tree canopy cover in the district as a whole'. The concept statements for the strategic development allocations sites state that the landscape framework and planting strategy for each site should be produced as a driver for the designed layout.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify the nature of the sites where this may be applicable.

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add reference to 'Trees in Hard Landscapes: A Guide for Delivery' Trees and Design Action Group 2014 to provide further design information
<p>WYG on behalf of Development Securities (Lichfield) Ltd</p>	<p>1.24 and 4.31</p>	<p>Part 4 contains useful information in respect of the issues to be considered at the design stage. However WYG are concerned that as the SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, that the Council need to make it clear within this section that the level of detailed required would need to be proportionate to the proposals.</p> <p>The Council should also clarify that this level of detail will often be considered as part of a discharge of conditions application rather than an issue for consideration at the planning application stage. Requiring this information 'up front' would place an unnecessary burden upon developers.</p>	<p>The information that the Council requires as part of a planning application is given in the Council's Planning Application Local Validation Requirements. This document is reviewed, and where necessary updated, on a regular basis. The list of local planning validation requirements is the principal document in relation to information required as part of an application. Therefore applicants should refer to the edition of the local validation requirements that is current at the time of making their application to determine the information that the Council requires.</p> <p>With respect to landscaping, the current requirements state that all planning applications (excluding Householder, Listed Building Consent, Advertisements and change of use) or where a development affects the setting of a designated heritage asset, should be accompanied by hard and soft landscaping details. The local validation requirements also set out the information that is required with the landscaping proposal.</p> <p>In some instances the landscaping details are submitted as a condition of planning consent. The use of landscape planning conditions is noted in paragraph 1.24 and 4.31 of the SPD.</p> <p>The current list of local validation requirements includes several documents that are related to landscaping. Therefore the purpose of the SPD is to give further guidance in relation to the information required by the validation requirements and, when considered appropriate by the planning officers, any landscaping details that may be subject to a landscaping condition as part of planning consent.</p> <p>Para 4.31 of the SPD gives further information on required landscaping details and expands on some areas to give further technical guidance. Paragraph 4.30 is suitable in respect of both the information required with a planning application and the landscaping proposals that may be submitted as part of the discharge of planning conditions.</p> <p>As the local validation requirements are the principal document, and in order</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

			<p>that the SPD remains flexible to accommodate any future changes to these requirements, it is considered that further detail is unnecessary other than including clearer direction to the validation requirements.</p> <p>Action: Amend paragraph</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.24-1.26 to include reference to LDC Planning Application Local Validation Requirements. • 4.31 to include reference to LDC Planning Application Local Validation Requirements.
<p>Environment Agency (2014)</p>		<p>The Environment Agency strongly supports the development of this document because it provides additional guidance to developers, advising them of the benefits of incorporating green infrastructure within all new developments, promoting best practice.</p> <p>This SPD will support the delivery of policies HSC1: Open Space Standards, NR3: Protected Species & their Habitats, NR6: Linked Habitat Corridors & Multifunctional Green Spaces, included within the Local Plan. One recommendation relates to an amendment within Chapter 4, Landscaping Provision.</p> <p>Within paragraph 4.17 Positive for Climate Change, Sustainability and Heath and Well Being (Page 28). The Environment Agency recommends that the text be expanded to include the following wording:</p> <p>“Furthermore, consideration of appropriate tree planting and landscaping is essential on sites adjacent to or protected by flood defences. Earth embankments can become fractured and damaged via the root action of certain established vegetation. Planting strategies adjacent and on such features will</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Action: Added recommended paragraph to the SPD at 4.17 under ‘Positive for Climate Change, Sustainability and Heath and Well Being’.</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

		<p>need to be agreed with the Environment Agency to ensure the long term sustainability of communities and protection against climate change.</p> <p>Planting within 8 meters of a main river or within the floodplain may require a flood defence consent from the Environment Agency.”</p>	
Framptons	-	<p>Considering the guidance and recommendations set out in the supplementary planning document, there is nothing recommended that is unusual or beyond what is normally provided within the scope of an arboricultural baseline report, arboricultural impact assessment, arboricultural method statement and associated plans. No suggested actions</p>	Action: None required
Highway Agency (2014)	-	No comments	Action: None required

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>Historic England (West Midlands)</p>	<p>4.12 4.13 4.14</p>	<p>We support the references within the document to the need to protect and maintain existing trees within Conservation Areas, where they are part of the local distinctiveness and value of the Conservation Area. There may also be other occasions where trees are considered valuable to the significance of a heritage asset and/or its setting and this would make a useful reference within the document.</p> <p>We support the inclusion of Paragraphs 4.12, 4.13 and 4.14. A useful inclusion to paragraph 4.14 would be a reference to locally designated assets from the Council's Local List.</p>	<p>Support for paragraphs 4.12 - 4.14 noted. The principal document for the historic environment is the Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document and therefore to prevent duplication reference to this document could be included. This document gives further information on heritage assets including locally designated assets from the Council's Local List.</p> <p>Action: Paragraph 4.12 - include reference to the Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document and the council's Principal Conservation and Design Officer. Examples of historic landscape features to be added.</p>
<p>National Forest (2014)</p>		<p>The National Forest Company (NFC) strongly support the publication of this document which clearly sets out the importance of retaining trees and hedgerows within development and the need to incorporate high quality new landscaping. The NFC welcomes the aspiration to increase tree canopy cover in urban areas to 20%.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Action: none required</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>National Forest (2014)</p>		<p>Para 4.1 The National Forest Company (NFC) considers that this section should refer to the need to incorporate woodland planting as part of new development within The National Forest and make reference to our Guide for Developers and Planners which provides guidance on how this could be achieved. In addition, the NFC considers that landscaping of new development within The National Forest should aim to reflect its Forest location through significant specimen tree planting such as highway trees, trees in private gardens and parkland creation in open space. These alterations would make this section more locally relevant.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Additional information considered to be more appropriate to para 2.42, which addresses green infrastructure and open spaces, than section 4 - landscaping. Suggest the following amendments added at 2.42</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link to the National Forest's '<i>Guide for Developers and Planners</i>' added at para 2.42. • Expand para 2.42 to give further guidance on creation of green infrastructure to include the National Forest area and also reference other distinctive areas or plans related to the district such as: Forestry Commission West Midlands: West Midland Forestry Framework and West Midlands Woodland Opportunities (England) maps, Cannock Chase AONB: Management Plan 2014-2019, Central Rivers Initiative, Forest of Mercia, Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan: Ecosystem Action Plans.
<p>National Forest (2014)</p>	<p>4.31</p>	<p>The National Forest Company (NFC) considers that the landscape maintenance regime should also require details of protection from strimming and grass cutting for specimen trees proposed within grassed areas. The NFC has found that damage to newly planted trees by strimming around their base to be one of the major causes of tree losses in new developments.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Action: add protection from mower and strimmer damage for specimen trees at para 4.31 as part of a landscape maintenance proposal</p>
<p>Health and safety executive</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>No comments</p>	<p>Action: None required</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>Natural England</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Welcomes the documents reference to the importance of early discussions regarding draft planning proposals and the range of opportunities this presents to avoid adverse impacts and maximise opportunities for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protection, enhancement and creation of environmental assets where appropriate • climate change mitigation • health and well-being <p>Welcomes link to policy NR4 and advises that the SPD may be strengthened by earlier reference to the district's landscape character, especially in view of the context this offers the document as a whole.</p> <p>Recommend the SPD refers to National Character Area profiles and county landscape character documents Staffordshire county council "supplementary planning guidance-planning for landscape change"</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Action: Reference to landscape character and historic character of the district, the role of trees, hedgerows, woodland and the designed landscape within this and sources of information to be added to the introduction section of the SPD.</p>
<p>Natural England (2014)</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Biodiversity: This SPD should encourage the taking of opportunities to incorporate features which are beneficial to wildlife into final proposals for development. The Council may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to provide guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The retention, enhancement and provision of new native trees, hedgerows and woodlands have strong benefits for wildlife. This is promoted within the SPD. Detailed biodiversity recommendations, such as bird box provision, are outside the scope of the SPD.</p> <p>Action: none required</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>Natural England (2014)</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Green infrastructure: This type of SPD should, where possible, provide a clear focus in relation to Green Infrastructure (GI) provision. Where possible such provision should be incorporated into new development. Greener neighbourhoods and improved access to nature may also improve public health and quality of life and reduce environmental inequalities. Urban green spaces will provide varied ecosystem services and will contribute to coherent and resilient ecological networks. It is important to emphasise the multi-functional benefits of GI to biodiversity, amenity, recreation and health and wellbeing and the need to consider GI in urban design and demonstrate how GI and green and open spaces could link to the wider GI network and interlink with access, the landscape and biodiversity. There may be significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments. The protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils needs to be considered in all urban design plans.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Benefits of green infrastructure and multifunctional green space are included in this SPD and the council's "Sustainable Design" SPD.</p> <p>Action: Reference the council's "Sustainable Design" SPD where appropriate</p>
<p>Natural England (2014)</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Landscape enhancement: This SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment. For example, it may be appropriate to seek that, where viable, trees should be of a species capable of growth to exceed building height and managed so to do, and where mature trees are retained on site, provision is made for succession planting so that new trees will be well established by the time mature trees die.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The incorporation of ultimately large size trees is promoted within the SPD both for their value in the landscape and also for their contribution to climate change adaptation. New tree planting, species selection and location is addressed in the SPD.</p> <p>Action: none required</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>Natural England (2014)</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Lighting: The SPD should consider the impact of lighting on landscape and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council's sustainable development and historic environment supplementary planning documents are more suited to address lighting within design. The Council's Ecology team assess lighting in relation to biodiversity as part of the consideration of planning applications. This SPD directs applicants to the Ecology team in respect of lighting near hedgerows.</p> <p>Action: Para 2.41 add additional reference to Ecology team in respect of lighting near woodland.</p>
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Long-term maintenance requirements: provision for the long-term maintenance (including monitoring where appropriate with a contingency plan for e.g. tree species loss) of trees and landscaping needs to be funded for a suitable timescale and/or a management company established to have responsibility for this aspect of a development scheme.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This SPD relates to the design of new landscaping and its maintenance during the period given as part of the landscaping conditions related to each development. Details in respect of funding for long term landscape maintenance or the delivery of management e.g. by a management company, is outside the scope of this SPD. Habitat creation and management plans would, additionally, be considered by the council's ecology team. However it is accepted that attention should be drawn to these considerations within the document.</p> <p>Action: Suggest add guidance at paragraph at 4.31 <i>'You should also consider how the landscaped area will be managed after the initial establishment phase is completed, who will have the ownership of, or responsibility for, the landscaped area and how this will be funded. We recommend early discussion with the Council's Planning Officers and Greens and Open Spaces Strategy Manager.'</i></p>
<p>Network Rail (2014 and 2015)</p>	<p>4.16</p>	<p>Network Rail has a duty to provide, as far as is reasonably practical, a railway free from danger or obstruction from fallen trees. Network Rail requests therefore that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no trees are planted next to the boundary with network rail land and the operational railway in any submitted planning applications. • only evergreen shrubs are planted in such proposals • they are planted a minimum distance from the Network Rail boundary that 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Action: Insert additional paragraph at 4.16 giving guidance regarding new planting and works adjacent to network rail land and the operational railway as recommended.</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

		<p>is equal to their expected mature growth height.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where tree removal, tree stump removal, tree root removal or pruning of trees is proposed adjacent to the operational railway the applicant contacts Network Rail's Asset Protection Team with a risk assessment and method statement prior to works on site commencing. 	
Office of road and rail	-	No comments	Action taken: none required
Staffordshire County Council	-	The SPD is a good model for woodland, trees and hedgerows but fails to cover other important aspects of landscaping such as other habitat and planting types and landscape and ecological character. Either this should be addressed or the SPD renamed to reflect its real scope.	<p>The SPD addresses existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows and these elements within new soft landscaping as part of development. The scope of the SPD was not intended to include detailed advice on large-scale landscape character or other ecological habitat management/creation as these are addressed in other documents by Lichfield District Council, Staffordshire County Council and the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>Action: Retain original title. Additional detail on the scope and limitation of the SPD to be included in the proposed Executive Summary and Part 4 for clarity.</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>1.21</p>	<p>The Tree Protection Plan should be in accordance with BS 5837: 2012 showing the retained trees in relation to the final layout. It should show the position of all barriers, ground protection and any other methods to be used to protect the trees. The SPD could suggest a type of protective barrier preference.</p>	<p>Preferred type of barrier is given in Appendix B '<i>Specification for protective barrier</i>' and is the industry-standard from BS5837: 2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-Recommendations".</p> <p>Action: None required</p>
<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>1.25</p>	<p>1.25 Recommend reference to SuDS included as follows ' This is in order to ensure that the landscaping forms an integral part of the design of the development and that future detailed landscaping schemes deliver the overall vision for the site, <i>including reference to incorporation of SuDS provision into such schemes.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Action: In consultation with Planning Development Manager amend para 1.25 to include reference to SuDS provision, to include broad development locations in addition to Strategic Development Allocation sites and a definition added of other significant major development sites for clarity.</p>
<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>2.29</p>	<p>2.29 could additionally refer to distances from hedgerows of development and highways to avoid damage and future conflicts.</p>	<p>Recommended distances for hedgerows included in paragraph 2.45</p> <p>Action: None required</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>Staffordshire County Council (2014 and 2015)</p>	<p>2.36</p>	<p>2.36 could refer to ponds as well as other SuDS features and perhaps reference other landscaping types such as wetland planting including reed-beds</p>	<p>The Sustainable Development Supplementary Planning Document is the principle SPD in relation to SuDS.</p> <p>Action: Reference to reed beds to be added as an example of other vegetation that can be planted within SuDS. As the Sustainable Development Supplementary Planning Document is the principal SPD in relation to SuDS no additional amendments are proposed in order to avoid duplication.</p>
<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>2.38</p>	<p>Section 2.38 it is recommended that consideration of impacts on bats is required for gaps under 10 metres. Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) Habitat Management for Bats guidance states that gaps as small as 10m may prevent bats using hedgerows and treelines and would allow installation of a road that could form a barrier to movement. Could the specification for consultation with the Ecology Team be reduced to gaps over 5 metres?</p>	<p>Best practice guidance <i>'Habitat Management for Bats: A Guide for Land Managers, Land Owners and their Advisors'</i> Joint Nature Conservation Committee 2001 states 'Avoid fragmentation and isolation of habitats. Dividing habitats into smaller areas, or isolating them through loss of connecting features such as hedgerows, may prevent them from being used by some bats. For example, even gaps as small as 10 m may prevent bats – especially the smaller species – from using hedgerows as a route to fly between roosts and foraging areas.' SPD para 2.38 follows guidance and states</p> <p>' Linear groups of trees and hedgerows may be important navigational aids for bats. In general, no breaks greater than 10m should be proposed without discussion with our Countryside Officer.' Referred to Ecology Team</p> <p>Action taken: Ecology team advise retain 2.38 as original. Amend 'countryside' to 'ecology' officers throughout document.</p>
<p>Staffordshire County Council (2014 and 2015)</p>	<p>2.42</p>	<p>Section 2.42 gives an over-emphasis on woodland at the expense of other landscape components. Reference should be made not only to the AONB, Forest of Mercia and National Forest but to the Central Rivers Initiative, Natural England Biodiversity Opportunity Maps and Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan Ecosystem Action Plans which should also inform green infrastructure / landscape design.</p> <p>Within Section 2 Site Layout and Design: wording in s.2.42 should reflect the most up-to-date thinking about mitigation of visitor impacts on Cannock Chase SAC which is</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SPD addresses existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows and these elements within new soft landscaping as part of development. The scope of the SPD was not intended to include detailed advice on large-scale landscape character or other ecological habitat management/creation as these are addressed in other documents. However, signposts to other sources of information may be appropriate.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In consultation with planning policy officers consider removing reference to Cannock Chase SAC in heading 2.41-2.42 so that this reads 'Open Space Provision of Natural and Semi-Natural Green Space ' • Add additional information at 2.41 to give further guidance on creation of green infrastructure and to also reference distinctive

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

		<p>that alternative green space provision may not be as effective as other mitigation measures. The Cannock Chase SAC Partnership has reviewed the Footprint Ecology mitigation proposals for impact of recreational impacts on the SAC and has concluded that, due to the unique nature of the SAC, mitigation through alternative natural space provision is of limited effectiveness as the features of open landscape scale and type that draw visitors to the SAC cannot be replicated on small sites. Removal of reference to the SAC in the heading of this section is recommended.</p>	<p>areas or plans related to the district such as: Forestry Commission West Midlands: West Midland Forestry Framework and West Midlands Woodland Opportunities (England) maps, National Forest: Guide for Developers and Planners, Cannock Chase AONB: Management Plan 2014-2019 and future documents, Central Rivers Initiative, Forest of Mercia, Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan: Ecosystem Action Plans.</p>
<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>2.43- 2.48</p>	<p>Sections 2.43-2.48 do not cover other aspects of landscaping outside of woodland, trees, hedgerows and orchards. Landscape features such as heathland, meadows, geological features, ponds and wetlands should be covered or the SPD renamed to make clear that it covers woodland, trees and hedgerows only.</p>	<p>The SPD addresses existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows and these elements within new soft landscaping as part of development. The scope of the SPD was not intended to include detailed advice on large-scale landscape character or other ecological habitat management/creation as these are addressed in other documents.</p> <p>Action: Retain original title. Additional detail on the scope and limitation of the SPD to be included in the proposed Executive Summary and Part 4 for clarity. Expand introduction to include information on the role of woodland, trees, hedgerows and other related features for biodiversity.</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>4.23</p>	<p>Section 4 relates only to trees in landscaping, other planting types are not covered, except for a very brief reference in 4.23 to heathland, giving the impression that planting/habitats other than woodland and trees are possibly not favoured.</p>	<p>The SPD addresses existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows and new provision within new soft landscaping as part of development. Whilst the SPD does draw upon the wider landscape context the scope of the SPD was not intended to include detailed advice on large-scale landscape character or other ecological habitat management/creation as these are addressed in other Lichfield District Council, Staffordshire County Council and Staffordshire Wildlife Trust documents.</p> <p>Action: Additional detail on the scope and limitation of the SPD to be included in the proposed Executive Summary and part 4 for clarity.</p>
<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>4.20</p>	<p>Section 4.20 - there needs to be reference here or elsewhere in the SPD to assessment of habitats present and avoidance of tree planting on or very close to habitats of existing value, such as heathland, species-rich grassland and wetlands, which could be damaged by such planting.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Amendment considered to be more appropriate at 4.28.</p> <p>Action: Amend para 4.28 to include 'habitats of existing value'</p>
<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>4.28</p>	<p>Section 4.28 - It is suggested that this should specify that Countryside Officer advice should be taken for all large landscape/green infrastructure schemes whether close to a designated site or not.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Action: Reference to Council's Ecology team and Council's Greens and Open Spaces Strategy Manager to be added at 4.1</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>4.31</p>	<p>Section 4.31 does not refer to elements of landscaping other than trees and shrubs, e.g. seed mixes for grassland, maintenance of grassland, heathland, wetlands etc.</p>	<p>The SPD addresses existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows and these elements within new soft landscaping as part of development. Whilst the SPD does draw upon the wider landscape context the scope of the SPD was not intended to include detailed advice on large-scale landscape character or other ecological habitat management/creation as these are addressed in other Lichfield District Council, Staffordshire County Council and Staffordshire Wildlife Trust documents.</p> <p>Action: Additional detail on the scope and limitation of the SPD to be included in the proposed Executive Summary and Part 4 for clarity.</p>
<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>4.31</p>	<p>It is recommended that applicants are advised to consider long-term maintenance of landscape areas in addition to the statutory aftercare period.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This SPD relates to the design of new landscaping and its maintenance during the period given as part of the landscaping conditions related to each development. Details in respect of funding for long term landscape maintenance or the delivery of management e.g. by a management company, is outside the scope of this SPD. However it is accepted that attention should be drawn to these considerations within the document.</p> <p>Action: Add suggested paragraph at 4.31 <i>'You should also consider how the landscaped area will be managed after the initial establishment phase is completed, who will have the ownership of, or responsibility for, the landscaped area and how this will be funded. We recommend early discussion with the Council's Planning Officers and Greens and Open Spaces Strategy Manager.'</i></p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>2.11</p>	<p>Section 2.11 - Within the bullet point list, to be a sustainable development the design and layout of landscape plans must also consider the conservation and enhancement of the setting of designated heritage assets such as Listed Buildings, Scheduled monuments, Registered Parkland etc. Landscape designs should also consider potential impacts a scheme may have upon historic sightlines and vistas and potentially where a scheme can enhance historic viewpoints. Could there be signposting to the Historic Development SPD?</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand introduction to include the role of trees, woodland, hedgerows and the designed landscape as part of the historic landscape • para 2.11 add direction to 4.12-4.13 • para 4.12 add reference to Historic Environment SPD and early consultation between parties.
<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>4.2</p>	<p>Section 4.2 - The Lichfield Local Plan (Policy BE1 - High Quality Design) recognises the importance of the historic environment in defining an areas unique character. High quality landscaping can play an important role in the conservation and enhancement of an areas historic environment and in turn enhance its unique sense of place. This can be achieved through early consultation and understanding of the historic character of the area. Co-operation between historic environment specialists and landscape architects can to create an informed design. This could be particularly powerful where schemes lie within areas of high quality historic landscape character, within historic parkland or in historic urban cores. This should be recognised within the bullet point list of this section.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend introduction to include the role of trees, woodland, hedgerows and the designed landscape as part of historic landscape • Amend para 2.11 bullet point adding directing to 4.12-4.13 • Amend para 4.12 adding reference to Historic Environment SPD and recommendation for early consultation between parties

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>4.12</p>	<p>Section 4.12 - Is to be supported as is the reference in the text to the emerging Historic Environment SPD for Lichfield District. Design within the urban landscape may also be informed by the joint Historic England and Department of Transport document entitled 'Streets for All: West Midlands' and relevant Conservation Area Appraisals</p>	<p>Support noted. As the Sustainable Design and Historic Environment SPDs are the principal documents for built design no additional references are considered needed in this SPD.</p> <p>Action: None required</p>
<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	<p>2.33 2.36 4.17 4.37</p>	<p>We welcome the inclusion and reference to SuDs in section 2.33 and 2.36 and how SuDs could be used in multi-functional spaces, creating a dual function with amenity and water management. We welcome that SuDs are mentioned within climate change section 4.17 as this will strengthen our local requirements for climate change to be incorporated within drainage design and for developers to design for exceedance. We welcome 4.37 and the reference to linking SuDs with water management within landscaped areas.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Action Taken: None required</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

<p>Woodland Trust</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>We are pleased to see the Council's aspiration to achieve 20% tree canopy in urban areas. In both urban and rural areas, the Woodland Trust believes that proximity and access to woodland is a key issue linking the environment with health and other social and economic issues that are addressed by green infrastructure provision. Recognising this, the Woodland Trust has researched and developed the Woodland Access Standard (WAS_t) for local authorities to aim for, as set out in our 'Space for People' publication. The Woodland Trust Woodland Access Standard recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size - that there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round-trip) of people's homes. <p>'Space for People' shows that, whilst some 17% of people in the West Midlands benefit from an accessible woodland within walking distance (500m) of their homes, in Lichfield DC this figure is only 10%.'</p> <p>We would be pleased for 'Space for People' and the Woodland Access Standard to be used to inform this SPD in order to increase the accessible woodland resource in Lichfield.</p>	<p>The standards listed do not accord with the adopted local plan strategy policy HSC1 and the SPD cannot amend the policy. However, the evidence is noted and could be utilised in any future policy review.</p> <p>Action: None required</p>
<p>Woodland Trust</p>	<p>1.14</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.14 We are pleased to see the aspiration to achieve no net loss of tree cover in Conservation Areas. However in order to achieve the Council's 20% canopy cover aspiration we suggest that a) This should be extended to the whole District, not just Conservation Areas, and b) There should be</p>	<p>Para 1.14 relates to trees in conservation areas in accordance with policies CP 14 and BE1 and therefore predominantly in respect to the historic environment. Across the wider district there is insufficient evidence to require 2 for 1 replacement to ensure tree success, and the increase in tree canopy cover can be achieved through a variety of measures in order to achieve the objectives of CP3 -mitigating adapting to the adverse effects of climate change. This may, for example, include planning conditions addressing the</p>

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

		<p>a 'two-for-one' replacement policy for any tree removal.</p>	<p>establishment, maintenance and replacement of newly planted trees, tree preservation orders on newly planted trees or the introduction of woodland as part of open space provision. Part 4 of the SPD addresses establishment and maintenance of newly planted trees.</p> <p>Action: Add footnote reference in the introduction to Lichfield District Strategic Partnership Carbon Reduction Plan in respect to canopy cover aspiration.</p>
Woodland Trust	2.40	<p>Paragraph 2.40 We are objecting to this paragraph because it does not provide absolute protection for ancient woodland and ancient trees. It is critical that the irreplaceable semi natural habitats of ancient woodland and ancient trees are absolutely protected. It is not possible to mitigate the loss of, or replace, ancient woodland by planting a new site, or attempting translocation. With Lichfield District Council showing a below average ancient woodland resource at 1.04% of land area compared to a UK average of 2.5%, it is critical that this valuable natural resource is absolutely protected in this SPD.</p> <p>It is also important that there is no further avoidable loss of ancient trees through development pressure, mismanagement or poor practice. There is also a need for policies ensuring good management of ancient trees, the development of a succession of future ancient trees through new street tree planting and new wood pasture creation, and to raise awareness and understanding of the value and importance of ancient trees.</p> <p>We recommend that the Government amend paragraph 118 of the NPPF to state that any loss of ancient woodland should be 'wholly</p>	<p>The concerns of the respondent are noted, however some of the changes required would not accord with the current National Planning Policy Framework. Policy NR4 of the Local Plan Strategy addresses ancient woodland as follows 'In the case of ancient woodland and veteran tree(s), development will be resisted as mitigation for these unique assets cannot be achieved'. It is recognised that ancient woodland is scarce in the district and therefore additional information has been added to reinforce this.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information from the Local Plan Strategy to be added to para 2.40 • The importance of trees and woodland, including ancient woodland, for nature conservation and as habitats of principal importance to be added to the introduction of the SPD. • Reference to Natural England and Forestry Commission's standing advice for ancient woodland and veteran trees in the planning system and the Forestry Commission's assessment guide 'Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees: Assessment Guide to Potential Impacts in relation to Planning Decisions' to be added at para 2.40.

Trees, landscape and development SPD: summary of public consultation responses

		exceptional'. Until the NPPF is amended there is a clear role for Local Plans and associated documents to provide this improved level of protection and to ensure that irreplaceable habitats get the same level of protection as heritage assets enjoy under the NPPF. We would therefore like to see paragraph 2.40 read: 'Development which would result in the loss of Ancient Woodland, Aged trees or Veteran trees will not be permitted'.	
Woodland Trust	4.11	Paragraph 4.11 We are pleased to see this paragraph on tree disease.	Support noted. Action taken: none required
Woodland Trust	4.23	Paragraph 4.23 We are pleased to see this paragraph on habitat creation and enhancement. Our ecosystems are under increasing pressure from multiple factors. The Government's Forestry and Woodlands Policy Statement (Jan 2013) places resilience and climate change at the core of its objectives. Protection of irreplaceable ancient and semi-natural woodland, restoration of degraded ancient woodland plus the addition of new and diverse woodland creation to buffer and extend our depleted and fragmented habitats can all significantly help resilience. We would therefore like to see this paragraph 4.23 aspire towards creating resilient landscapes in Lichfield supported by woods and trees.	Support noted. The creation of resilient landscapes and the role of trees and woodland is promoted by the council through the production of this SPD. The SPD considers habitat linkages and refuges for animals and plants as a key part of sustainable development, however this could be made more explicit within the SPD. Much of the information given in the SPD helps to provide resilient landscapes, for example, paras 2.39-2.46 address the variety of wooded habitats, 4.6- 4.8 address diversity of species,. Action taken: Expand introduction to include information on the role of woodland, trees, hedgerows and other related features for biodiversity, including the importance of connectivity and particularly linking Habitats of Principle Importance (as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012) and reference to Local Plan Policy NR6 'Linked Habitat Corridors and Multifunctional Greenspaces'.

Consultation date is 2015 unless otherwise stated.

Appendix B: Trees, Landscaping and Development SPD – Other amendments

Section	Proposed	Reason
throughout	Add references to policy and best practice guidance published since the draft SPD was produced in 2014 e.g.: Updated National Planning Practice Guidance 'Trees in the Hard Landscape' Trees and Design Action Group 2014 British Standard 8545;2014 ' Trees; from nursery to independence in the landscape' 'Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees: Protecting them from Development' Natural England and the Forestry Commission Oct 2015	To provide relevant guidance and further information for users of the SPD
throughout	Add references to other supplementary planning documents as appropriate	To provide sources of further information produced by Lichfield District Council that may be of interest to users of the SPD and to integrate the SPD with the others that have been adopted.
2.16	Include 'historic hedgerows' in addition to 'species-rich hedgerows'	Historic hedgerows are often, but not always, species rich, the proposed amendment gives clarity. Adding 'historic hedgerows' reflects the importance of hedgerows as part of the historic landscape and also relates to hedgerows as part of the historic environment in the council's local planning validation requirements.
throughout	Amend references to UK Biodiversity Action Plan (England) (UK BAP) to include Habitats of Principal Importance in England in accordance with section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 and National Planning Policy Framework 2012	To use terminology within the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2.47	Add 'and species of principal importance' to heading	To use terminology within the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2.48	Add non-exhaustive list of types of species of principal importance that may be related to woodland and ancient trees e.g. flowering plants, invertebrate animals (e.g. insects), mosses, lichens and fungi that are associated with woodland, utilising veteran or aged trees or the land in which the trees are situated.	In order to signpost users of the SPD to principal species other than vertebrate animals i.e. birds, badgers, bats to ensure these are not overlooked/ omitted.
4.50	Add further guidance on root deflectors and barriers following recommendations in 'Trees in the Hard Landscape' Trees and Design Action Group 2014 regarding tree stability when	Update relevant guidance

	these are used.	
4.58 - 4.61 and Appendix C	Amend information relating to the adoption of open space in consultation with the council's Greens and Open Spaces Strategy Manager to reflect consultation and guidance role of LDC rather than adoption and management of new open spaces by LDC.	Reflects LDC changes in adoption and management of new open spaces provided by developments.

equality impact assessment stage 1 quick check questionnaire



If you are planning on making a change to an existing service or policy, or launching something new, fill out this quick questionnaire to find out if you need to complete a full equality impact assessment. You can also use this form to check your current services or policies.

To find out more about the legal background to equality impact assessments, or for advice on which of your current services should be assessed, read our equality impact assessment help notes.

Section 1: About you and your service area

Your name:	Portia Howe
Your service area:	Spatial Policy and Delivery
Your director/line manager:	Craig Jordan
Your cabinet member:	CLlr I. Pritchard

Section 2: About your plans

Name of service/policy you are assessing:	Trees and Landscape & Development Supplementary Planning Document
--	---

Is it? (please delete as appropriate)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A new policy/planned service

Who are the main users of your service/policy? (please delete any that are not appropriate)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All residents ▪ Visitors to the district ▪ Mixture of residents and visitors ▪ Users of a specific service (e.g. leisure centre customers) ▪ Internal (employees) ▪ Disability specific groups ▪ Race specific groups ▪ Gender specific groups ▪ Religious groups ▪ Sexual orientation groups ▪ Older people ▪ Young people ▪ Other (please specify)

Please briefly describe why you are creating a new service/changing an existing service or reviewing current policy/service (where appropriate, include sources of evidence such as customer feedback):
To provide guidance to assist in the implementation of adopted Local Plan policies. Implementation of policies using the SPD will impact upon residents and visitors to the District.

1 For help or guidance contact Colin Cooke on 01543 308121 or Alison Bowen on 01543 308129 or email colin.cooke@lichfielddc.gov.uk or alison.bowen@lichfielddc.gov.uk

Section 3: Will your plans impact on any particular groups?

3a: Please fill in all boxes that apply in the table below. If any boxes don't apply, please leave blank.

Hints & tips Think about who will benefit from or be affected by your plans/policy. Will any particular group be negatively affected, or not able to use the service? For further guidance please see Section 3 of the help notes.

Impact of plans Groups of users	Will your plans have a positive impact on this group? If so please explain why?	Will your plans have a negative impact? If so please explain why? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If there is a negative impact on any group(s), please complete section 4 for each group.
Age ranges (indicate range/ranges)	Yes. The guidance will help people of all ages to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on trees, woodland and the landscape across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new tree planting and enhanced landscape features.	No
Disability (physical, sensory or learning)	Yes. The guidance will help people whether disabled or able bodied to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on trees, woodland and the landscape across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new tree planting and enhanced landscape features.	No
Gender/sex	Yes. The guidance will help people of all gender groups to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on trees, woodland and the landscape across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new tree planting and enhanced landscape features.	No
Transgender/gender reassignment	Yes. The guidance will help people of all gender groups to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on trees, woodland and the landscape across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new tree planting and enhanced landscape features.	No

Race (includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality)	Yes. The guidance will help people of all races to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on trees, woodland and the landscape across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new tree planting and enhanced landscape features.	No
Gypsies and travellers	Yes. The guidance will help gypsies and travellers to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on trees, woodland and the landscape across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new tree planting and enhanced landscape features.	No
Refugees / asylum seekers	Yes. The guidance will help refugees/asylum seekers to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on trees, woodland and the landscape across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new tree planting and enhanced landscape features.	No
Sexual orientation	Yes. The guidance will help people of all sexual orientations to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on trees, woodland and the landscape across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new tree planting and enhanced landscape features.	No
Religion or belief (includes lack of belief)	Yes. The guidance will help people of all or no religious beliefs to understand the importance of considering the impacts of development on trees, woodland and the landscape across the District and the opportunities that exist with development proposals to create new tree planting and enhanced landscape features.	No
Other (please specify)	None.	

3b: Further details

Please use this space to provide further details if necessary

Section 4: Can you justify and evidence, or lessen any impact?

4a: If you have identified a negative impact(s) on any group(s) please complete the below table for each affected each group. If any boxes don't apply, please leave blank. If you didn't identify any negative impact(s) on the previous page, skip to section 6.

Hints & tips Is there something you can do to reduce or alter any negative impact you have identified? *For example when we changed waste and recycling collections to kerbside collections, we offered disabled/less able people assisted collections.* Please list all the evidence you have gathered to support your decision(s) – this could include customer feedback, statistics, comparable policies, consultation results. If you don't have any evidence, please carry out appropriate studies and research to gather the evidence you need to support your decision(s). If you have no/insufficient evidence or cannot gather any, you will need to complete a full EIA. For further guidance, see Section 4 of the help notes.

Actions you need to take	We will make the following change(s) to the service/policy to reduce the negative impact. Explain the change(s) and the evidence you have to support your decision? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use section 4b below if you want to give more details.	We won't make changes as we can justify our decision and there are sound reasons behind our decision. Justify why and detail the evidence you have gathered to support your decision. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use section 4c below if you want to give more details.	There is a negative impact, and we cannot justify it and/or have no, or insufficient, evidence to support our decision. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> You will need complete a full equality impact assessment. See the help notes for more details.
Groups of users			
Age ranges (indicate range/ranges)			
Disability (physical, sensory or learning)			
Gender / sex			
Transgender / gender reassignment			
Race (includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality)			
Gypsies and travellers			
Refugees / asylum seekers			
Sexual orientation			
Religion or belief (includes lack of belief)			
Pregnancy and maternity			
Carers or the people cared for (dependants)			
Other (please specify)			

4b: Further details on changes

Please use the space below to give more details on the changes you will make, if necessary:

4c: Further details on justification

Please use the space below to give more details on the justification/evidence you have gathered, if necessary:

Section 5: Your action plan

Help notes If, as a result of this assessment, you are going to adapt your plans or policy, please include details below. Please include a quick action plan and key dates that will show how you will review your decisions and when. Please include responsibility and expected outcomes. For full guidance on how to complete this section, please refer to the help notes.

--

Section 6: Record your actions (delete as appropriate)

I have sent this to Policy and Performance for publication on the intranet and on www.lichfielddc.gov.uk	No	Yes
Date completed:		

Review of the Effectiveness of the Pre-Application Charging Regime

Cabinet Member: Councillor I Pritchard

Date: 16th March 2016

Agenda Item: 7

Contact Officer: Claire Billings

Tel Number: 01543 308171

Email: Claire.billings@lichfielddc.gov.uk

Key Decision? No

Local Ward Members All Ward Members



**ECONOMIC GROWTH,
ENVIRONMENT AND
DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW
AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE**

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update Members on the effectiveness of the pre-application charging regime which is part of the Development Management process.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the effectiveness of the pre-application charging regime since it was introduced in April 2014.
- 2.2 That the Committee recommend to Planning Committee that:
- a) the current schedule of fees for pre-application charging be updated to include a further separate category (change of use of land/building for non-residential use), charged at a basic rate of £150 as set out in Appendix 1;
 - b) that all basic fee levels should remain as is, although that these fees should be subject to the addition of VAT payment, rather than be inclusive of VAT, as set out in Appendix 1;
 - c) that a further review of the basic schedule of fees be undertaken in 12 months' time.

3. Background

- 3.1 Charging for pre-application planning advice was introduced in April 2014. Prior to its introduction a report on pre-application charging and the levels of fees to be attributed thereto was considered by the Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee on the 12 March 2014 and subsequently was agreed by Planning Committee on the 31 March 2014.
- 3.2 As part of the Planning Committee's approval to introduce pre-application charging and the subsequent schedule of fees set in March 2014, it was agreed that a report would be considered by both the EGED Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Planning Committee after 12 months of its introduction. This review has unfortunately been delayed due to staffing resources within the team.
- 3.3 Pre-application charging was introduced in order to generate further income as part of the Fit for the Future Development Services review. Whilst pre-application advice is a discretionary/non-statutory service provided, it is an important part of the development management process, as it adds value to

the quality of planning application submissions, as well as encouraging the delivery of high quality and appropriate development and therefore, it was considered to be an important process to maintain as part of the planning Development Management service.

3.4 The current approved schedule of fees were devised having regard to legislation (that charges must be on a not-for-profit basis); the unit/hourly costs normally involved in dealing with pre-application enquiries, as identified by a previous PAS benchmarking exercise; the existing charges levied by other nearby LPAs; and, the actual planning application fee for the type of development. The current level of fees charged are set out in **Appendix 1** (under basic fee charged column). It was estimated based upon the proposed level of fees and the likely level of pre-application enquiries that an income of approximately £50K may be generated per annum; which took account of a potential 20% reduction in the number of pre-application enquiries received following the introduction of the charges (removal of more speculative pre-application enquiries).

3.5 Details of the number of pre-application enquiries received in the last 3 financial years and also until the end of February in the current financial and level of income generated since April 2014 is set out in the table below. This identifies that the level of fee income generated has been below what was initially projected (£50K per annum).

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16 (to 29/2/16)
No. of pre-apps	414	424	165	162
Income received	N/A	N/A	£28,958	£27,722

3.6 The split of number of pre-application enquiries compared to type of development proposal (major; minor or other/householder & adverts) is set out in the table below. Comparing the financial year prior to introduction of charging (2013/14) and the first year of its introduction (2014/15), this clearly shows that the introduction of pre-application charging did significantly reduce the number of pre-application enquiries received by the Council; some 60% fall in the number received overall.

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16 (up to 29/2/16)
Major	27	40	18	19
Minor	243	225	76	71
Householder/Advert	144	146	65	66
EIA screening/scoping	0	13	6	6
TOTAL	414	424	165	162

3.7 Although the number of pre-application enquiries received in the first year following the introduction of fees was much lower than anticipated (60% rather than 20% fall in number of enquiries), it is appreciated that already in the current financial year this number is likely to be exceeded by the end of the year, so numbers are steadily increasing. Furthermore, although the initial envisaged level of income has not been achieved, the introduction of fees has regulated the overall number and quality of pre-application enquiries received to a more manageable level for the service, with some of the costs of that service now being recouped, thereby offsetting the staff resource involved thereto.

3.8 In terms of dealing with the pre-application enquiries, the feed-back from planning case officers is that following the introduction of fees, generally speaking, applications now run smoother following

constructive pre-application advice. Also, officers seem to find that most pre-apps transpire into applications, as the pre-app charge generally puts off those off who have come up with a development proposal on a 'whim', so this avoids unnecessary, unproductive work by the service.

3.9 With regard to the operation of the pre-application service, the Council has not received any complaints about the fact that a charging regime was introduced. There appears to have been a general acceptance, that a fee is payable for the professional service and advice provided. However, there have been comments about the fact that certain categories of development (namely change of use of land/buildings to non-residential uses) can come under a pre-application fee schedule that is greater than would be the cost of the associated planning application fee in certain instances. With regard to this point, it is recommended that a further category be introduced to the pre-application fee schedule to allow for a reasonable fee level that is more accountable to the level of application fee, rather than based on floor area of a site; as is currently the case. It is recommended that this should be a fee of £150, which is commensurate with other required pre-application fees 'minor' category of developments. This is included in the current/proposed schedule of fees in Appendix 1. This should consequently attract more pre-application enquiries for this type of development proposal in the future.

3.10 Consideration has been given to the scale of fees charged, and whether this should now be increased. In view of the fact that the level of inflation has only marginally increased more recently within the last 2-year period (0.3% in January 2016), and that the introduction of the current fee levy reduced pre-application enquiries by some 60%, it is considered that the basic schedule of fees should remain as existing. However, it is to be appreciated that VAT is inclusive within the current fee schedule, yet many other Local Authorities who apply pre-application fees, VAT is stated to be exclusive/payable on top of the fees levied for pre-application advice. For example, at South Staffordshire and Solihull Councils. I therefore recommend that the current fee schedule be amended to reflect that of other local pre-application charging regimes, to state that the fees are 'exclusive of VAT' and accordingly is payable on top of the fees stated (the current VAT rate being at 20%). In view of this, it is recommended that from April 2016, subject to Planning Committee approval, the fee schedule be amended to state the fees are exclusive of VAT, and so a VAT payment is payable on top of the basic fee; to be charged at the current VAT rate at the time of application receipt. This is set out in the proposed fees schedule in Appendix 1. Also, I feel it would be appropriate to fully review the basic level of fees further 12-months' time, as recommended.

3.11 In conclusion, Members are asked to note the effectiveness of the pre-application charging regime as set out above and, recommend to Planning Committee the addition of a further separate category of charging for pre-application advice in relation to changes of use, whilst a VAT payment should be applied to all basic fees currently charged for pre-application advice. And further, it is recommend that a review of the basic level of fees charged should be undertaken in 12 months' time.

Alternative Options	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pre-application advice is not a mandatory service, therefore we could cease to provide this. However, this would impact on the quality of development proposals received and also impact on the speed to determination of planning applications as often issues can/are highlighted in the development process where pre-application engagement occurs. 2. Return to a 'free' pre-application service. Although this would impact on staff resource and remove a committed income stream identified, as within the Development Service review.
Consultation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None

Financial Implications	1. This would maintain a level of income that off-sets the cost of providing pre-application advice to developers, thereby reducing the net cost of the Development Service, ensuring tight control and management of the Council finances.
Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	1. Ensures the provision of pre-application advice to developers in bringing forward development within the District in line with the Local Plan Strategy which is relevant to all of the Council's ambitions identified in the Strategic Plan where they have a spatial element.
Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	1. None. Although the current pre-application fee schedule (to be maintained) does include exemptions for certain categories/applicants, including where it applies to development that would provide direct benefit to a disabled person.
Crime & Safety Issues	1. None.

	Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
A	Charges may continue to impact on the number of developers that seek pre-application advice, potentially meaning a lower quality of application submission and consequently more applications may need to be refused.	Regular review by managers and planning case officers.	Green

Background documents <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fit for the Future: Development Services Review 2. Economic Growth, Environment & Development (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee 12 March 2014 3. Planning Committee 31 March 2014
--

Relevant web links www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/Council/Planning/Pre-application-guidance/Pre-app-charges-and-exemptions.aspx

Appendix 1: Proposed Schedule of Fees for Pre-application Advice at Lichfield District Council

Proposed Development Type	Basic Fee Charged	Total Fee Inclusive of VAT (20%*)	Additional costs (per additional meeting) Plus VAT
Strategic Major Developments 200+ dwellings or over 4 ha site area or more than 10,000 sqm gross floor area.	£1800	£2160	£300
Major Developments (a) 50 to 199 dwellings or 2ha to 3.9ha site area or 5,000 to 9,999 sqm gross floor area	£1200	£1440	£200
Major Developments (b) 10 to 49 dwellings; sites of up to 1.9ha or 1,000 to 4,999sqm gross floor area	£600	£720	£150
Minor Developments 5 to 9 dwellings; sites of 0.5 to 0.99ha; 500 to 999sqm floor area	£300	£360	£100
Minor Developments 1 to 4 dwellings; sites up to 0.49ha; up to 499sqm	£150	£180	£50
Householder & Advertisements	£35	£42	£35
Change of use of land or buildings to a non-residential (dwelling) use.**	£150	£180	£50

Exemptions:

- Planning discussions following enforcement investigations
- Where the enquiry is made by a Local Authority or County Council
- Where the enquiry is made by a Parish or Town Council
- Where the development is for the direct benefit of a disabled person/s (and as such there would be no fee incurred to make a planning application)
- Works in respect of Tree Preservation Orders
- Works to a Listed Building or in a Conservation Area, where no planning application fee would be required.
- Advice about how to submit a planning application or a fee enquiry.

Notes:

Strategic Major Developments and Major Developments (a) - includes up to 3 meetings and notes of meetings and written response.

Major (b), Minor Developments & Change of Use (non-residential) - includes up to 2 meetings, notes of meetings and 1 written response.

Householder & Advertisements- includes 1 meeting in the Council office and 1 written response. It does not however include a site meeting/site visit. If a site meeting/visit is required the normal fee rate will be doubled.

One short follow-up clarification/query on the advice provided will be given otherwise a further pre-application query will be necessary, which would generate a further fee. If a revised/amended scheme is subsequently proposed by the same applicant/developer in relation to the site within 6 months of the initial advice, then a reduction of 25% will be made against the further request.

All above basic charges are exclusive of VAT* and all fees are non-refundable.

If specialist external advice is required to provide a response, the rates will be charged based on the fees incurred by the Council i.e. in relation to independent viability assessments or specialist agricultural advice required. Such fees are to be agreed between the two parties before specialist advice is sought.

*VAT payable at current rate (20% at time of print/March 2016). **proposed additional fee category (March 2016).

SUBMISSION TO ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE

Date: March 16th 2016

Agenda Item: 8

Contact Officer: Richard King

Telephone: 01543 308060

Local Ward Members: applicable to all wards

SUBMISSION BY CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

ACTIVITY AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2016/17

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Each year, every Directorate defines its priority issues within the Directorate Top 10. These are endorsed by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee and progress reports against these are provided to the O&S Committees biannually. However, the top 10s are by implication selective and do not cover the complete range of services delivered by each Directorate. Consequently, a set of performance indicators are also routinely reported to Members which reflect a wider range of the day to day activities that each Directorate carries out.
- 1.2 This report provides an opportunity to consult with Members regarding the proposed activity and performance indicators for the Development Services Directorate to be reported to this Committee on a biannual basis.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 Members are requested:
- To consider and comment on the proposed PI's
 - To note that reports on performance will be considered at the end of June and January meetings of the Committee

3. Background

- 3.1 At the January meeting of this Committee, Members considered a Directorate Top 10 and were advised that a proposed set of performance indicators would be produced for consideration by the Committee in March.
- 3.2 The objectives of providing the Committee with performance indicators are to enable Members:
- To monitor services which we have a legal obligation to provide or where a large number of customers are affected or matters which are of particular interest to the public eg. preparation of planning policy, determination of planning applications and results of appeals.
 - To prompt questions to be asked so that the Cabinet Member and officer team are held to account
 - To check that value for money is being provided
 - To gain a better insight and understanding of the services delivered
 - To ask for more in depth reports where concerns are raised
 - To inform the Committee's future Work Programme

3.3 Members will recall that performance indicators (PIs) have been presented to this Committee in previous years; performance reports are provided at the June and January meetings of the Committee (reflecting the full year and mid year position). These PIs have been reviewed and where relevant revised having regard to the Directorate Top 10, Service Plans and other service issues / policy or legislative changes. Subject to Members' approval, data in relation to these PIs will be collected and reported from April 2016. The proposed PIs are set out at **Appendix A**

3.4 Targets will be set for each PI having regard to previous year's performance / activity. Target setting will be undertaken in Spring once we have the complete year of data for 2015/16.

Alternative Options	Members can suggest amendments to the PIs proposed for collection and reporting or identify other areas of operational activity that they would like to see included and reported on
---------------------	--

Consultation	This report is an opportunity to consult Members
--------------	--

Financial Implications	None arising directly from this report. However, financial management is a top priority for the Council and therefore one of the PIs concerns financial performance
------------------------	---

Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	One of the priorities within the Strategic Plan is to be ' <i>A Council that is fit for the future</i> '. In order to achieve this aspiration, to check on the progress we are making towards the other three priorities and ensure that our day to day activities are delivered effectively, it is important to regularly measure and review performance.
--	--

Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	The equality, diversity and human rights implications of the top 10 issues will be considered in more detail as work is progressed on each one and equality impact assessments undertaken where needed. Overall, it is anticipated that there will be a positive impact on people with protected characteristics
---	--

Crime & Safety Issues	It is anticipated that the top 10 issues will impact positively on our duty to prevent crime and disorder within the District (Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1988).
-----------------------	---

	Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
A	Information provided to Members is too 'high level' and inadequate for robust scrutiny	The Cabinet Member, Director and Service Managers are in attendance at the O&S meeting and can elaborate on the content of the report Members can request further details or a separate report on any item referred to in the report	Green

Background documents Draft Strategic Plan 2016 – 2020 Reports to Strategic overview and Scrutiny Committee, June and November 2015
--

Relevant web links

Development Services Performance and Activity Indicators 2016/17: the Descriptors

Performance Indicator (Descriptor)	Why we need this information
1 The percentage of major planning applications determined against statutory national indicators of 60% or above.	This is a long established CLG <u>statutory return</u> and a good measure of efficiency. The development industry confirms that quicker decisions help accelerate economic growth. Failure to determine 40% of major applications can result in designation as a poor performing planning authority.
2 The percentage of minor planning applications determined against statutory national indicators of 65% or above.	This is a long established CLG <u>statutory return</u> and a good measure of efficiency. The development industry confirms that quicker decisions help accelerate economic growth.
3 The percentage of other planning applications determined against statutory national indicators of 80% or above.	This is a long established CLG <u>statutory return</u> and a good measure of efficiency. The development industry confirms that quicker decisions help accelerate economic growth.
4 The percentage of all planning appeals dismissed - 70% or above.	This is a long established CLG <u>statutory return</u> and a good measure of the quality of decision making.
5 The number of major planning decisions allowed at appeal as a percentage of all major decisions over a two year period – below 20%.	This is a <u>statutory designation criteria</u> for a poor performing planning authority. Designation would have serious financial and reputational risks for the Council, with developers having the choice to submit major applications direct to the Planning Inspectorate.
6 95% of building control applications checked within 2 weeks of receipt	This is an internal performance management measure and good indicator of efficiency and customer satisfaction when competing for business in a commercial environment.
7 Process 100% of land charges applications in 10 working days	This is an internal performance management measure and good indicator of efficiency and customer satisfaction when competing for business in a commercial environment.
8 Increase visitor numbers across the District by at least 1%	Tourism is key to a vibrant and prosperous economy and it is important that we can demonstrate that visitor numbers are increasing and helping sustain local businesses
9 Revenue spend as a percentage of the net revenue budget.	A top ten priority is to operate within the Directorate's budget and therefore spend needs to be closely monitored.
10 Reduce property vacancy rates by 1% to 8.2% in Lichfield City and by 1% to 3.6% in Burntwood	Creating a vibrant and prosperous economy is a key strand of the Council's Strategic Plan and a reduction in commercial property vacancy rates would demonstrate progress towards achieving that objective

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY REVIEW

Cabinet Member for Finance and Democracy

Date: 16 March 2016
Agenda Item: 9
Contact Officer: Richard King
Tel Number: 01543 308060
Email: richard.king@lichfielddc.gov.uk
Key Decision? NO
Local Ward Members: All Members are affected



**ECONOMIC GROWTH,
ENVIRONMENT &
DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW
& SCRUTINY)
COMMITTEE**

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 To provide Members with an update on progress made in the review of the Overview & Scrutiny function.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the progress on the review of the Overview & Scrutiny function be noted.

3. Background

- 3.1 As Members will recall the Overview & Scrutiny function was reviewed as part of the LGA Peer review in September 2014.

The key points emerging were:-

- O & S were trying to deal with too much, it needed to be selective with what topics it looked at and what value could be added, concentrating more on policy and strategy to increase the corporate capacity of the Council.
 - A regular dialogue was needed between Cabinet and O & S about strategic direction and key policy items for the Scrutiny Work Programme.
 - Experiment with different forms of scrutiny to see what works best and delivers more outcome driven task and finish work.
 - A more intelligent approach to pre-scrutiny, focussing on quality not quantity.
- 3.2 Following the review, training was provided for Members on the Overview and Scrutiny function by Ed Hammond of the Centre for Public Scrutiny. This highlighted a number of points that the Council could investigate to try and improve the Overview and Scrutiny function.
- 3.3 Some were relatively easy to address for example it was recognised at the training that there were too many items on each agenda and too much information to accompany the reports.
- 3.4 It was, therefore, proposed that fewer agenda items be submitted to each Overview and Scrutiny Committee and by focussing Overview and Scrutiny more on policy and strategy there was greater potential for it to help enhance the corporate capacity of the organisation. Triangulation meetings have been introduced to assist in ensuring the right issues are addressed at the meeting channelling the valuable council resource of Member scrutiny in the right places.

- 3.5 It was also agreed that the Council should experiment with different approaches and methods on Overview and Scrutiny and a Task Group was established comprising Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Councillors Strachan, Cox, Leytham and Awty and the Leader of the Opposition Group Councillor Mrs Woodward, to take matters forward.

Overview and Scrutiny Improvement Task Group:

- 3.6 The first meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Improvement Task Group took place on 24 November 2015.

The terms of reference for the Task Group were agreed as follows:-

- To consider ways of improving the function of Overview and Scrutiny Committee as per recommendations from the peer review
- To consider how to engage all members of Overview and Scrutiny Committees and what training would be required if needed
- To consider what topics scrutiny should focus on, when, how and what the outcome should be
- To consider the different approaches and methods of scrutiny that could be used. To ensure (1) development of outcome focussed task and finish work (2) effective value adding pre-decisions scrutiny (3) directed and forensic use of Performance and financial data (4) appropriate post decision scrutiny.

The following actions were agreed at the meeting of the Task Group: -

Provision of Information

- i. A revised template for Committee Reports be used, whereby the same template is used for both Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny Committees. This will give O & S Members the requisite information and will bring efficiencies, as it will only require Officers to write one report as opposed to two different versions on the same subject matter.
- ii. A newsletter be produced for each Overview and Scrutiny Committee or one newsletter broken down into each O & S Committee, on a quarterly basis rather than briefing papers. The revised newsletter will be produced from 1 April 2016 and should be a far more efficient way of providing information to Members that is current and relevant.
- iii. The use of web links should be encouraged and reduction in hard copy papers with reports ideally restricted to two pages of A4 with any background documentation being included as an Appendix.

Meeting Administration

- iv. Only brief presentations be given by Cabinet Members in introducing O & S reports given that Members are expected to have read the reports prior to the meeting
- v. Seating at Committee meetings to be mixed as opposed to sitting in political groups to emphasise that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee function should not be run on political lines
- vi. Also, the Chairman of O & S Committees to address Members by first names to break down any perception of formality and positioning on political lines, giving more credence to the Committee working together as one entity
- vii. The forward plan and work programme be placed at the start of agendas to recognise their importance and the need for Members to shape their own work programmes

- viii. Where a report has been considered at Overview and Scrutiny Committee that will be considered subsequently by Cabinet, the Committee to nominate a Member from the O & S Committee to attend the Cabinet meeting to observe proceedings.
- ix. Triangulation meetings to continue between Cabinet Members and Chair and Vice Chairs of each Overview and Scrutiny Committee to look at issues within a Cabinet Member's area that would be coming forward in future months so that O & S Chairs and Vice Chairs could request a matter to be considered at Overview and Scrutiny Committee if felt appropriate
- x. That the Overview and Scrutiny Improvement Task Group visit other authorities who are considered to be good practitioners of Overview and Scrutiny to establish whether any improvements could be made to the Council's current arrangements. This will then help us to define clearly what the Overview & Scrutiny function will provide in Lichfield and help inform any structural changes that will facilitate our revised approach.

Alternative Options	1. There are a number of alternative methods for operating the Overview & Scrutiny function. Through the Peer Review and the training provided by the Centre for Public Scrutiny, they have advocated trying a number of alternative actions to determine which suits the Overview & Scrutiny function best at Lichfield
----------------------------	--

Consultation	1. Meetings of the Overview & Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group and the Overview & Scrutiny Improvement Task Group have helped inform the review to date. We will be visiting other authorities to view how they operate the Overview & Scrutiny function.
---------------------	---

Financial Implications	1. At this stage it is not possible to forecast any financial implications of the review but if a revised structure is put in place, this may have financial implications. 2. The use of electronic links rather than producing hard copy appendices will also save the authority money.
-------------------------------	---

Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	1. In order that the Council is Fit for the Future, it is vital that the Overview & Scrutiny function operates effectively and adds to the Corporate capacity of the Council.
---	---

Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	1. At this stage there are no equality, diversity and human rights implications arising out of the review.
--	--

Crime & Safety Issues	1. None directly arising from this report.
----------------------------------	--

	Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
A	That the Overview & Scrutiny function is not operating effectively.	Ensuring that Members are fully engaged in the review from the Overview & Scrutiny process to add to the corporate capacity of the Council .	Green

Background documents

Relevant web links