

# Public Document Pack

Your ref  
Our ref  
Ask for Mark Hooper  
Email mark.hooper@lichfielddc.gov.uk



District Council House, Frog Lane  
Lichfield, Staffordshire WS136YU

Customer Services 01543 308000  
Direct Line 01543 308064

12 November 2018

Dear Sir/Madam

## **CABINET SUPPLEMENT – APPENDIX D (PART 1)**

Please find attached supplement papers for Cabinet on **TUESDAY 20 NOVEMBER, 2018 at 6.00 PM IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM** District Council House, Lichfield.

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

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Neil Turner'.

Neil Turner BSc (Hons) MSc  
**Director of Transformation & Resources**

## **SUPPLEMENT**

3. Submission of Local Plan Allocations Document for Independent Examination to the Secretary of State – **Appendix D (Part 1)**



[www.lichfielddc.gov.uk](http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk)



[/lichfielddc](https://www.facebook.com/lichfielddc)



[lichfield\\_dc](https://twitter.com/lichfield_dc)



MyStaffs App

This page is intentionally left blank

# **LICHFIELD DISTRICT COUNCIL**



## **LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS FOCUSED CHANGES MAIN MODIFICATIONS CONSULTATION SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL 2018**

## Contents

1 Introduction .....	5
Background .....	5
Delivering Sustainable Development.....	6
Strategic Environmental Assessment .....	6
Sustainability Appraisal.....	6
The Combined Process.....	7
Habitat Regulations Assessment.....	7
Purpose of this Report .....	7
Report Structure .....	7
Meeting the requirements of the SEA Directive.....	7
Table 1 Questions that must be answered (sequentially) within the SA Report.....	7
Difficulties in carrying out the SA.....	8
2 What is the sustainability context and the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal? .....	9
Introduction .....	9
Consultation on the scope .....	10
Who has carried out the Sustainability Appraisal.....	11
What is the plan seeking to achieve? .....	11
The Development Plan Process .....	12
Local Plan Strategy Vision .....	12
Local Plan Strategy Objectives .....	12
The Local Plan Allocations.....	14
What is the plan not trying to achieve?.....	15
Habitats Regulation Assessment.....	15
What is the sustainability context?.....	15
International: .....	16
National:.....	16
Regional: .....	17
Local: .....	18
What is the sustainability baseline? .....	19
How would the baseline evolve without the plan? .....	19
What are the key issues that should be a focus of the appraisal? .....	20
Population Trends.....	20
Social and Community Issues.....	20
Health Inequalities .....	21

Deprivation .....	21
Crime.....	21
Built and Natural Environment .....	22
Environmental Issues .....	22
Energy Usage.....	23
Transport.....	23
Economy.....	24
Minerals and Waste .....	24
The Sustainability Assessment Framework .....	24
Table 2 Sustainability Framework.....	25
3 What has the plan/making/SA involved up to this point?.....	31
Introduction .....	31
General Methodology Housing Sites .....	31
Table 3 Preferred Options Housing Sites .....	32
General Methodology Employment Sites.....	34
Table 4 Preferred Options Employment Sites.....	34
General Methodology Gypsy and Traveller Sites.....	35
Table 5 Preferred Options Gypsy and Traveller Sites .....	35
General Methodology Saved Policies .....	35
Reasons for selecting preferred alternatives.....	36
4 What were the appraisal findings at Publication stage? .....	36
Methodology.....	36
Table 8 Scoring Mechanism .....	37
Table 9 Example Scoring Table.....	37
Summary of Findings.....	37
Assessment of Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects.....	37
Summary of Cumulative Effects.....	38
Chart 1: To promote biodiversity protection, enhancements and management of species and habitats. ....	38
Chart 2: To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/geological assets and landscape character of the district. ....	39
Chart 3: Seek and improve air soil and water quality.....	40
Chart 4: Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth.....	40
Chart 5: To provide affordable homes that meet local need. ....	41
Chart 6: To maximise the use of previously developed land/buildings and the efficient use of land. ....	41

Chart 7: To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change.....	42
Summary of Cumulative Effects.....	42
Interaction with other relevant plans and programmes .....	43
Inter relationships.....	43
Table 10 Compatibility matrix of sustainability appraisal objectives .....	43
Duration .....	44
Table 11 Durational Effects.....	44
Mitigation.....	45
Overall Conclusions.....	46
5What are the next steps (including monitoring)?.....	47
What happens next.....	47
Local Plan Allocations Sustainability Appraisal Appendices Contents.....	48

# 1 Introduction

## Background

This document is called a Sustainability Appraisal Report. It is the key output of the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) processes. It presents information on the social, environmental and economic effects of implementing Lichfield District Local Plan Part 2, Local Plan Allocations (hereafter referred as the LPA) and the appraisal methodology adopted to identify these effects.

This report has been produced to meet the reporting requirements of both the Strategic Environmental Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal processes and will be updated should there be any changes to the LPA as it moves towards adoption.

The Draft LPA had been subject to two Regulation 19 consultations. The first took place between 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017 and the 12<sup>th</sup> May 2017. Approximately 5000 representation were received in the response to the consultation. This was followed by consultation on the Draft LPA Focused Changes document (Regulation 19) consultation which took place between the 8<sup>th</sup> January 2018 and the 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018. Just under 300 representation were received in the response to the consultation.

Between the two Regulation 19 consultations there were two significant factors that altered the planning landscape for Lichfield District and the context of the LPA. The first was receipt of three appeals from the Secretary of State, one of these appeal decisions for 750 dwellings at Land at Watery Lane was approved despite not being in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy. The second factor relates to the Government's consultation on the Housing White Paper which inter alia seeks to clarify the national policy position associated with Green Belt. The consultation documents were both subject to sustainability assessment.

The Local Plan Allocations 2008-2029 Focused Changes document included all required accompanying documentation (including a Sustainability Appraisal) and was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate 31<sup>st</sup> May 2018. A schedule of proposed Modifications (March 2018, Examination Core Document Reference CD1-3) was part of the submission. Proposed Modifications M3 and M4 was considered within the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. The subsequent updates to the submitted Sustainability Appraisal have been clearly listed within the submitted schedule of changes to local plan Allocation supporting documents (March 2018, Examination Core Documents Reference CD1-4).

The LPA was subject to Examination in Public (EIP). Hearing sessions opened on the 4<sup>th</sup> September and took place over a two week period. Following the hearing sessions, the Inspector provided the district council with suggested Main Modifications. The council are now required to consult on these Main Modifications

A total of seven Main Modifications have been developed and they can be found in full on the district council's website. Following assessment of the proposals it is considered that two suggested Main Modifications require inclusion within the Sustainability Appraisal. Proposed amendments to existing policy EMP1 Protection of Employment land (MM7) and the inclusion of a new policy Local Plan Review (MM1) are both considered to require assessment.

Therefore this report considers Main Modifications (MM1 and MM7) in the context of a Sustainability Appraisal. Further it includes such assessments within the submitted Sustainability Appraisal that accompanied the LPA through examination which has resulted in a Main Modification version of the Sustainability Appraisal.

## Delivering Sustainable Development

In producing the Local Plan Lichfield District is committed to the promotion of sustainable development. The Bruntland Report released by the World Commission on the Environment and Development defined sustainable development as:

“Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

- The key priorities for delivering sustainable development are set out in the UK Government’s Sustainable Development Strategy (securing the Future) published in March 2005. These are:
  - Sustainable Consumption and Production
  - Sustainable Communities
  - Natural Resource Protection and Environmental Enhancement
  - Climate Change and Energy

The concept of sustainability lies at the heart of the Planning Process. The National Planning Policy Framework states that ‘At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking’. In order to ensure that the LPA is ‘sustainable’ we are required to carry out two distinct, but complementary processes. These processes are called Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA). These two processes are considered in more detail below.

## Strategic Environmental Assessment

The European Directive 2001/42/EC enacted in England under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004) requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be completed on all parts of the LDF with the exception of the Local Development Scheme (LDS), and Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

The purpose of Strategic Environmental Assessment is to “provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to promoting sustainable development,” (2001/42/EC Article 1). Put simply the SEA process requires that in preparing the Local Plan we consider its likely effects on a broad range of issues such as *biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage and landscape* (2001/42/EC annex 1) and determine whether negative effects of implementing the Local Plan can be improved and positive effects enhanced.

By ensuring that Local Planning Authorities consider these issues the SEA Directive seeks to ensure that environmental considerations are fully integrated into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes which are likely to have a significant effect on the environment.

## Sustainability Appraisal

Whilst SEA focuses upon environmental issues, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) widens the approach to include social and economic issues. The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal is to ensure that the principles of sustainable development are taken fully into account when preparing the Local Development Framework. In preparing all Local Development Documents that will be included within the Local Development Framework Section 19 (5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires that we:



- Carry out an appraisal of the sustainability of the proposals in each documents
- Prepare a report of the findings of the appraisal

### The Combined Process

In England, the requirements for Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment have been integrated into a combined 'Sustainability Appraisal'. This combined process is designed to extend the ambit of rigour of the SEA process to include other pillars of sustainability, namely social and economic assessment.

The combined Sustainability Appraisal process seeks to ensure that all relevant Local Development Framework Documents are subject to appraisal before they are adopted in order that the environmental social and economic effects of each plan can be adequately tested and modified prior to adoption.

### Habitat Regulations Assessment

The Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Flora and Fauna- the Habitats Directive provides legal protection for habitats and species of European importance. Article 2 of the Directive requires the maintenance and/or restoration of habitats and species of interest to the EU in a favourable condition. This is implemented through a network of protected areas referred to as Natura 2000 sites.

Articles 6 (3) and 6(4) of the Habitats Directive require an Appropriate Assessment for plans and projects likely to have a significant effect on a European site. The requirement for HRA in the UK is set down in the Conservation (Natural Habitats 7c) Regulations, 1994 in England and Wales, amended in 2007 and is consolidated into the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (SI No. 201/490).

### Purpose of this Report

This report sets out the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal of Lichfield District Council (the LPA). It presents information on the social, environmental and economic effects of implementing the Plan and the appraisal methodology adopted to identify these effects.

### Report Structure

This report has been structured in four sections to directly reflect the four SA questions illustrated over in Table 1.

### Meeting the requirements of the SEA Directive

The following checklist is designed to signpost the requirements of the SEA Directive through references to specific parts of the SA report, or other documents, thus demonstrating how the SA has incorporated SEA.

Table 1 Questions that must be answered (sequentially) within the SA Report

SA Question	SA Sub - Question	Corresponding Requirement
What is the scope of the SA?	What is the Plan seeking to achieve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An outline of the contents and main objectives of the plan.</li> </ul>
	What is the sustainability context?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relationship of the plan with other relevant plans and programmes</li> <li>The environmental protection objectives, established at international or national level, relevant to the plan.</li> </ul>
	What is the baseline at the current time?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment.</li> <li>The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.</li> </ul>
	How would the baseline evolve without the plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The likely evolution of the current state of the environment without implementation of the plan.</li> </ul>
	What are the key issues that should be a focus of the SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any existing environment problems which are relevant to the plan including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance.</li> </ul>
What has the plan-making/Sustainability Appraisal involved up to this point?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with (and thus an explanation of why the alternatives dealt with are 'reasonable').</li> <li>The Likely significant effects on the environment associated with alternatives/an outline of the reasons for selecting preferred alternatives/a description of how environmental objectives and considerations are reflected in the Plan.</li> </ul>
What are the appraisal finding's at this current stage?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The likely significant effects on the environment associated with the Plan.</li> <li>The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the Plan</li> </ul>
What happens next (including monitoring)?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring.</li> </ul>

### Difficulties in carrying out the SA

There is a general requirement of the SEA/SA that a section is included which sets out the difficulties encountered in undertaking the assessment. The main difficulties identified in this SA are discussed below:

**Data:** A common problem affecting the SA process is the availability and reliability of data. Although data has been collected to illustrate a number of conditions and trends relevant to the SA of the LPA,

some data sets are more useful than others, and some data sets are known to be old, incomplete. In some cases, no data is available. It is therefore almost impossible to quantify effects with total certainty, but this has been done where possible.

**Differing level of detail:** This is particularly relevant to the appraisal of sites and housing development options, some of which have secured planning permission and have a greater level of detail available, for example ecology reports. It is therefore possible to predict likely positive or negative impacts at a detailed level. For others sites limited/no detailed information is available and therefore it is not possible completely ascertain if positive or negative effects could result.

**Assumptions:** It is important to note that a number of assumptions have underpinned all of the SA indicators relating to site assessments. These assumptions introduced an element of uncertainty about the likely effect of these options/scenarios if implemented. In particular the impact on climate change and the type of employment opportunities that might be created both affect the nature of impacts that might result, but are somewhat uncertain.

**Significance:** There are very few agreed sustainability thresholds or constraints, as little work has been done in the UK on this issue, although the idea of 'living within environmental limits' is increasingly being operationalised. Because of this, it is not always possible to assess the significance of any impacts with certainty. However, wherever possible the prediction and evaluation of effects utilises relevant accepted standards, regulations and thresholds e.g. the amount of priority habitat created or the number of Grade II Listed Buildings considered to be at risk. In many cases it is the scale of the impact on these standards, regulations and thresholds and the geographical extent which determine the significance of the effects.

The Sustainability Appraisal which accompanied the Local Plan Strategy required revisiting due to the changed planning landscape and updates in baseline information. This has resulted in an amended set of Sustainability Objectives being developed. To ensure continuity a summary of the historic and current objectives has been created (Appendix A:Amendments to SA Framework) and where possible indicators identified to monitor significant effect(s) will be retained to ensure effective monitoring and coordinated response to the process of identifying and addressing adverse effects.

Despite these limitations and uncertainties, it is still possible to draw conclusions about the overall effects that will result from the implementation of the LPA.

## 2 What is the sustainability context and the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal?

### Introduction

This chapter outlines the context and scope of the SA. The requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 were outlined within Chapter 1. Of the identified requirements, this section seeks to answer the questions below.

SA Question Answered	Corresponding Requirements (The report must include)
What is the Plan seeking to achieve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>An outline of the contents and objectives of the plan.</li></ul>
What is the sustainability context?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The relationship of the plan with other relevant plans and programmes.</li></ul>

SA Question Answered	Corresponding Requirements (The report must include)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environmental protection objectives, established at international or national level, relevant to the plan.</li> </ul>
What is the sustainability baseline?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment.</li> <li>The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.</li> </ul>
How would the baseline evolve without the Plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The likely evolution of the current state of the environment without implementation of the plan.</li> </ul>
What are the key issues that should be a focus of the SA?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance.</li> </ul>

### Consultation on the scope

In addition to internal consultation and involvement, there is a specific requirement for engagement with statutory consultation bodies and public consultees at certain stages of the combined Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Processes. These requirements are set out in the SEA Regulations.

In determining the 'scope' of the Sustainability Appraisal (the level of detail and information to be used to appraise the plan options), the SEA regulations requires that the three statutory environmental consultation bodies should be consulted for a period of five weeks. We consulted the following three organisations on a complete copy of the Scoping Report via e mail for a five week period commencing in August 2016:

- Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Natural England

In addition Government guidance recommends that other community groups and social and economic bodies should be consulted, as the planning authority considers appropriate. As such the authority has alerted a number of additional organisations to the publication of the scoping report through e mail. These were;

- Birmingham City Council
- Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council
- South Derbyshire Borough Council
- Derby City Council
- Derbyshire County Council
- Wolverhampton Metropolitan Borough Council
- Redditch Borough Council
- Bromsgrove Borough Council
- Worcestershire County Council
- Stoke City Council

- South Staffs Borough Council
- Staff Moorlands Council
- Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Nature Beauty
- Stafford Borough Council
- Newcastle Borough Council
- Stoke and Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership
- Greater Birmingham Local Enterprise Partnership
- Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
- North West Leicestershire District Council
- East Staffordshire District Council
- Tamworth Borough Council
- Wyre Forest District Council
- Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council
- Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council
- Staffordshire County Council
- Warwickshire County Council
- North Warwickshire Borough Council

Parish Councils were also informed of where and how they could view and comment on the Scoping Report. Whilst a full public consultation was not required at this stage of the Sustainability Appraisal process, we did published the Scoping Report on the Council's website.

Comments submitted regarding the 'scope' of the Sustainability Appraisal and the amendments made to the information set out in the Scoping Report following this stage of consultation are recorded at Appendix B. These amendments were reported to the Council's Growth Environment & Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee in December 2016.

### Who has carried out the Sustainability Appraisal

Lichfield District Council Spatial Policy and Delivery Team has undertaken the Sustainability Appraisal. We have sought to undertake the appraisal 'in-house' in order to ensure that the results are fully integrated with the preparation of the LPA. The appraisal has also been informed through liaison with Staffordshire County Council.

### What is the plan seeking to achieve?

The SA Report must include

- An outline of the contents and objectives of the plan

## The Development Plan Process

The Planning system provides a framework for managing the development and use of land. A key element of this system is the preparation of development plans, which establish where and what type of development might take place, and provides the basis for the consideration of planning applications.

The Local Plan Strategy was adopted by resolution of Full Council on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2015, the LPA complements the Strategy. The 'Strategy' and 'Allocations' should be read in conjunction and are both Development Plan Document produced under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) to help shape the way in which the physical, economic, social and environmental characteristics of Lichfield District will change between 2008 and 2029. The LPA together with the Local Plan Strategy (part 1) will, once adopted, replace the existing Lichfield District Local Plan 1998.

## Local Plan Strategy Vision

The vision for Lichfield District is set out in the Local Plan Strategy. As a sister document of the Local Plan Strategy the LPA will also seek to deliver the same vision, this is set out below.

### **Vision for the District**

By 2029, residents of the District will continue to be proud of their community, experiencing a strong sense of local identity, of safety and of belonging. Everyone will take pride in the District's history, its culture, its well cared for built and natural environment, its commitment to addressing issues of climate change, and the range of facilities that it offers. Our residents will have opportunities to keep fit and healthy, and will not be socially isolated. People will be able to access quality homes, local employment, and provision for skills and training which suits their aspirations and personal circumstances. Those who visit the District will experience the range of opportunities and assets in which its residents take pride, will be encouraged to stay for longer and will wish to return and promote the area to others. The need to travel by car will be reduced through improvements to public transport, walkways, cycle routes and the canal network. New sustainably located development, and improvements to existing communities will have a role in meeting the needs of Lichfield District and will have regard to the needs arising within Rugeley and Tamworth. Such development, coupled with associated infrastructure provision will also address improvements to education, skills, training, health and incomes, leading to reduced levels of deprivation. The natural environment within the urban and suburban areas and within the wider countryside and varied landscape areas will be conserved and enhanced, and locally important green spaces and corridors will be secured to meet recreational and health needs. Sustainable development will also help protect the biodiversity, cultural and amenity value of the countryside and will minimise use of scarce natural and historic resources, contributing to mitigating and adapting to the adverse effects of climate change.

## Local Plan Strategy Objectives

The LPA shares the same Strategic Objectives as the Local Plan Strategy. The following Local Plan strategic priorities outline delivery requirements to achieve the Vision and address the key issues that have been identified in the District. The Strategic Priorities give direction to the emerging LPA.

### **Strategic Priority 1: Sustainable Communities**

To consolidate the sustainability of the existing urban settlements of Lichfield and Burntwood as the District's principal service centres, together with key rural settlements and to ensure that the

development of new homes contribute to the creation of balanced and sustainable communities by being located in appropriate settlements and by containing or contributing towards a mix of land uses, facilities and infrastructure appropriate to their location.

#### **Strategic Priority 2: Rural Communities**

To develop and maintain more sustainable rural communities through locally relevant employment and housing development and improvements to public transport facilities and access to an improved range of services, whilst protecting the character of our rural settlements.

#### **Strategic Priority 3: Climate Change**

To create a District where development meets the needs of our communities whilst minimising its impact on the environment and helps the District to mitigate and adapt to the adverse effects of climate change.

#### **Strategic Priority 4: Infrastructure**

To provide the necessary infrastructure to support new and existing communities, including regeneration initiatives in those existing communities where the need for improvements to social, community and environmental infrastructure have been identified, in particular within north Lichfield, Burntwood, Fazeley and Armitage with Handsacre.

#### **Strategic Priority 5: Sustainable Transport**

To reduce the need for people to travel by directing most growth towards existing sustainable urban and rural settlements and by increasing the opportunities for travel using sustainable forms of transport by securing improvements to public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure.

#### **Strategic Priority 6: Meeting Housing Needs**

To provide an appropriate mix of market, specialist and affordable homes that are well designed and meet the needs of the residents of Lichfield District. Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy 2015. To promote economic prosperity by supporting measures that enable the local economy to adapt to changing economic circumstances and to make the most of newly arising economic opportunities.

#### **Strategic Priority 7: Economic Prosperity**

To ensure that employment opportunities within the District are created through the development of new enterprise and the support and diversification of existing businesses, to meet the identified needs of local people.

#### **Strategic Priority 8: Employment Opportunities**

To create a prestigious strategic city centre serving Lichfield City and beyond, an enlarged town centre at Burntwood and a vibrant network of district and local centres that stimulate economic activity, enhance the public realm and provide residents' needs at accessible locations.

#### **Strategic Priority 9: Centres**

To create a prestigious strategic city centre serving Lichfield City and beyond, an enlarged town centre at Burntwood and a vibrant network of district and local centres that stimulate economic activity, enhance the public realm and provide residents' needs at accessible locations.

#### **Strategic Priority 10: Tourism**

To increase the attraction of Lichfield District as a tourist destination through supporting and promoting the growth of existing tourist facilities, the provision of a greater variety of accommodation, the development of new attractions appropriate in scale and character to their locations and the enhancement of existing attractions.

#### **Strategic Priority 11: Healthy & Safe Lifestyles**

To create an environment that promotes and supports healthy choices. To improve outdoor and indoor leisure and cultural facilities available to those that live and work in and visit the District and to ensure a high standard of community safety, promoting healthier living and reducing inequalities in health and well-being.

#### **Strategic Priority 12: Countryside Character**

To protect and enhance the quality and character of the countryside, its landscape and villages by ensuring that development which takes place to meet identified rural development needs contributes positively to countryside character through enhancements to the local environment and preserves the openness of the Green Belt.

#### **Strategic Priority 13: Natural Resources**

To protect and enhance and expand the quality and diversity of the natural environment within and outside urban areas and help realise the positive contributions which can be made to address climate change.

#### **Strategic Priority 14: Built Environment**

To protect and enhance the District's built environment and heritage assets (including Lichfield Cathedral), its historic environment and local distinctiveness, ensuring an appropriate balance between built development and open space, protecting the character of residential areas, protecting existing open spaces and improving the quality of and accessibility of open space and semi-natural greenspaces.

#### **Strategic Priority 15: High Quality Development**

To deliver high quality development which focus residential, community and commercial facilities within the most sustainable locations whilst protecting and enhancing the quality and character of the existing built and natural environment.

#### **The Local Plan Allocations**

The LPA supplements and provides additional detail concerning how development will be managed in Lichfield District up to 2029

- Land Allocations associated with meeting the growth requirements set out in the Local Plan Strategy (2015) including:
  - Determining remaining housing land requirements to deliver the overall 10,030 homes to 2029 in line with the adopted spatial strategy, including allocations of sites with the Broad Development Location (BDL) to the north of Tamworth, for housing in rural areas and the 'Key Rural' Settlements (including Green Belt release);
  - Consideration of 'infill' boundaries for Green Belt villages (as set out in Core Policy 1);
  - Sites to meet the identified Gypsy and Traveller requirements;



- Land allocations to meet the Employment Land requirements, including the identification of primary and secondary retail areas for Lichfield City Centre;
- A review of any remaining Local Plan (1998) Saved policies;
- Consider Green Belt boundaries including the integration of the developed area of the former St Matthews into Burntwood and development needs beyond the plan period; and
- Consider any issues arising through 'Made' and emerging Neighbourhood Plans where communities have sought the support of Lichfield District Council to progress with matters outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.

### What is the plan not trying to achieve?

The LPA supports the Local Plan Strategy and helps to implement its vision and policies. While it is strategic in nature because it will shape the development of areas in the future, it does not set a vision for the District or assess and determine the development needs of the District. This work has already been carried out and established by the adopted Local Plan Strategy. The key purpose of the LPA is therefore to deliver the residual development identified by the Local Plan Strategy. It seeks to do this by allocating sufficient sites which present the most sustainable opportunities for development within the District.

### Habitats Regulation Assessment

A full HRA screening analysis was undertaken on the Local Plan Strategy (2015) including considering the effects of the spatial strategy.

There is one international and European statutory nature site within the Lichfield District.

- River Mease SAC.

Two other international and European SAC's are within the vicinity of the District and may need to be taken into consideration. These are

- Cannock Chase SAC
- Cannock Extension Canal SAC

The screening assessment of the Local Plan Strategy identified significant adverse effects on these European sites and an appropriate assessment was completed, mitigation packages have been identified and are currently being implemented. The LPA will be developed in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy (2015). It is therefore considered that accepted mitigation measures are sufficient to support the LPA documents. A Habitat Regulation Assessment accompanies the LPA.

### What is the sustainability context?

The SA Report must include

- The relationship of the plan with other relevant plans and programmes.
- The environmental protection objectives established at international or national level relevant to the plan.

A fundamental part of undertaking a sustainability appraisal of the LPA is the identification and assessment of the relationship between the Plan and other relevant plans, and strategies established at international, European Community, National and local levels.

A list of plans, policies and programmes, relevant to the LPA has been compiled and analysed. This list, (originally published in the LPA Scoping Report) has been updated to reflect comments received back during the Scoping Report consultation. In addition Appendix C of this report provides details on the relationship and reflects any additional published plans, policies, strategies and initiatives.

A summary of the plans and programmes reviewed are listed below:

#### International:

- New York Sustainable Development Summit, 2015
- EC Habitats Directive, 1992
- UN Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992
- EU Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC)
- EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC)
- EU Nitrates Directive (91/676/EEC)
- Drinking Water Directive (98/83/EC)
- EU Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds (79/409/EEC)
- EU Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Fauna and Flora (92/43/EEC) and subsequent amendments
- EU Directive on Waste (2008/98/EC)
- EU Directive on the Landfill of Waste (99/31/EC)
- EU Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive (2015/720/EC)
- Renewed EU Sustainable Development Strategy, 2006
- UNFCCC (1997) The Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC
- World Commission on Environment and Development, Brundtland Report, 1987
- European Structural and Investment Funds Growth Programme 2014-2020 (2015)
- UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972
- European Strategy for Sustainable Development, 2009
- Our Life Insurance, Our Natural Capital: An EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020, 2011
- Energy Efficiency Plan, 2011
- Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, 1979
- EU Seventh Environmental Action Programme of the European Community
- UNESCO World Heritage Convention 1972
- European Landscape Convention (Florence Convention)
- The Convention for the protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada Convention)
- The European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (Valetta Convention).

#### National:

- Securing the Future – the UK Sustainable Development, 2005
- Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon: Making Sustainable Local Transport Happen (2001)
- Government Review of Waste Policy in England 2011
- Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981
- Countryside Rights of Way Act, 2000
- Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, 2006
- DEFRA Rural Strategy, 2004
- EA Water Resources Strategy for England and Wales, 2009
- Sustainable Energy Act, 2008

- DEFRA Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales & Northern Ireland, 2007
- Planning Act, 2008
- Climate Change Act, 2008
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- National Heritage Protection Plan
- Biodiversity , The UK Action Plan
- England Biodiversity Strategy Climate Change Adaption Principles Conserving Biodiversity in a Changing world (2008)
- Government Forestry and Woodlands Statement
- Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006: Biodiversity Duty, Public Authority Duty to have regard to Conserving Biodiversity, 2014
- Conserving Biodiversity, The UK Approach, 2007
- Safeguarding our Soils, A Strategy for England, 2009
- Low Carbon Transition Plan, 2009
- Renewable Energy Strategy, 2009
- Noise Policy Statement for England, 2010
- National Infrastructure Plan, 2010
- White Paper, Water for Life, 2011
- Flood and Water Management Act, 2010
- White Paper, The Natural Choice, Securing the Value of Nature, 2011
- Biodiversity 2020: A Strategy for England's Wildlife and Ecosystem Services
- Healthy Lives, Healthy People: Our Strategy for public health in England (Department of Health 2010)
- Enabling the Transition to a Green Economy, 2011
- Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations, 2010
- Localism Act, 2011
- National Planning Policy Framework
- A Better Quality of Life, Strategy for Sustainable Development, 1999
- Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, 2012
- Circular 06/05: Biodiversity & Geological Conservation
- Infrastructure Act, 2015
- Living Places, Cleaner, Safer, Greener, 2002
- Housing & Planning Act, 2016
- Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004
- Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations, 2012
- Water Act, 2014
- High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill 2013-14 to 2015-16
- Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future, 2003
- Planning Our Electric Futures: A white Paper for a Secure, affordable and low carbon electricity
- The Carbon Plan: Delivering Our Low Carbon Future
- Energy Efficiency Strategy
- Energy Security Strategy
- Historic England's Regional Streetscape Manuals
- National Planning Practice Guidance (2014)

#### Regional:

- Leading for a connected Staffordshire, Strategic Plan 2013 - 2018, Staffordshire County Council
- Staffordshire Local Transport Plan 2011
- National Forest Strategy 2014-2024, 2014

- Central Rivers Initiative
- Economic Regeneration Strategy, SCC, 2006
- Staffordshire Declaration
- Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Climate Change Risk Register
- Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Minerals Local Plan 1999-2006
- Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Waste Local Plan 2010-2026, 2013
- Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy 2010-2026, 2013
- Safer, Fairer, United Communities for Staffordshire 2013-18
- Sustainable Community Strategy (Staffordshire) 2008-2023
- Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan
- Staffordshire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, 2015
- Shaping the Future of Staffordshire 2005-2020: The Sustainable Strategy for the County
- Staffordshire County Council, A Strategy for School Organisation 2012-2017
- Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2014-19
- Cannock Chase SAC Strategic Access Management and Maintenance Measures (SAMM)
- Greater Birmingham & Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan 2014
- Stoke-on-Trent & Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan Part 1 – Strategy 2014-2030 (2014)
- Staffordshire County Council, Lichfield Historic Character Assessment, 2011
- CAMS: Tame, Anker & Mease Abstraction Licensing Strategy, Environment Agency, 2013
- CAMS: Staffordshire Trent Valley Abstraction Licensing Strategy, Environment Agency, 2013
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Staffordshire 2013-2018
- Southern Staffordshire Outline Water Cycle Study, 2010
- South Staffordshire Water PLC Water Resource Plan 2015-40
- Severn Trent Water PLC Water Resource Management Plan 2015-40
- Humber River Basin Management Plan 2015
- CAMS: Staffordshire Trent Valley Abstraction Licensing Strategy: Environment Agency 2013
- Tame Valley Wetlands Landscape Partnership Scheme Landscape Conservation Action Plan
- Staffordshire Country Council Supplementary Planning Document: Planning for Landscape Change
- Local Landscape Character Assessments

#### Local:

- Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029, 2015
- Biodiversity & Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), 2016
- Developer Contributions SPD, 2016
- Historic Environment SPD, 2015
- Rural Development SPD, 2015
- Sustainable Design SPD, 2015
- Trees, Landscaping & Development SPD, 2016
- Little Aston Neighbourhood Plan, 2016
- Stonnall Neighbourhood Plan, 2016
- Conservation Area Appraisals
- Lichfield District Strategic Partnership's Carbon Reduction Plan 2012/13
- Lichfield District Integrated Transport Strategy 2013-2028
- Strategy for the A5
- Lichfield District Housing Strategy 2013-17
- Lichfield District Council AQMA Updating & Screening Assessment, 2015
- Lichfield District Council Economic Development Strategy 2016-2020, 2016

- Lichfield District Council Community Infrastructure Regulation 123 List, 2016
- Lichfield District Community Safety Delivery Plan 201/18
- Lichfield City Centre Development Strategy & Action Plan 2016-2020
- Lichfield District Council Strategic Plan 2016-2020
- Rural Settlements Sustainability Study, 2016
- River Mease Restoration Plan, 2012
- River Mease Water Quality (Phosphate) Management Plan 2011
- River Mease Diffuse Water Pollution Plan

### What is the sustainability baseline?

The SA Report must include?

- The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment
- The environmental characteristic of areas likely to be significantly affected?

The SEA Directive requires the collection of baseline information on social, economic and environmental characteristics of the area in order to provide the basis for predicting and monitoring effects of the policies within Local Planning Documents. The baseline information will also help to identify sustainability issues and potential ways of dealing with them. A review of current environmental, social and economic conditions affecting Lichfield District is set out in Appendix D.

### How would the baseline evolve without the plan?

The SA Report must include:

- The likely evolution of the current state of the environment without implementation of the plan

In addition to ensuring that the scope of the SA is informed by an understanding of the current baseline conditions, it is also important to ensure that thought is given to how the baseline conditions may evolve in the future without the LPA.

- A significant amount of development could be delivered in an ad hoc manner. This could have particularly significant implications for housing delivery, resulting in both shortages and an inability to plan for predicted future housing need. Certain housing requirements may not be met in particular affordable housing and those with unique housing requirements (elderly requirements for smaller properties).
- The ad hoc principal could also apply to employment sites, with development resulting in a disconnection between housing and employment sites impacting on accessibility. In addition the impact on infrastructure on transport routes would be unknown.
- The natural environment will be affected by climate change. Species and habitats will be put under strain particularly designated sites within the District would be uncertain resulting in an inability to mitigate for impact which could result in harm.
- River level rises and more extreme rainfall patterns will increase flood hazard, particularly in those areas of the District already designated as Flood Zones.
- Commercial property may come under greater pressures to be redeveloped for alternative purposes.
- The District's distinct rural communities will not be develop sustainably, some will be unable to prosper, struggling to retain local services and community facilities whilst others may experience growth that changes their unique character and landscape setting.
- Opportunities to enhance the Districts rich historic environment will be lost.

- An aging population will also mean that additional strain will be put on certain community infrastructure elements.

### What are the key issues that should be a focus of the appraisal?

The SA Report must include

- Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan

### Population Trends

The population of Lichfield District has increased by 1.8% between 2011 and 2015 and is expected to increase by a further 8.5% between 2014 and 2039.

The largest population influence is death with a net decrease of 7,800 through natural change which reflects the death rate being markedly higher than the birth rate. This points to the ageing population within the District and as displayed in the age structure breakdown with 22.9% currently aged over 65 which is over 5% more than the national average. The population is projected to see a significant growth in people aged 65 and over and in particular those aged 85 and over.

Life expectancy within the District is similar to the regional and national average with males living to 80 years and females to 84 years. The population is projected to see a significant growth in people aged 65 and over and in particular those aged 85 and over. The rate of increase in the number of older people in Lichfield is faster than both the West Midlands and England and by 2029 equates to a 60% increase in 75-84 year olds and a 115% increase in the amount of residents aged 85. There are however discrepancies within the District with differences in life expectancy between the ward with the lowest life expectancy and the ward with the highest life expectancy which for men means the difference between 76 years and 83 years and for women between 79 and 91.

The 2011 Census found that 18.1% (18,300 people) had a limiting long-term illness in Lichfield. This is higher than the England average of 17.6% and reflects the ageing population within the District.

Between 2014 and 2039 there is a projected fall in household size within Lichfield District from 2.37 to 2.24 persons per household. The projected fall in household size reflects the general ageing of the population evidenced by the projected household growth by age which shows that between 2014 and 2039 there is a large growth in the number of households within the 75+ age category. The age groups for the remaining categories remain largely similar between 2014 and 2039.

The dependency ratio for older people in Lichfield (measures the number of people aged over 65 who depend on people of working age (16-64)) is 38 older people for every 100 people of working age. This is higher than the England average.

### Social and Community Issues

Within Lichfield District 86.5% of the dwelling stock is either owned or privately rented with 41.1% or housing being detached, both significantly higher than the county, regional and national average.

Property prices are relatively high with the average house price in Lichfield District being £250, 675 significantly higher than neighbouring districts in which average house prices range from £164, 916 to £204, 361, and the Staffordshire average of £190, 214 (December 2015). Lichfield District is seen as an attractive commuter area for Birmingham and the larger salaries associated with these jobs.

Housing affordability issues are highlighted by the lowest quartile house price being 7.1 times the lowest quartile income.

The majority of working aged (16-64) population in Lichfield District is in work, with economic inactivity being consistently significantly lower than both the national and regional indicator and benefit claimants for Lichfield also below the national and regional averages.

9.3% of Lichfield District residents aged 16 - 64 have no qualifications which is slightly higher than the national average (8.6%) but significantly lower than Staffordshire and the West Midlands figures. Within Staffordshire those achieving 5 GCSE's Grades A\*-C is consistent with the national average at 64.9% and 64.2% respectively. In Lichfield District 31% of the population is educated to at least NVQ level 4 which also covers degree level qualifications however the proportion of the working age population qualified to 'NVQ Level 4 and above' is below the national average.

### Health Inequalities

In 2012, 23.5% of adults are classified as obese. The rate of smoking related deaths was 229, better than the average for England. This represents 143 deaths per year. Rates of sexually transmitted infections, people killed and seriously injured on roads are better than average. Rates of statutory homelessness, violent crime, long term unemployment, drug misuse, early deaths from cardiovascular diseases and early deaths from cancer are also better than average. The level of early death in men is declining and is below the national average with early death in women declining at a slower rate and reflecting the national average. Levels of infant mortality are also declining and in Lichfield are significantly lower than both the County and National figures.

### Deprivation

Lichfield District is ranked as 206 out of 326 local authorities (i.e. in top 40%) where 1 is the most deprived.

There are however pockets of deprivation within Lichfield District. Two lower super output areas fall within IMD's 20% of most deprived areas nationally. These are found within the wards of Chadsmead and Chasetown.

Four wards in Lichfield have high proportions of households with lone pensioners and of these lone pensioners 59.5% (2, 992) have a long term health problem or disability, similar to the national average of 59.6%. The percentage of lone pensioners with a long term health problem or disability is significantly higher than England in two wards; Burntwood Central (67.9%) and Chasetown (72.1%).

Using 2014 mid-year population figures for Lichfield it has been estimated that around 500 residents aged 65+ are at risk of loneliness. This is exacerbated by lack of transport, with around 18% of people aged over 65 having no private transport which increases to 55% of people aged 85 and over. Free bus passes for the over 65s go some way to ameliorating this issue however the bus service needs to be accessible.

### Crime

Crime within Lichfield District is relatively low with 36 crimes per 1,000 residents which is significantly lower than the Staffordshire average. The number of crimes recorded in the District decreased from 4, 308 crimes in 2010-11 to 3, 677 in 2014-15. Anti-social behaviour has increased by 6.2% over the last year but overall there has been a reduction over the past 5 years from 2, 262 incidents in 2010-11



to 2015 in 2014-15 although there was an increase in hate crimes during 2014/15, the majority motivated by race.

In terms of road traffic casualties, the proportion of casualties killed or seriously injured in 2014 was the lowest rate for 5 years, and lower than the Staffordshire rate. Staffordshire County recorded the 8<sup>th</sup> lowest casualty severity ratio of 153 local authorities across England and it can be inferred that the District's roads are some of the safest in the country.

### Built and Natural Environment

The setting of the District falls within 3 historic landscape character areas, to the west the land rises towards what was an 11<sup>th</sup> century royal hunting forest, the central belt covering the city of Lichfield, and to the east the river valleys. Some of the earliest known sites within the District date back to the Palaeolithic with evidence of human activity throughout the Bronze Age, Roman occupation and Anglo Saxon period, with many sites later recorded in the Domesday Book. The evolution of settlements, ecclesiastical and cultural expansion along with agricultural and industrial development continued throughout the 11<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The rich tapestry of historic development is reflected in the amount of protected historic landscapes and structures within the District. Virtually every settlement contains a conservation area with 21 throughout the District, with a wide variety of scheduled ancient monuments (16 in total), one registered historic park and garden and around 760 listed buildings. These important historic assets make this attractive rural and historic environment locally distinctive and make a substantial contribution to the local economy through tourism.

### Environmental Issues

The number of developments on brownfield land as a percentage of all development has increased from 76% in 2010/ 11 to 88% in 2015/ 16. The percentage profile of homes built on previously developed land will change in future years as greenfield releases will be required to deliver the housing requirements within the Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029.

Lichfield supports a variety of wildlife rich habitats and species which are protected under domestic or European legislation. There are 7 Special Areas of Conservation within a 20km radius of Lichfield District however the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Local Plan only identified two sites namely the Cannock Chase SAC and the River Mease SAC to which the Local Plan could cause significant harm. As such projects have been put in place to mitigate the effect of the development on these protected sites. There are also 4 Sites of Special Scientific Interest and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty along with 78 Sites of Biological Interest. In addition the Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan identifies those habitats of importance for the county and includes plans for their conservation and management.

Lichfield District is comprised of a variety of landscapes within a relatively small area, due to significant variations in geology, the presence of two significant river valleys, the Tame and the Trent, and remnants of historic landscapes including extensive forest and heathland. The landscapes, such as the former Forest of Needwood, areas of heathland and historic field patterns. Some Landscape character types and habitats have suffered significant losses or degradation, and all of the District's landscape is affected by change arising from development, mineral working, agricultural and climate change.



Trees and wooded habitats are important for nature conservation and landscape value within the District. There are 392 Tree Preservation Orders within Lichfield District which along with the Conservation Area legislation protect the trees which bring significant amenity benefit to the local area.

The River Tame and River Trent are the main rivers that flow through the Lichfield District Council area. These rivers carry large volumes of water and have wide floodplains. The EA Flood Zone maps for the River Trent and River Tame indicate fluvial risk occurs predominantly into rural agricultural land where there is currently little proposed development. Pluvial flooding poses a risk to the District due to the lack of drainage capacity during high flows. Blockages of drains and watercourses in urban areas have been attributed to the pluvial flooding incidents and have been identified as highways flooding. Fazeley suffers from recurring fluvial and pluvial flood events. There are a number of properties at risk of flooding from sewer flooding but no known problems with groundwater, reservoir or canal flooding.

There are a number of regional initiatives affecting parts of the District that aim to achieve enhancements to existing landscapes and create valuable new habitats that can play a part in increasing biodiversity value within the District. In particular these include the National Forest, the Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative.

### Energy Usage

The average amount of electricity and gas used per capita in Lichfield District has decreased in line with the British average (2005-2014) however it remains at a high rate. Since 2005 the rate of gas usage in Lichfield District per consumer has reduced by 33% with the reduction in electricity usage of around 20%.

### Transport

The District is well served by local routes such the A51, A515 and A5127 and has excellent connections to the national transport network including the M6 Toll, A38 (T), A5148 (T) and A5 (T). However Lichfield has one of the highest levels of car drivers, at 75% with 49.1% of residents commuting out of the District to work.

Lichfield District has four rail stations Lichfield City, Lichfield Trent Valley, Rugeley Trent Valley and Shenstone. 3% of employed residents commute by rail which is the highest level in Staffordshire. Lichfield Trent Valley, Lichfield City, Shenstone, Blake Street and Four Oaks stations are served by the Cross City North line which forms part of the busiest local rail corridors in the West Midlands.

In Lichfield City 71% of households are within 350 metres of a half-hourly or better weekday bus service, achieved through the commercial network. However around 80% of the District's households are within Lichfield and Burntwood and the key rural settlements which therefore intimates that current bus services predominantly serve the main centres and key rural settlements rather than the outlying rural areas.

For the rural north west of the District which have either a less regular or non existent bus service the County Council provide the 'Needwood Forest Connect' bookable bus service where route is plotted on a daily basis from telephone bookings enabling it to only run where there are passengers which require its services. This service is provided between 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday. There are improvements proposed to the road and rail network for the benefit of the District.

## Economy

Lichfield District has two a City Centre, Lichfield, and a Town Centre, Burntwood. Since January 2009 vacancy rates for Lichfield City Centre have fluctuated between a high of 10.5% in August 2009 to a low of 7.0% in July 2014. In December 2015 vacancy rates stood at 9.15% representing 28 of the available 306 retail premises available in the City Centre. In terms of Burntwood vacancy rates were recorded at 9.85 in July 2014 and fall to 4.55% in December 2015, representing 3 vacancy premises of the total 66 available. Lichfield Direct maintains a large portfolio of sites which are available for employment development, 64.42 ha of land is under construction and/ or has secured planning permission for employment.

## Minerals and Waste

Land to the west of the A38 within Alrewas Parish has been identified as a potential new sand and gravel site. Lichfield District recycles, reuses or composts 54.5% of its waste, which is both above and well in advance of the EU target of 50% of waste being recycled by 2020.

## The Sustainability Assessment Framework

Following on from the review of other plans, policies and programmes, the review of baseline data and the identification of key sustainability issues the Council developed a Sustainability Appraisal Framework against which the LPA site and policies options could be tested. The framework sets out a number of sustainability appraisal objectives, site specific questions that the District council has used to identify and predict the effects of implementing LPA. Since its conception in the Scoping report, the SA framework (consisting of 16 objectives) has been consistently used during the SA process.

Detailed decision-making criteria or sub objectives are also included within the SA Framework. The purpose of these sub-objectives is to provide prompts which allows the council to identify whether detailed objectives are being met. In total 57 detailed decision making criteria are included within the Framework. These detailed questions have evolved since first being published against the SA indicators within the Scoping Report, these amendments and additions are captured within Appendix B.

A number of indicators and targets were also identified and these could be used to monitor the implementation of the plan.

A copy of the SA framework is provided over in Table 2.

	Table 2 Sustainability Framework		
Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
Biodiversity, Geodiversity, Flora and Fauna	1 To promote biodiversity protection enhancement and management of species and habitats	1. Will it conserve protected/priority species? 2. Will it conserve protected/priority habitats and local nature conservation sites? 3. Will it protect statutory designated sites? 4. Will it encourage ecological connectivity (including green corridors and water courses)?	Proportion of local sites where positive conservation management has been or is being implemented. Number, type of quality of internationally and nationally designated sites. Number of species relevant to the district which have achieved SBAP targets Number of Local Nature Reserves within Lichfield District.
Flora and Fauna, Landscape, Cultural heritage	2 To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/geological assets and lands character of the district	1 Does it respect and protect existing landscape character? 2 Will it protect sites of geological importance? 3 Does it offer the opportunity to improve and promote landscape connectivity sympathetic to the existing District Landscape character? 4 Will it lead to the sterilisations of mineral resources? 5 Will it improve green infrastructure including National Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative? 6 Will it result in the loss of historic landscape features? 7 Will it safeguard sites of archaeological importance (scheduled or unscheduled) and their setting?	The proportion of housing completions on sites of 10 or more which have been supported, at the planning application stage by an appropriate and effective landscape character and visual assessment with appropriate landscape proposals. Number and area of RIGS within District. Number of sites subject to development where archaeology is preserved in situ compared with those scientifically recorded. National Forest Coverage within the District. Proportion of Forest of Mercia or Central Initiatives promoted schemes implemented within the District. Loss of historic landscape features erosion of character and distinctiveness (HLC).

	Table 2 Sustainability Framework		
Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
			Extent and use of detailed characterisation studies informing development proposals (HLC)
Cultural Heritage	3 To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting	1. Will it preserve and enhance buildings and structures and their setting and contribute to the Districts heritage? 2. Will it improve and broaden access to, and understanding of, local heritage, historic sites, areas and buildings? 3. Will it preserve and enhance conservation areas including their setting? 4. Will it offer opportunities to bring heritage assets back into active use?	Number and Proportion of major planning proposals which improved access to heritage features as part of the scheme. Number of listed buildings or structure in Lichfield District Heritage at risk and number of assets removed from Register. Proportion of Conservation Areas with an up to date character appraisal and management plan
Cultural Heritage Population	4 Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrated effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character	1 Will it achieve high quality and sustainable design for buildings, spaces and the public realm sensitive to the locality? 2 Does it value and protect diverse and locally distinctive settlement and townscape character? 3 Does it safeguard historic views and valuable skylines of settlements? 4 Is the site within a main settlement or a key rural settlement? 5 Is the site within close proximity to key services (e.g. schools, food shop, public transport, health centres etc.)?	Improvements in the quality of the townscapes e.g. delivery of street/public realm audits, improvements works, de-cluttering works both in urban and rural areas. Development meeting design standards within Supplementary Planning Documents.

	Table 2 Sustainability Framework		
Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
Soil Water and Air	5 Maximise the use of previously developed land/buildings and the efficient use of land.	1. Will it result in the loss of land that has not previously been developed? 2. Is the site capable of supporting higher density development and/or a mix of uses? 3. Does the site allow for the re-use of existing buildings? 4. Will it reduce the amount of derelict degraded and underused land within the District?	Proportion of new development on Brownfield Land. No of redundant buildings bought back into use. Proportion of long term vacant dwellings in the District. Housing Mix of sites with planning permission. Housing Density of sites with planning Permission.
Climatic Factors	6 Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of transport and increased opportunities for non-car travel	1. Does the site location encourage the use of existing sustainable modes of travel? 2. Will it reduce the overall impact on traffic sensitive areas? 3. Will it help develop walking, cycling rail and bus networks to enable residents access to employment, services and facilities?	Traffic Levels (million vehicle kilometres) in the local road network. Access to bus services. Increase opportunities for walking and cycling.
Climatic Factors	7 To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change	1. Will it reduce the causes of climate change? 2. Will it encourage prudent use of energy? 3. Will it provide opportunities for additional renewable energy generation capacity within the District?	Carbon Dioxide emissions within the Authority Areas. Renewable Energy Capacity within the District.
Soil Water and Air	8 To minimise waste and increase the reuse and recycling of waste materials.	1 Will it reduce household and commercial waste? 2 Will it increase waste recovery and recycling? 3 Will it reduce the proportion of waste sent to landfill?	Residual Household water per household. Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting. Municipal waste landfilled.

	Table 2 Sustainability Framework		
Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
Soil Water and Air	9 Seek and improve air, soil and water quality	1.Which Source Protection Zone does the development fall within? 2.Does the site fall within the River Mease SAC? 3.Is the site within or directly connected to road to an AQMA? 4.Will it result in the loss of quality agricultural land?	Population living within Air Quality Management Areas. Number of planning applications granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on water quality. Proportion of homes built on Greenfield land
Soil Water and Air	10 To reduce and manage flood risk	1.Is the site located outside an area of risk from flooding? 2.Will there be an opportunity for flood risk reduction?	Number of Planning Permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on fluvial flooding. Number of Planning Permissions granted contrary to Lead Local Flood Authority advice on surface water flooding. Number of existing properties within the Environment Agency's flood risk areas. Proportion of new development/dwellings incorporating Sustainable urban drainage techniques.
Population and Human Health	11 To provide affordable homes that meet local need	1.Will it provide sufficient housing to meet existing and future housing need? 2.Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups? 3.Will it reduce the number of households waiting for accommodation or accepted as homeless? 4.Will it meet the needs of the travelling community and show people?	Number of households on the household register. Number of people accepted as homeless (annually). Net Additional Dwellings. Net affordable housing completions. Housing mix. Net additional Pitches.

	Table 2 Sustainability Framework		
Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
Human Health	12 Improve services and access to services to produce good health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	1 Will it improve accessibility to health care for existing residents (including older residents) and provide additional facilities for new residents? 2 Will it support a healthy life style including opportunities for recreational/physical activity? 3 Will it provide new accessible green space?	Life expectancy at birth (male and female). Number of new or improved healthcare facilities delivered annually through development. Number of new sports pitches or other leisure facilities delivered annually through development.
Population and Human Health	13 To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime	1. Will it reduce crime through design measures? 2. Will it contribute to a safe built environment?	Reduction in overall British Crime Survey comparator recorded crime – Lichfield District. % of residents who say that they feel very or fairly safe when outside in Staffordshire during the day and after dark.
Material Assets	14 Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth	1. Will it encourage higher skilled economic sectors in the District? 2. Will it encourage new employment that is consistent with local needs? 3. Will it encourage growth of existing businesses? 4. Will it encourage small businesses to grow?	Employment Rate. Number of VAT registrations per 1000. Business Births. Unemployment by ward. Proportion of the District Employed in key sectors.
Material Assets	15 To enhance the vitality and viability of existing city, town and village centres within the District	1. Will it improve existing facilities within Lichfield City and Burntwood Town Centre? 2. Will it protect and enhance the ability of our key rural settlements to meet the day to day needs arising with these settlements and from the wider rural areas they serve?	Total amount of retail floor space (by type) in Lichfield City Centre and Burntwood Town Centre. New retail spaced developed within villages. Loss of shops and other retail businesses to other uses.

	Table 2 Sustainability Framework		
Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
		3. Will it support and protect existing neighbourhood centres serving the local needs of our urban communities	Vacancy rates in Lichfield City Centre and Burntwood Town Centre. Loss of local community, leisure and shopping facilities to other uses.
Population and Human Health	16 Increase participation and improve access to education, skills based training knowledge and information and lifelong learning	1 Will it increase educational attainment amongst young people? 2 Will it reduce the number of working age residents who have no, or lower level qualifications?	Proportion of working age population with no, or lower level qualifications. Success rate for Work Based Learning. % of Working Age Population with NVQ level 4 and above. Success rate for further education. % of 18-59 year olds attending Higher Education Institutions.



### 3 What has the plan/making/SA involved up to this point?

The SA Report must include

- An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with (and thus an explanation of why the alternatives dealt with are reasonable);
- The likely significant effects of the environmental associated with alternatives/an outline of the reasons for selecting preferred alternatives/a description of how environmental objectives and considerations are reflected in the Plan.

#### Introduction

The statutory requirements require the SA Report to present (and explain) the alternatives, present their appraisal and tell the story of how this appraisal has informed the development of the plan.

This section seeks to identify where alternatives have been considered and why those selected were reasonable. It also provides signposts to the assessments associated with the reasonable alternatives and tells the story of how alternatives to the sites and policies within the plan were considered.

#### General Methodology Housing Sites

- **Policy Context**, Lichfield District Council adopted its Local Plan Strategy in February 2015. Within that Strategy, Core Policy 1 'The Spatial Strategy' and Core Policy 6 'Housing Delivery' provides the policy context for the selection of alternatives and preferred options. These policies are supported through the following localised policies; Policy Lichfield 4: 'Lichfield Housing', Policy Burntwood 4: 'Burntwood Housing', Policy: 'North of Tamworth', Policy: 'East of Rugeley', Policy Frad4: 'Fradley Housing', Policy ALr4: 'Alrewas Housing', Policy Arm4: 'Armitage with Handsacre Housing', Policy Faz4: 'Fazeley, Mile Oak & Bonehill Housing', Policy Shen4: 'Shenstone Housing', Policy Whit4: 'Whittington Housing', Policy Rural 2: 'Other Rural Settlements'.
- **Regulation 18**, Lichfield District Council undertook consultation on the proposed scope and nature of the Local Plan Allocations (Regulation 18) from August 2016 to October 2016. Assessment of the responses received did not identify any issues which could be considered as 'showstoppers'. The scope of this consultation was directly informed by the Local Plan Strategy which had already been subject to SA.
- **Stage 1**: All sites within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2016 which were located within or adjacent to settlements identified within the settlement hierarchy were identified and subject to the SA process along with any additional sites which were submitted/ promoted through the Regulation 18 consultation. Such an approach was taken so that sites which could be considered to be potentially aligned to the adopted spatial strategy were considered. Any sites which were noted as being complete or under-construction (having had the benefit of planning permission), or sites assessed as capable of delivering less than 5 dwellings were removed from the schedule of sites prior to being assessed. This was because it was considered that these were already moving through the planning process and for sites of 5 or less dwellings were not taken through the SA process because the LPA was not allocating sites below this threshold.
- Concurrently and in isolation an Urban Capacity Assessment was produced which assessed the deliverability of all sites identified within the SHLAA located within the existing built up areas of settlements. Where this assessment determined that an urban capacity site was deliverable, consideration was given to other evidence, including their assessment within the SA (SA outputs), to conclude on whether the site should be proposed for allocation.

- **Stage 2:** The Urban Capacity Assessment assesses each settlement within the settlement hierarchy in terms of its delivery against the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy. Where the assessment indicated that insufficient sites had been found including those found through stage 1, consideration to sites beyond the settlement boundary was given. This consideration was based on a range of evidence e.g. green belt review, including the SA outputs.
- An SA assessment was completed for each of the identified reasonable alternatives and full results are contained and a summary of allocated sites produced.
- **Stage 3: Changes to Site Selection post Regulation 19 consultation.**
- Since preparing the Regulation 19 consultation (undertaken March – May 2017) there were two significant factors that altered the planning landscape for Lichfield District. The first was receipt of three appeals from the Secretary of State, one of these appeal decisions for 750 dwellings at Land at Watery Lane was approved despite not being in conformity with the Plan. The second factor relates to the Government's consultation on the Housing White Paper which inter alia seeks to clarify the national policy position associated with Green Belt. In light of these factors, along with significant public objection to the release of Green Belt land, a review of the housing supply was undertaken. The Housing Supply Update 2017 concluded that there was a supply of 11,259 dwellings, which is 1229 dwellings above the 10,030 dwellings. This enables the release of Green Belt sites to be excluded from the LPA whilst still meeting the overall housing requirements.
- In addition, a number sites with small yields have secured planning permission within the period between the completion of the original SA and the publication of this version. These additional sites have been included with the preferred options.
- Consultation response received during Regulation 19 consultation identified additional information which further informed site assessments. Where appropriate, amendments were made to site assessments.
- A number of new reasonable alternatives were identified within the period between the completion of the original SA and the publication of this version. These additional alternatives have been included within the SA.
- A completed assessment for all reasonable alternatives and full results are contained within Appendix E a summary of the effects of the preferred options are contained within Appendix F.
- Table 3 below identifies the preferred options for the housing sites. Those sites which have been identified and included post Regulation 19 consultation are denoted by a \*.
- It should be noted that those sites deemed under construction pre the Regulation 19 are not identified within Table 3 or Appendix F. However those sites deemed under construction in the period between Regulation 19 and this publication of the SA are included.

Table 3 Preferred Options Housing Sites

Settlement	Allocations	SA reference
Alrewas	A2	28
	A3	751
	A4	974
	A5	36
Armitage	AH1	91
Burntwood	B1	1005
	B2	156
	B3	7
	B4	119

Settlement	Allocations	SA reference
	B5	4
	B7	496
	B8	429
	B10	ELAA 47
	B13	478
	B16	1037
	B17	1054
	B20*	167
	B21*	146
East of Rugeley	R1	1031
Fazeley	FZ2	115
	FZ3	140
Fradley	F1	138
Lichfield	L1	418
	L2	1032
	L3	ELAA 58
	L4	1057
	L5	1065
	L5	89-90
	L5	19
	L6	44
	L7	428
	L8	648
	L9	East of Streethay
	L10	103
	L12	31
	L13	1040
	L14	39
	L16	61
	L17	63
	L18	836
	L19	60
	L20	813
	L21	425
	L22	54
	L23	164
	L24	415
	L25	64
	L26	144
	L27	856
	L28	1070
	L29	52
	L31*	ADD1
North of Tamworth	NT1	104
	NT2	43
Other Rural	HR1	255
	HR1	135
	OR1	51
	OR3	935

Settlement	Allocations	SA reference
	OR4	1046
	OR5	1022
	OR7*	837
	OR8*	1109
	H1*	85
	HR2*	ADD2
Shenstone	S1	30
Whittington	W2	8
	W3	754

### General Methodology Employment Sites

- **Policy Context** Lichfield District Council adopted its Local Plan Strategy on February 2015. Within that Strategy Core Policy 7 Employment and Economic Development provides the policy context for the selection of alternatives and preferred options.
- **Regulation 18** Lichfield District Council undertook consultation on the proposed scope and nature of the Local Plan Allocations (Regulation 18) from August 2016 to October 2016. Assessment of the responses received did not identify any issues which could be considered as 'showstoppers'.
- **Stage 1** Potential employment sites that feature within the District Council Employment land Review (ELR), Employment Land Availability Assessment (ELAA) 2016 and Regulation 18 consultation were identified as reasonable alternatives on the basis that these sites may be in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy.
- **Stage 2** Of those sites the following were removed, sites under construction and site that had been completed in previous years because it was considered that these were already moving through the Plan process.
- **Stage 3** An SA assessment was completed for each of the identified reasonable alternatives full results are contained within Appendix E.
- **Stage 4** Summary of scores undertaken, the summary sheets for allocated sites are contained within Appendix F.
- **Stage 5** Taken into consideration the effects identified within the SA, the policy context, wider evidence base including Employment Land Capacity Assessment and factors identified within the general methodology the following employment sites were identified as preferred options to fulfil the remaining development quantum.

Note there has been not further amendments or additions to the Employment Sites methodology following Regulation 19 consultation.

Table 4 Preferred Options Employment Sites

Settlement	Allocations	SA ref
Employment	F2	ELAA 97
	F2	ELAA 105
	F2	ELAA 113
	OR6	ELAA 96
	A6	ELAA 77
	L30	ELAA 52

## General Methodology Gypsy and Traveller Sites

- Lichfield District Council adopted its Local Plan Strategy on February 2015. Within that Strategy Core Policy 6 Housing Delivery provides the policy context for the selection of alternatives and preferred options.
- Lichfield District Council undertook consultation on the proposed scope and nature of the Local Plan Allocations (Regulation 18) from August 2016 to October 2016. Assessment of the responses received did not identify any issues which could be considered as 'showstoppers'.
- Gypsy and Traveller Site identification work: The process of site identification was completed using the criteria outlined within Local Plan Strategy Policy H3: Gypsies, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople. A number of sites feature within the SHLAA others identified solely as part of the implementation of policy H3. Gypsy and Traveller Site Methodology Appendix A includes an assessment which considered sites at initial filter stage.
- An SA assessment was completed for each of the identified reasonable alternatives which are considered reasonable on the basis of their broad compliance with policy H3, full results are contained within Appendix E.
- Summary of effects completed, the summary sheets for allocated sites are contained within Appendix F.
- Taken into consideration the effects identified within the SA, the policy context, and factors identified within the general methodology the following Gypsy and Traveller Site was identified as a preferred option.

Note there has been no further amendments or additions Gypsy and Traveller methodology following Regulation 19 consultation.

Table 5 Preferred Options Gypsy and Traveller Sites

Settlement	Allocations	SA ref
Gypsy & Traveller	GT21	GT

## General Methodology Saved Policies

- Lichfield District Council adopted its Local Plan Strategy on February 2015.
- In total there are currently 54 saved policies carried over from the 1998 Local Plan. The Council has committed to a review of these saved policies. Appendix J of the Local Plan Strategy identifies policies that have been replaced by the Local Plan Strategy and those that will be replaced by the LPA.
- Lichfield District Council undertook consultation on the proposed scope and nature of the Local Plan Allocations (Regulation 18) from August 2016 to October 2016. Assessment of the responses received did not identify any issues which could be considered as 'showstoppers'.

SA assessment has been completed for each policy. In terms of reasonable alternatives the following have been considered:

- Proposed Policy (the policy the LPA is proposing)
- Policy absent – (the impact without the policy in place)
- Alternative if suggested – (alternative policy options suggested by others)
- Saved Policy – (existing policies within the Local Plan)

These alternatives were considered reasonable on the basis that not taking a policy forward or taking a differently worded policy would be realistic if a preferable outcome was delivered.

Regulation 19 consultation responses have led to a number of wording amendments to a number of Proposed Policy options. Those amendments were appropriate and have been accommodated within the policy wording. An assessment of amended policies has been completed. These new policy options are referred to as Amended Proposed Policy.

As outlined within the introductory section of this report, Main Modifications proposals have resulted in two further policies assessments being completed.

The introduction of new policy MM1: Local Plan Review has resulted in the creation of a separate assessment. MM6 Protection of Employment Land has been included within the existing matrix and summary table for EMP1. These policy options are referred to as Main Modification within the Appendix E

Appendix G contained the scoring for each of the proposed policies and Supporting Commentary and Recommendations if appropriate.

#### Reasons for selecting preferred alternatives.

To provide a link between Appendix E: Full SA Scoring Matrix and Appendix F: Allocated Sites Summary Impact, Table 6 Reasons for Preferred Alternatives in relation to housing and employment selection has been included within this updated version of the SA. A separate table, Table 7 Reasons for Preferred Alternatives Gypsy and Traveller sites has also been included. The tables will ensure the narrative behind preferred alternatives is easily and succinctly available. Table 6 and Table 7 can be found within Appendix G.

## 4 What were the appraisal findings at Publication stage?

The SA Report must include

- The likely significant effects on the environment associated with the Publication Plan.
- The measure envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the Plan.

This section of the SA report relates to the Publication Plan stage of the SA process. The first part provides a brief overview of the methodology used to undertake the appraisal. A review of the findings and the envisaged cumulative, synergistic and indirect effects of the LPA is provided. Conclusions for each stage of the assessment are also presented.

### Methodology

The purpose of the SA is to identify likely significant effects on the baseline /likely future baseline of the Plan. This has been achieved by assessing the plan against 16 Sustainable Indicators supported through a number of Site Specific Questions identified through the scoping process and which are collectively referred to as the SA Framework.

Due to the many uncertainties, there is a need to exercise caution when identifying effects. The appraisal findings contained within Appendix E (sites) and Appendix H (policies) have therefore been notably cautious. All likely significant effects are identified within the headings for each of the sites and policies, and commentary is provided in respect of all of the individual site assessments and remaining significant effects. The commentary should be read in conjunction with Appendix I (assumptions) which provides greater detail of assumptions made and includes context for significant effects.

The SA scoring is not a quantitative process but a qualitative one, it is also based on the professional judgement of officers. A single negative score against an objective could be so significant that even if other scores are positive an option may be rejected, or policy amended. Alternatively a negative score could be justifiable and not require any changes to be made.

In many instances, it has not been possible to predict whether significant effects are likely to occur, as opposed to only possibly occurring. This is most notable in respect to SA 7 (To reduce, manage and adapt to climate change). In these cases, the appraisal has undertaken a precautionary approach, recording any information which may result within the assumptions and commentary and recording a neutral or uncertain effect where it was not possible to conclude the nature of the effect. Despite these uncertainties, the appraisal has sought to focus on the merits or implications of the LPA.

It should be noted that in predicting the likely significant effects of the LPA, regard has been given to the criteria presented within the Environmental Assessment of Plan and Programmes Regulations 2004, Schedule 1. Where possible, the duration, frequency and reversibility of effects have been taken into account. Cumulative, synergistic and indirect effects have also been considered.

Table 8 below provides a key for the scoring mechanism.

Table 8 Scoring Mechanism

Scoring	Explanation
++	Significant positive effect on sustainability objective
+	Minor positive effect on sustainability objective
N	Neutral effect on sustainability objective
-	Minor negative effect on sustainability objective
--	Significant negative effect on sustainability objective
?	Uncertain effect on sustainability objective

The full results of the SA are provided in tables as the one below in Table 9

Table 9 Example Scoring Table

SA Objective	Site Specific Question	Score	Comment
To promote biodiversity protection enhancement and management of species and habitats	Will it conserve protected/priority species	<b>Double -</b>	There are protected species present on site and on land adjacent to the site 2016 survey data

## Summary of Findings

SA assessment was completed for each of the identified reasonable alternatives and full results are contained within Appendix E. Allocated sites summary impact are contained within Appendix F Sites and Appendix H policies.

## Assessment of Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects

In addition to the appraisal of individual policies and sites which may arise direct from policy and site implementation, the SEA Regulation (Annex 1f) requires consideration of the overall effect of the plan including secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects of the plan policies.

The SA Guidance (ODPM 2005) defines secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects as:


- Secondary (Indirect) effects are those that are not a direct result of the Development Plan, but occur away from the original effect or as a result of a complex pathway. These effects can be both positive and negative. Examples of secondary effects are a development that changes a water table and which, as a result, may affect the ecology of a wetland; or construction of one project that facilitates or attracts other development.
- Cumulative effects may arise where several developments each have insignificant effects but together have a significant effect, or where several individual effects of the plan have a combined effect result in noise disturbance or visual impact.
- Synergistic effects interact to produce a total effect greater than the sum of the individual effects. These can often occur as habitats, resources or communities get close to capacity. For example a wildlife habitat can become progressively fragmented to such an extent that there is insufficient space to support the species which have used the space in the past. On the other hand, beneficial synergistic effects may occur when a series of major transport, housing and employment developments in a sub-region, each with their own effects, collectively reach a critical threshold so that the developments as a whole and the community benefiting from them become more sustainable.

These terms are not mutually exclusive and in undertaking this assessment the term cumulative effects is taken to include secondary and synergistic effects

### Summary of Cumulative Effects

The detailed site specific questions included within the SA scoring matrix has enabled the identification of trends which identified a broad range of Cumulative effects. The significant positive and negative effects, uncertain effects have been summarised below using charts and commentary. In addition charts summarising of all the SA Objectives can be viewed in Appendix J.

Chart 1: To promote biodiversity protection, enhancements and management of species and habitats.




- The significant proportion of Double Negative effects can be accounted for by the identification of sites within the 0-15km zone of influence attached to the Cannock Chase SAC.



The level of development proposed through the LPA is line with the adopted Local Plan Strategy. This level of residential growth is mitigated through the approved Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Measures approved by the Cannock Chase partnership. The District Councils adopted Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 123 ensure obligations are secured to enable the implementation of identified mitigation measures. It is necessary for development to mitigate their impact on the Cannock Chase SAC.


- Further negative scores have been recorded against the loss of ecological connectivity, what is difficult to record at this point within the process is if at detailed design stage through the interpretation of adopted policy and support included within the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents mitigation could be identified.
- It is clear that the plan will have a negative impact on biodiversity and habitats and it should be noted that detailed survey work to confirm site detail at time of delivery and measures identified within Appendix I (assumptions) would to a large extent mitigate these effects.

Chart 2: To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/geological assets and landscape character of the district.




- The negative cumulative effects against this indicator result in large from the impact on landscape character. What was unclear at assessment is the opportunities that sites offer to improve and promote landscape character and connectivity providing mitigation for such impacts.
- In addition it is also unclear as the positive overall impact that the proposed amendments to the saved policies could have on delivering mitigation in term of cumulative effect in this regard most notably National Forest and AONB Policy.
- Comments received as part of the Regulation 19 consultation attached to the Focused Changes LPA lead to a small number (four) of preferred option sites receiving amended scores relating to Site Specific Question 7. These accounts for the small increase in single negative effects relating this indicator. Of those effects identified all can be mitigated through existing policies within the adopted Local Plan Strategy.

Chart 3: Seek and improve air soil and water quality




- The negative effects against this indicator result in large part from the impact of soils in terms of the loss of agricultural land. Whilst the LPA focused on delivering development on previously developed land there still remains an impact. What is uncertain is if any cumulative negative impact will result from the loss of individual areas. This uncertainty will need to be monitored to enable the mitigation measures if required.

Chart 4: Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth



- The significant negative effect against this indicator results in the loss of employment land for housing development. This could result in the cumulative effect of the District being unable to provide adequate employment provision and opportunities for economic growth. However placed within a broad policy context, the District Council Employment Land Review 2012 concludes that the District has an excess of employment land particularly B8, therefore this effect may not require mitigation, only appropriate monitoring.

Chart 5: To provide affordable homes that meet local need.



- In relation to its cumulative effects the LPA is largely positive and this should not be overlooked. In particular the LPA by its nature provides homes for the District SA Objective 11 and to a greater extent identifies a positive impact in terms of using existing resource well, SA Objective 5. As illustrated in Chart 4 and 5 respectively.

Chart 6: To maximise the use of previously developed land/buildings and the efficient use of land.





Chart 7: To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change.



- The site specific question should result in the identification of effects. However due to the nature of the LPA being predominately a site based document it was unclear as to the extent each site would have on the questions posed therefore a precautionary approach was taken and all sites scored neutral.
- An increase in the District contribution to greenhouse gas production (or exported production) is an almost inevitable consequence of the quantum of proposed development and includes factors such as increasing mobility, embedded energy in construction material and increased energy use from new housing and employment development. It is clear that the delivery of the LPA will have an impact on climate change. While the negative effect that may result are likely to be generational, none the less spatial planning has some influence over the manner in which places evolve and operate. Every effort should be made through the implementation of policy, supported by Supplementary Planning Documents and in combination with other external plans to mitigate these effects and to ensure adaption measures are put in place in a timely manner. The monitoring of this cumulative effect and mitigation will be reported through the Authorities Monitoring Report.

### Summary of Cumulative Effects

#### Negative

- Pressures on biodiversity and Landscape in both urban and undeveloped areas
- A reduction in landscape quality
- Loss of agricultural grade land
- Loss of existing employment land

#### Positive

- Provision of affordable homes
- Use of brownfield land.

#### Uncertain



In summary the vast majority of the objectives either sit comfortably alongside each other or have no effects. However a number have been identified as being potentially incompatible.


## Duration

As part of the Scoping Report that proceeded this assessment timescales for durational effects were identified as follows:

- Short term 0-5 years
- Medium term 6-10 years
- Long term 11 years plus

Table 11 below plots the preferred sites in regarding to rate of development over the plan period.

Table 11 Durational Effects



It is clear that in combination the plans effect in regard to housing will peak during the Short term, drop in volume but remain high in the Medium term, with effects falling dramatically at the point at the Long term is reached. However, within each 'term' there is very likely to be sites that have greater positive or negative effects than their counterparts. These individual peaks and troughs are best illustrated in Appendix F.

In regard to policy effects the majority will be consistent across the plan period with the peaks and trough identified above against housing and employment delivery. Effects positive or negative associated with Policy IP2: Lichfield Canal will have a far greater link to the timescales attached to the completion of the Lichfield Canal. Further Policy NR11 National Forest and Policy NR10 have defined restricted geographical areas and as such will only have effect when development in those areas is brought forward.

In regard to impact generated from Main Modifications on durational impacts, MM1: Local Plan Review states the following;

*“Lichfield District Council shall carry out an early review of the Local Plan for Lichfield that will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination in accordance with the latest Local Development Scheme or no later than the end of December 2021.”*

Whilst the policy will not impact on the likely significant impacts associated with the delivery of sites, impacts associated with certain policies will, to some extent, be curtailed after 2021. The significant impacts generated from the following policies will cease following the implementation of MM1, which will see policies reviewed and replaced.

Impacts from these policies occur directly at the point of implementation, there will not be any ongoing impacts and therefore all impacts being experienced within the Short Term period of the plan.

- Policy ST3: Road Line Safeguarding
- Policy E2: Services Access to our Centres
- Policy E3: Shop fronts and advertisements

These impacts (summarised in Appendix H) are overwhelmingly positive. There are however benefits associated with the duration restriction, most notably relating to significant negative impacts on Sustainability Objective 2 relating to Policy ST3.

The following policies will also fall within the requirements of MM1 (their impacts are identified in Appendix H). Implementation of these policies in the Short term period will result in impacts being experienced into the future. As such resulting in impacts continuing through to the Medium term period of the plan.

- Policy IP2: Lichfield Canal
- Policy EMP1: Employment Areas & Allocations
- Policy NR10: Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- Policy NR11: National Forest
- Policy BE2: Heritage Assets
- Policy Lichfield 3: Lichfield Economy

Due to the transport nature of the following policies it is considered that the impacts will continue through to the Long term period of the plan.

- Policy ST4: Road and Junction Improvements - Lichfield City
- Policy ST5: Road and Junction Improvements – Fradley

## Mitigation

The LPA follows the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy and a wide range of Supplementary Planning Documents. Local Plan Strategy was adopted in 2015. As well as providing a spatial strategy for the district it also contains a number of relevant Core Policies and Development Management Policies which will facilitate mitigation in response to significant negative effects identified as part of the LPA. Main Modification MM1 will after 2021 lead to the delivery of a set of replacement policies both Strategic and Non-Strategic in nature in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

In addition the district has adopted a number of Supplementary Planning Documents covering the following areas:

- Biodiversity and Development
- Developer Contributions



- Trees, Landscaping and Development
- Historic Environment
- Rural Development
- Sustainable Design

They build upon and provide more detailed advice and guidance on the policies within the Local Plan Strategy.

Within the LPA each allocation has a number of Key Development Considerations whilst not all encompassing they identify potential mitigation measures that may arise during the planning application process that applicants will need to address.

Lichfield District Council adopted its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging Schedule in April 2016. The District Councils Regulation 123 list sets out infrastructure requirements within may in whole or in part be funded through CIL. It is likely to mitigating actions will be supported by CIL.

It is also considered that additional measures contained within other plans, policies and programmes will also support mitigation e.g. Cannock Chase SAMM.

All five routes of mitigation have been designed to complement and reinforce one another and will enable a raft of mitigation responses to bring the plans impacts down to an acceptable level.

### Overall Conclusions

Overall, the level of development proposed by the publication version of the LPA accords with the identified needs of the District. The range of sites allocated by the LPA strike a balance between the need to protect the Districts valuable environmental assets, promote economic growth and deliver the spatial strategy for the District. Most importantly the LPA sits within the policy context of the Local Plan Strategy which has identified and outlined within policy the mitigation measures which are required to make development acceptable. Whilst the additional of MM1 will have an impact on the detail of these policies it is considered that the overarching requirements contained within the NPPF 2018 through Strategic and Non –Strategic policy will ensure the Development Plan for the District will continue to provide the ability to make development acceptable. It is therefore considered that these measures are sufficient to guard against adverse environmental effects. The SA is legally compliant, and provides robust basis in which to base decision making in terms of site and policy selection.



## 5What are the next steps (including monitoring)?

The SA Report must include:

- A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring

### Developing a Monitoring Framework

The SEA Directive requires the significant environmental effects of plans and programmes to be monitored, in order to identify at an early stage unforeseen adverse effects and to be able to take appropriate action where necessary.

The monitoring undertaken on the LPA will help to:

- Monitor the significant effects of the Plan
- Track whether the plan has had any unforeseen effects
- Ensure that action can be taken to reduce/offset the significant effects of the plan
- Provide baseline data for future sustainability appraisals, and
- Provide evidence of how the environment / sustainability criteria of the area is evolving.

The requirements of the SEA Directive focus on monitoring the effects of the Plan. This equates to both the plan's significant effects and also unforeseen effects. It may be difficult to implement monitoring mechanisms for unexpected effects, or to attribute such effects to the implementation of the Plan when they occur as often other plans, projects or programmes could all effect the quality of environment, economic performances or the social aspects of the Plan.

It is good practice for the monitoring of significant sustainability effects to be integrated with other monitoring of the Local Plan Strategy and LPA. For this reason, the Council will report significant effects as part of its existing monitoring regime. Proposed significant sustainability effects indicators are included in the Sustainability Appraisal Framework. These have been drawn from the baseline information and key sustainability issues identified within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report and are identified to monitor potential significant adverse effects highlighted in the main report.

A complete monitoring framework will be established prior to the Adoption of the Site Allocations Plan and the Authority Monitoring report updated to reflect the proposed framework.

### What happens next

Following the Examination of the LPA in September 2018 seven main modifications have been put forward. This documents has taken such modifications into consideration. Approval will be sort from the appropriate Council groups to undertake a seven week public consultation. Comments will be processed and consideration by the the inspector for consideration.

## Local Plan Allocations Sustainability Appraisal Appendices Contents

Please use the links below to view each appendix.

Appendix A – Amendments to SA Framework (LPS – LPA)

Appendix B – SA Scoping Report consultation responses

Appendix C – Review of published Plans, Policies, Strategies and Initiatives

Appendix D – Baseline, current state of the environment

Appendix E – Full SA Scoring Matrix

- Appendix E – Alrewas
- Appendix E – Armitage with Handsacre
- Appendix E – Burntwood
- Appendix E – East of Rugeley
- Appendix E – Employment
- Appendix E – Fazeley, Mile Oak & Bonehill
- Appendix E – Fradley
- Appendix E – North of Tamworth
- Appendix E – Other Rural
- Appendix E – Gypsy & Traveller
- Appendix E – Lichfield
- Appendix E – Shenstone
- Appendix E – Whittington
- Appendix E – Post Regulation 19

Appendix F – Allocated sites summary impacts

Appendix G – Table 6 Reasons for Preferred Alternatives Housing and Employment and Table 7 Reasons for Preferred Alternatives Gypsy and Travellers. \_

Appendix H – Saved policy summary

Appendix I - Assumptions

Appendix J – Cumulative effects summary

# **APPENDIX A – LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

## Appendix A Amendments to SA Framework

Revised Objective in SA Framework	Local Plan Strategy SA Objective	Reasons for Changes
1. To promote biodiversity protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats.	B. To promote biodiversity and Geodiveristy through the protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats.	The Geodiveristy element has been incorporated into SA Objective 2. To enable a clear distinction between the scope of each indicator.
2. To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of the District.	A. To maintain and enhance landscape and townscape quality. <b>Landscape Element.</b> B. To promote biodiversity and Geodiveristy through protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats. <b>Geodiveristy element.</b> C. To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting. <b>Archaeological Element</b>	SA objective two pulls to together the natural landscape elements enabling linkages which have in the previous SA been split. This amendment will avoid both duplication and provide clarity in regard to assessment.
3. To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting.	C. To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting.	No changes made apart from creating a number reference number.
4. Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrated effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas, and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character.	A. To maintain and enhance landscape and townscape quality.	The separation of Landscape and Townscape assessment better reflects the scope of the Local Plan Strategy. In addition, creating a separate design objective will enable townscape to be assessed as a whole leading to high quality design.
5. Maximise the use of previously developed land/buildings and the efficient use of land.	A. To maintain and enhance landscape and townscape quality.	Objective included to reflect accurately the Local Plan Strategy.

Revised Objective in SA Framework	Local Plan Strategy SA Objective	Reasons for Changes
6. Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of transport and increased opportunities for non-car travel.	G. To improve availability of sustainability of sustainable transport options to jobs and services. I. To create mixed and balanced communities.	Wording amended to enable scope of indicator to include the need to travel which was previously measured through Detailed Criteria in Objective I. The amended wording enables the link between development patterns and transport infrastructure to also be established.
7. To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change.	D. To mitigate and adapt to the effects of Climate Change	Wording amendment to enable the reduction element to be included within the assessment which then better reflects the scope of the Local Plan Strategy, Allocations and supporting Supplementary Planning Documents.
8. To minimise waste and increase the reuse and recycling of water materials.	E. To encourage prudent use of natural resources	The Original Sustainability Objective E is now reflected in the following focused indicators 5, 8 and 9.
9 Seek to improve air, soil and water quality.	E. To encourage prudent use of natural resources.	The Original Sustainability Objective E was generic. Sustainability Objective 9 has a clear specific scope.
10 To reduce and manage flood risk.	F. To reduce flood risk	Wording amendment to enable scope to include 'manage flood risk'.
11 To provide affordable homes that meet local need.	I. To create mixed and Balanced communities	The Original Sustainability Objective I was generic. Sustainability Objective 11 has a clear specific scope.
12 To improve services and access to services to produce good health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	K. To improve the health of the population.	Wording amendments to reflect both access to healthcare and wider wellbeing.

Revised Objective in SA Framework	Local Plan Strategy SA Objective	Reasons for Changes
13 To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime.	J. To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime.	No changes made apart from creating a number reference number.
14 Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth.	I. To create mixed and Balanced communities H. To encourage sustainable distribution and communication systems.	Economic Impact was assessed in the Original Sustainability Indicator through the combination of two cross cutting indicators. Creation of a focused indicator is reflective of the Local Plan Strategy and will enable robust assessment of impact.
15 To enhance the vitality and viability of existing, city, town and village centres within the district.	A. To maintain and enhance landscape and townscape quality. I. To create mixed and balanced communities	Not included in any detail in the Original Sustainability Indicators scope. Added to reflect Local Plan Strategy.
16 Increase participation and improve access to education, skills-based training, knowledge and information, and lifelong learning.	N/A	No previous SA indicator, Detailed Criteria or Suggested Target or indicator recognises education education/skills and its link to economic sustainability. Whilst baseline indicators illustrate Lichfield District performs well in regard to educational attainment, the Economic Development Strategy 2016/2020 for the district confirms that access to skills and education is fundamental achieving sustainable economic development.

Appendix A

Note Objective: **Sustainable Objective L: To enable improved community participation**, which was assessed against the following **Detailed Criteria** has not been incorporated into the amended Sustainability Objectives.

- 51 Will it empower all sections of the community to participate in decision-making and the impacts of those decisions?
- 52 Will it improve community capacity to enable engagement in community enterprise?
- 53 Is there a framework for engagement with communities, including novel approaches to reach particular groups/sectors?

**Justification**

In broad terms the amended Sustainability Objectives have been written within the context of the adopted Local Plan Strategy, Neighbourhood Plans and a recently adopted Statement of Community Involvement. Each of these documents provide for and facilitate for engagement in the Plan-making and Decision-taking processes. In addition a review of the baseline data did not identify excluded communities who may require tailored intervention.

**Original SA Objectives**

A. To maintain and enhance landscape and townscape quality.	J. To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime.
B. To promote biodiversity and geodiversity through protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats.	K. To improve the health of the population
C. To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting.	L. To enable improved community participation.
D. To mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	
E. To encourage prudent use of natural resources.	
F. To reduce flood risk.	
G. To improve availability of sustainability of sustainable transport options to jobs and services.	
H. To encourage sustainable distribution and communication systems.	
I. To create mixed and balanced communities.	





# **APPENDIX B (i) – LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SCOPING REPORT: CONSULTATION SHEET**

## Local Plan Allocations Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report: Consultation Sheet

Responses with a green background are the final proposed responses, those with a red background represent previous responses that have now been amended. Table 1 represents the responses that were presented to the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2016 EGED Overview and Scrutiny.

Table 1:

Comment	Response
<b>Statutory Organisation: Historic England</b>	
Historic England has published guidance on the SA/SEA process and the historic environment which may be of interest – this can be found at <a href="https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/strategic-environ-assessment-sustainability-appraisal-historic-environment/SA_SEA_final.pdf">https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/strategic-environ-assessment-sustainability-appraisal-historic-environment/SA_SEA_final.pdf</a> . This includes a list of international, national and local plans and programmed that could usefully supplement the list on pages 14-16.	<p>Duly noted,  <b>Recommendation</b>            The following documents will be included in the review of Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNESCO World Heritage Convention 1979</li> <li>• European Landscape Convention (Florence Convention)</li> <li>• The Convention for the protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada Convention).</li> <li>• The European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (Valetta Convention)</li> <li>• National Policy Statement for Waste Water March 2012</li> <li>• National Policy Statement for Energy July 2011</li> <li>• Streets for all: Guidance for Practitioners- English Heritage's regional manuals on the design and management of streets and public open spaces</li> </ul>
We welcome the section on the built and natural environment baseline data on page 20. In our view, this should be expanded to include data on Heritage at Risk within the district ( <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/</a> ) as well	<p>Duly Noted            Information requested is contained within the following sections of Appendix B  <b>Main Heading</b></p>

as locally designated heritage assets. The Staffordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) will also offer information to identify areas that have a high potential for archaeology.	Archaeology <b>Sub Headings</b> Landscape Character Historic Farmsteads Historic Environment Conservation Areas Listed Buildings <b>Recommendation</b> None
We also welcome SA objectives 2, 3, and 4 – all of which relate to the historic environment to differing degrees.	Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> None
In terms of the last two boxes of page 25, it would be helpful to be consistent and insert some text explaining <b>Why</b> the sustainability objective is included. As per the objectives across pages 24-30. Here, this could be along the lines of 'To ensure new development does not affect the significance of the local historic environment.	Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> Insert <i>"To ensure new development does not affect the significance of the local historic environment"</i> . In the why sections for Objective 2 and 3 pages 25.
In the last section of page 25 we feel that there is something of a disconnect between the proposed decision making criteria and the suggested indicators. We do not feel that the suggested indicators would be able to clearly demonstrate whether the Local Plan Allocations documents had positively or otherwise addressed the baseline findings. This could be addressed by inserting a new question 5, along the lines of 'Will it offer opportunities to bring heritage assets back into active use?'	Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> Against the <b>Detailed Decision Making Criteria</b> relating to SA indicator 3 include the addition of the following question: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it offer opportunities to bring heritage assets back into active use?</li> </ul>
The text against <b>Why</b> in the first box on page 26 could be extended to include the words '...jobs and services <i>and to ensure the retention of local distinctiveness and character</i> '.	Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> Amend the <b>Why</b> sentence relating to SA indicator 4.  <b>Why</b>

	To reduce the need to travel through closer integration of housing, jobs and services and to ensure the retention of local distinctiveness and character.
In relation to possible mitigation strategies we would note that the NPPF makes clear that harm should always be avoided in the first instance in relation to mitigation be considered – any harm and mitigation proposals need to be fully justified and evidenced to ensure they will be successful in reducing harm.	Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> none
<b>Statutory Organisation: Natural England</b>	
We acknowledge the passage of time since the SA for the LPS took place and have aimed to facilitate the Council achieving the relevant outcomes described in the NPPF with a focus in particular upon maximising opportunities and recognising synergies between the various interests themes.	Duly noted (support for the amendments to the SA Objectives) <b>Recommendation</b> none
NE advises that the council scopes in issues only where there are likely to be significant effects (either positive or negative). We recognise that a balance needs to be struck between a robust review of the evidence base now, as compared with that in 2007. We offer advice below on those themes and issues where we believe SA/SEA can add particular value to the allocations stage of the LPS.	Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</b> “The allocations Document will be developed in conformity with the LPS (2015) spatial strategy. It is therefore considered that accepted mitigation measures are sufficient to support the Allocations Documents.” (p6 HRA). We accept this approach in principle provided that no substantive issues have been pushed down to HRA at the project level (e.g. Hatherton & Lichfield canal restoration project) that might benefit from further consideration on the basis of new information that has been added to the evidence base since the SA for the LPS.	Duly Noted. Confirmation that no additional information has been submitted in regard to the Hatherton & Lichfield Canal Transportation Project. Mindful that during the SA process that the existing mitigation measures remain if amendments are required these are addressed in the SA process. Recommend direct discussions with Natural England. <b>Recommendation</b> None

<p><b>Sources of info</b></p> <p>Sources of Good Practice/Information</p> <p>NE has a range of data sources that may be useful in the production of an SA. Our data sets are now all downloadable and responsible authorities should be referred to the website at (weblink). Other data sources include:</p> <p>MAGIC (Defra's GIS package for environmental assets)</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment for National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty</p> <p>Management Plans for National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty</p> <p>SSI/European Sites condition assessments</p> <p>National Character Areas</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>none</p>
<p><b>Comments on the detail</b></p> <p><b>1. Relationship with other relevant plans and programmes</b></p> <p>Please refer to our comments above regarding the balance to be struck between checking and updating the evidence base and the opportunity, in recognition of the subsidiary nature of site allocations to the overall Local Plan Strategy, to adopt an approach to SA/SEA at the allocations stage which focuses in on a finer grain of detail consistent with the nature of site allocations.</p> <p>We welcome the comprehensive list included in the report and note that the Cannock Chase Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Measures (SAMMM) and the R.Mease SAC related plans have been included in the regional and local plans and programmes evidence base respectively.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>
<p><b>2. The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and their likely evolution without implementation of the plan or programme.</b></p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>

<p>We are satisfied that the relevant aspects of the environment have been identified but we offer comments below on how the sustainability objectives arising from a sustainable development approach employing multi-functional green infrastructure.</p>	
<p><b>3. The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.</b></p> <p>We are satisfied that the environmental characteristics of the <u>district</u> have been identified.</p> <p>At this stage, over and above existing initiatives such as the River Mease and Cannock Chase SAC projects the scoping report does not appear to explicitly identify further locations likely to be significantly affected in terms of landscape and biodiversity.</p> <p>We comment separately (below) on sources of information that may be used to help inform subsequent stages of the SA/SEA process for those areas e.g. Cannock Chase AONB and its setting (AONB 'special qualities' and National Character Area profile 'Statements of Environmental Opportunity').</p>	<p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> None.</p> <p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> Section 4: Baseline Information inclusion of a Landscape focused paragraph under Built and Natural Environment heading.</p> <p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> None</p>
<p>In terms of wider themes we note the district's high levels of car use and 'out commuting'. The Council should consider related air quality impacts on 'ecological receptors' (semi natural habitats and their wildlife) in order to understand potential effects arising from site allocations The Highway Agency 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' provides the accepted methodology for the assessment of such impacts while the Air Pollution Information System (APIS) describes the nature and</p>	<p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> The following site specific question will be added to Table 1 against Sustainability Objective Seek to improve air, soil and water quality.</p>

causes of adverse impacts on ecological receptors from air pollution.	
<p><b>4. Existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme</b></p> <p>We welcome the reports reference to the River Mease SAC and Cannock Chase SAC in relation to environmental pressures on these European designated sites.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>
<p><b>5. The environmental protection objectives relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation</b></p> <p>Biodiversity – “1. To promote biodiversity and through protection, enhancement and management of species and Habitats”.</p> <p>Is this a Typo? Should it read” To promote biodiversity through the protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats?</p> <p>6. To reduce, manage and adopt to the impacts of climate change” – Typo - <u>adapt</u> to...</p> <p>Table 1- Allocations Scoping report Sustainability Objectives – Comments on the “ Detailed decision making questions” and “detailed indicators”</p> <p>Biodiversity – ‘Site specific questions’. We would encourage you to consider the ‘helicopter view’ i.e. district wide, parish, groups of sites. A focus on each specific site (individually) may overlook SA/SEA issues that are relevant at a larger scale and contribute to decision over which individual sites (or groups of sites) should</p>	<p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> Amend Sustainability Objective Number 1 to read: To promote biodiversity through the protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats. Page 23, 24</p> <p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> Amend Sustainability Objective 7 to read: To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change. Page 23, 29.</p> <p>Duly Noted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation.</b></p> <p>See amended Site Specific Questions and indicators listed against Staffordshire County Council : Ecology rep box three.</p>

<p>proceed. A 'cascade' approach may be needed from the district down to the individual site. This approach reflects the Lawton Review whereby biodiversity is safeguarded for the future by achieving a biodiversity resource which is 'Bigger, better, more and joined'. Please refer also to our comments below regarding multifunctional green infrastructure.</p>	
<p>"Site specific questions – 3. What affect will there be on green corridors/water courses. Will it reduce/eliminate fragmentation/wildlife connectivity"</p>	<p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> None</p>
<p>We welcome this question as a test to establish the specific site's contribution to the connectivity and wider context issues we have commented on above.</p>	
<p>Detailed indicators e.g. "Amount of priority habitat created/recreated – lowland/heathland"</p>	
<p>A simpler and more practical approach may be to step back from individual habitat types and simply seek to express the amount of green infrastructure and/or priority habitat created, restored or maintained as part of that site allocation. It is difficult to see how the SA/SEA process can accurately predict a finer grain of detail than this. However reference to biodiversity opportunity maps, the relevant National Character Area profile and Staffordshire County Council's 'planning for Landscape Change' SPD may be helpful in understanding which parts of the district would be most suited to a particular type of semi-natural habitat(s).</p>	<p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> See amended Site Specific Questions and indicators listed against Staffordshire County Council : Ecology rep box three</p>
<p>Detailed indicators: 4. Number of hectares of Local Nature Reserves 5. Number and type of internationally/nationally designated sites</p>	<p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation</b></p>



<p>6. Number of species relevant to the district which have achieved BAP Veteran trees, ancient woodland.</p> <p>It isn't clear from the SA scoping report how these types of indicators would help us understand the SA/SEA performance of the proposed sites.</p>	<p>See amended Site Specific Questions and indicators listed against Staffordshire County Council : Ecology rep box three</p>
<p>Sustainability objective – 'To protect and enhance the rich diversity of natural archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of the district'.</p> <p>Site Specific questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it promote and maintain an attractive and diverse landscape</li> <li>2. Will it protect areas of highest landscape quality</li> <li>3. Will it improve areas of lower landscape quality</li> <li>4. Will the development create a new landscape character.</li> </ol> <p>We refer the Council to the Statements of Environmental Opportunity (SEO) for the relevant NCA profile and the 'special qualities' of the Cannock Chase AONB (see AONB Management Plan 2014-19).</p> <p>Where proposals are for over 100 homes and/or 3Ha in extent Natural England consider this may represent a strategic site. Landscape &amp; Visual Impact Assessment should be carried out accordingly. The following NPPF material is relevant:</p> <p>Para 17. Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land use planning principles should underpin plan-making .....planning should... take account of the different roles and character of different areas, ... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.</p>	<p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b></p> <p>The following indicator will be added to the Site Specific Questions Table 1 related to the Sustainability Objective 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proximity to an internationally or nationally designated landscape</li> <li>2. In terms of Landscape Character Types what is the sites sensitivity rating?</li> <li>3. Proximity to an internationally or nationally designated geodiversity sites</li> <li>4. Is it on previously undeveloped land?</li> <li>5. Does it offer the opportunity to promote landscape connectivity?</li> <li>6. Does it offer the opportunity to improve or create the landscape character of the District?</li> </ol> <p>The following questions will remain.</p> <p>Will it improve existing green infrastructure including National Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiatives.</p> <p>Will it prevent the sterilisation of mineral resources.</p> <p>In addition the Assumption Appendix will provide further clarity in regard to assessment.</p>

<p>Para 109 The Planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes...</p> <p>Para 170 Where appropriate, landscape character assessments should also be prepared, integrated with assessment of historic landscape character, and for areas where there are major expansion options assessments of landscape sensitivity.</p>	
<p>Site Specific questions</p> <p>5. Will it improve existing green infrastructure including national Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative.</p> <p>We welcome this question and refer you to ur comments above regarding the need to consider the context for each site in terms of the adverse impacts or positive opportunities it presents in terms of SA/SEA , from the district level down to the site specific level.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None.</p>
<p>Detailed Indicator: 3 The proportion of housing completions on sites of 10 or more which have been supported, at the planning applications stage by an appropriate and effective landscape character and visual assessment with appropriate landscape proposals.</p> <p>AGI led approach would help provide the framework for such mitigation (&amp; enhancement) measures.</p>	<p>Duly Noted. The adopted Local Plan Strategy and Supplementary Planning Document support the delivery of Green Infrastructure holistic approach.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>
<p>Sustainability Objective: Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrate effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas, and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character.</p> <p>NCA profiles and SCC 'Planning for landscape change' SPD contribute to the evidence base and would help to facilitate a GI</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the Site Specific Questions relating to the Sustainability Objective 2, See above.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>

<p>led approach. The Site Allocations part of the local plan process provides a platform for the implementation of the strategic approach in the LPS. Clear linkage between the allocated sites' performance in terms of offering opportunities e.g. improvements in <u>Landscape character</u> and <u>creating and linking GI</u> would be desirable and positive.</p>	
<p>Sustainability Objective – “Maximise the use of previously developed land/buildings and the efficient use of Land”  Site specific questions –formatting typo to correct.  Detailed indicator – “% of permissions granted on previously developed land as a % of previously developed land available within the District”.</p> <p>We refer you to our comments above on landscape character and multifunctional GI. Regarding the wording of the detailed indicator – would <u>numbers of units</u> be valuable too? i.e. to give a sense of the <u>scale</u> as well as the percentage balance being achieved.</p>	<p>Duly Noted  <b>Recommendation</b>  Table 1 Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Questions, amend bullet point 3 to read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would the development of the site involve the loss of greenfield?</li> </ol> <p>Bullet point 4 to be removed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Would the development of the site involve the loss of gardens?</li> </ol> <p>Table 1 Sustainability Objective 5, Detailed Indicator, amend to read:</p> <p>% of permissions granted on previously developed land.</p> <p>Table 1 Sustainability Objective 5 Detailed Indicator add.</p> <p>Number of homes granted permission on previously developed land.</p>
<p>Sustainability Objective – “Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of</p>	<p>Duly Noted  <b>Recommendation</b></p>

<p>development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of travel and increased opportunities for non-car travel”.</p> <p>Our comments about ‘site specific questions’ apply equally here. The performance of individual sites in terms of SA/SEA will reflect their strategic location and relationship with existing infrastructure. Detailed indicators should refer to sustainable transport links (bus routes, cycleway and paths) created or enhanced through the provision of multi-functional GI.</p>	<p>Add the following against Table 1 Sustainability Objective 6 Detail Indicator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to bus services</li> <li>• Access to cycle ways</li> <li>• Increase in the provision of multi-functional space: cycle and walking networks that include green Infrastructure gain.</li> </ul> <p>Remove the following Indicators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic Counts on selected strategic roads in the District</li> <li>2. Journey to work by mode</li> <li>3. Access to bus services</li> </ol> <p>In addition see recommended amendments made against SCC highway comments.</p> <p>In addition the assumptions will further link sites to existing sustainable transport infrastructure.</p>
<p>We welcome reference to sustainable transport links under the sustainability objectives for climate change mitigation and adaption.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>
<p><b>6 The likely significant effects on the environment</b></p> <p>1. Biodiversity – Themes 11, 14, and 15 are recorded as ‘potential incompatibility’. We acknowledge the potential, however this is a matter of perspective as multifunctional GI offers a model whereby these themes (11, 14 and 15) within SA/SEA can positively benefit from multi-functional GI.</p> <p>Similar comments apply in respect of themes 2 (with regard to 11 and 14) and 4 (with regard to 11).</p>	<p>Duly Noted. We are aware of and understand the potential opportunities which could be identified, they feature as key compounds within a number of the Districts SPD’s.</p> <p>Amendments to Site Specific Questions and Detailed Indicators relating to Sustainability Objective 1, 6 and 2 do however further identify the benefits of GI and identify the linkages.</p>

	<p>However, a significant benefits are likely to only become apparent at detailed design stage and secured through application.</p> <p>As such 'potential incompatibility' remains.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> None</p>
<p><b>7 The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan and programme.</b></p> <p><u>Soils</u> The site allocations SA/SEA should consider the scale of impacts arising from the proposed housing and employment site resources across the district and describe what avoidance and mitigation measures may be used to minimise loss of the district's soil resource including 'best and most versatile land'. Site allocations' performance in this respect should form an important criteria for inclusion in the site selection decision-making process.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Sustainability Objective 9: Seek to improve air, soil and water quality.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Table 1 sustainability Indicator 9, the following Soil related Detailed Indicator to be added.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of permissions granted on previously developed land.</li> </ul> <p>No further amendments are recommended see response to comments made by the Environment Agency.</p>
<p><u>Climate Change &amp; green infrastructure (GI)</u> A positive opportunity arises in respect of this site allocations stage in the local plan process. Synergies between climate change mitigation/adaption and multi-functional GI are strong and have recently been expressed as 'nature based solutions'. These address the value of nature for people and what bio diverse, multifunctional green infrastructure can do for us. It has the potential to: Cool buildings, reduce need for air conditioning, reduce 'urban heat island' effect, help reduce flooding and water pollution, provide recreation and green transport routes, store carbon, increase biodiversity, health, climate change adaption.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Amendments have been made to the Sustainability Objective 6 in relation to GI and sustainable transport links. Adopted SPD's clearly outline the role of GI in addressing Climate Change.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> None</p>

SA/SEA criteria might include – location (relative to existing development), proximity to public transport routes/routes that could be reinstated, massing/orientation opportunities (topography/aspect – solar gain) etc.	
<b>Statutory Organisation :Environment Agency</b>	
<b>Environmental Issues</b> From an EA perspective, the River Mease SAC is probably the most important area of protection in the district. The section in Lichfield District however, is relatively rural and is unlikely to be subject to much development, unlike further up the catchment in North West Leicestershire that is more urbanized and has more pressure on it. The most likely threats in Lichfield District are from farming, i.e. pesticides/ammonia/grazing on the banks and non-mains foul drainage systems on small developments not working properly. We would not therefore expect significant impacts on this are when applying the SA Framework to the Site Allocation process.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> None
With reference to the flood risk element, we would concur that the main areas of floodplain are in the rural areas of the River Trent and Tame valleys so would expect very few if any, greenfield sites to be allocated in the floodplains given the extensive areas of Floodplain Zone 1 around our major settlements and elsewhere.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Sustainability Framework</b> For the Sustainability Framework, we suggest you consider a follow up question for the Sustainability Objective 'To reduce and manage flood risk'. Following the question Is the site located outside an area at risk from flooding? Does it pass the Sequential Test? This will help to ascertain whether a site is that in in the floodplain is there legitimately form a policy perspective.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Table 1 page 24, To reduce and manage flood risk add the following questions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Does the site pass the Sequential Test?</li></ul>

<p>We suggest Green/blue Corridors to refer to green networks and watercourses together in the objective To promote Biodiversity through protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Table 1 Page 24 Sustainability Objective 1, To promote biodiversity and through protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats, Site Specific Question 3 amend from</p> <p>3 What affect will there be on green corridors /water courses?</p> <p>To</p> <p>3 What affect will there be on green networks and watercourses?</p>
<p>The objective Seek to improve air, soil and water quality – Will it reduce water pollution? Is not particularly clear or specific. For example, just off site or in the nearest watercourse? What type of pollution – Foul, runoff from developments as suspended solids such as dirt or oil/petrol? There is probably only one scenario where water quality issues could not be overcome and that would be lack of foul capacity going into the River Mease SAC for example. Depending on what type of water pollution you had in mind, you could ask whether the development would be likely to utilise SuDs or whether there is capacity in the receiving Sewage Treatment works; you may have this information to hand from either a Water Cycle Study or an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	<p>Duly Noted. Agree that the effect of new development on water quality will depend on factors such as whether there is capacity at the relevant sewage treatment works to accommodate the new development, which cannot be assessed at this stage unless directly related to sites within the River Mease SAC. It is recognised that Development Management Policies (Policy NR9: Water Quality) may require any necessary upgrades to be made before development proceeds.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Table 1, Sustainability Objective : Seek to improve air, soil and water quality amend as follows;</p> <p><b>Why</b></p> <p>To reduce air, water and soil pollution.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Questions</b></p> <p>Which Source Protection Zone does the development fall within?</p>

	<p>Does the site fall within River Mease SAC?</p> <p>Is the site within or directly connected by road to an AQMA?</p> <p>Is the site mainly or entirely on brownfield land?</p> <p>If the site is on greenfield land which class of agricultural quality is it?</p>
<p><b>Document List</b> In this document list, I cannot see the Planning Practice Guide included anywhere. This offers lots of useful advice on Policy Guidance for Water Quality, Sustainability Drainage and Flood Risk amongst much else. Locally, you may also wish to review the Tame Valley Wetlands Landscape Partnership Scheme (TVWLPS) Landscape Conservation action Plan (LCAP) in order to assess any impacts or potential conflict with the Site Allocations.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Insert the following under the National Planning Practice Guidance (2014) reference in Appendix A page 56</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance (2014)</p> <p>The National Planning Practice Guidance provides technical guidance in topic areas in order to support policies set out within the NPPF. It aims to allow for sustainable development as guided by the NPPF.</p> <p>The allocation documents should seek to ensure that it reflects the objectives</p> <p>Insert the following under CAMS: Staffordshire Trent Valley Abstraction Licensing Strategy, Environment Agency (2013) reference in Appendix A page 70</p> <p>Tame Valley Wetlands Landscape Partnership Scheme Landscape Conservation Action Plan</p> <p>Landscape scale approach to restoring conserving and reconnecting the physical and cultural landscape of the Tame Valley.</p> <p>Allocations within the identified wetland area should consider the key priorities of the vision.</p>
<b>Staffordshire County Council</b>	



Thank you for consulting SCC on the SA scoping report we acknowledge that we are not a statutory consultee and appreciate the opportunity to input in relation to the Duty to Co-operate and joint working. We will seek to engage with you throughout the plan preservation including the SA as it is produced.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> none
We are content with the general approach set out in the scope and support the incorporation of a Health Impact Assessment in to the SA. We would suggest that you should engage with us on evidence gathering and preparation of the SA moving forward.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> none
<b>Staffordshire County Council: Highways</b>	
<b>Section 4</b> Baseline information – transport (page 22) the bus accessibility statistic should be updated to 71% for Lichfield City or 61% for Lichfield District which is accurate to October 2016 bus timetable information	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Page 22 para 2 change 83% to 71%.
<b>Appendix B</b> p 108, row relating to Traffic Congestion – could the last bullet point be changed to say ‘manage routing of heavy commercial vehicles and consider the provision of lorry park at Fradley.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Page 108 Traffic Congestion Bullet 10 Replace with “Manage routing of heavy commercial vehicles and consider the provision of lorry park at Fradley”.
<b>Table 1</b> Allocation Scoping Report Sustainability Objectives – for the sustainability objective ‘reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development. Efficient use of existing sustainable modes of travel and increased opportunities of non-car travel’ includes the following site specific questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it use and enhance existing transport infrastructure</li> <li>2. Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment</li> <li>3. Will it reduce journeys undertaken by car by encouraging alternatives modes of transport.</li> <li>4. Will it increase accessibility to services and facilities</li> </ol>	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> None

<p><b>5. Will it reduce the overall impact on traffic sensitive areas.</b></p>	
<p>It may be useful to separate out walking and cycling from bus and rail to highlight the differences between sites. The most sustainable sites are those where residents can utilise public transport as well as access services and facilities by walking in and cycling. Superfast broadband, home working and car sharing would be ways to reduce trips by car.</p>	<p>Duly noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Add the following site specific questions to Sustainability Objective 6 page 29 enable separation and improve the ability to accurately score sites.</p> <p>Will it help to develop walking and cycling networks to enable residents to access to employment, services and facilities?</p> <p>Will it help develop bus and rail transport networks to access employment, services and facilities?</p>
<p><b>Question 2</b> may be difficult to score as none of the sites are likely to lead to road schemes apart from site accesses but the delivery of a walk and cycle route can have negative impacts on the environment. For example a cycle route is unacceptable it is crosses and environmentally sensitive area; lighting in walk/cycle bridge is unacceptable for bats; air quality issues due to buses; and the selection of paving; signing; coloured paint on roads requires careful selection in a conservation area.</p>	<p>Duly noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Remove Question 2 Sustainability Objective 6 page 29. The question is included as part amendments proposed in previous recommendations and will enable clear scoring.</p>
<p><b>Question 3</b> no development can reduce journeys undertaken by car. We are working to provide development in the most sustainable locations to enable the new residents to undertake as many journeys as possible by non-car modes. The question used in the previous sustainability appraisal is better phrased 'will it provides opportunities to reduce trips by car?'</p>	<p>Duly noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Replace Question 3 Sustainability Objective 6 page 29 Will it reduce journeys undertaken by car by encouraging alternative modes of transport? With Will it provide opportunities to reduce trips by car?</p>
<p><b>Question 4</b> can relate to increased accessibility to services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport or to the</p>	<p>Duly noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

provision of additional services and facilities by the development itself.	Remove Question 4.
<b>Staffordshire County Council: Ecology</b>	
The statement on page 6 in regard of Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) only applies if the site allocations for residential are in accordance with spatial strategy figures within the 15km zone of influence on the Cannock Chase SAC and that windfalls have not meant that the proposed figures will be exceeded. Should housing allocation figures be above the assessed in HRA of the spatial strategy further HRA will be required. The Cannock Chase SAC Partnership is in the process of commissioning assessment of the impacts of increased housing allocations to enable impacts and mitigation requirements to be assessed.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> None
The Built and Natural Environment section on page 20 fails to mention the natural environment including sites of international and national importance let alone locally important sites and habituates and species of principal importance. Neither is landscape character mentioned. This is a significant omission.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> See landscape comments
In Table 1 Indicators for designated sites should refer to site condition rather than number of sites as the number of sites or their size is not within Local Plan influence. Sites outside the District but affected by the Plan need to be included – e.g. Cannock Chase SAC and the River Mease SAC outside of the District. We recommend the indicator be percentage of international/national sites in favourable condition. This reflects Natural England condition assessment phraseology. An indicator for Local Wildlife Sites (sites of Biological Importance) should be included.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> The following text will replace the Detailed Decision Making Criteria and Detailed Indicator information that relates to Sustainability Objective Table 1.  <b>Detailed Decisions making Criteria</b>  <b>Why</b> <b>Site Specific Questions:</b> 1. What affect will there be on protected/priority species 2. What affect will there be on priority habitats and local nature conservation sites?

	<p>3. What affect will there be on statutory designated sites?</p> <p>4. What affect will there be on veteran trees?</p> <p>5. What affect will there be on green corridors and water courses?</p> <p>6. Will it reduce ecological connectivity?</p> <p>7. What affect will there be on the RIGS site</p> <p><b>Detailed Indicator</b></p> <p>1. Performance SBAP Action Plan Targets</p> <p>2. Amount of priority habitat created, restored or maintained as part of the site allocation.</p> <p>3. Amount of green and blue infrastructure restored or maintained as part of the site allocation</p> <p>4. Increased links between woodland, hedgerows, copes, individual trees – including veteran and aged trees.</p> <p>5. Number of and area of RIGS within the District.</p>
We also note that the proposed indicators fail to answer most of the questions and recommend a rethink.	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>See amended Table 1 Sustainability Objective 1 Detailed Decision Making Criteria and Detailed Indicator above.</p>
There is no mention of water quality or ecological status despite Water Framework Directive requirements for Local Plans to contribute to objectives.	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>See amended Table 1 Sustainability Objective 1 Detailed Decision Making Criteria and Detailed Indicator above</p>
In Table 1 there appears to be a typo in the biodiversity Detailed Indicator column for item 1 which should read Lowland Heathland (i.e. without the slash). There appears to be a typo in the biodiversity Detailed Indicator column for item 3 which should read either wildflower grassland or species-rich grassland.	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>See amended Table 1 Sustainability Objective 1 Detailed Decision Making Criteria and Detailed Indicator above.</p>

<p>There appears to be a typo in the biodiversity Detailed indicator column for item 6 which makes no sense as worded.</p>	
<p><b>Appendix A</b> There is missing text under Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan (SBAP ) On page 66</p>	<p>Duly Noted  <b>Recommendation</b>            Typo amendment Appendix A page 66 Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan in the key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal</p> <p>Amend 4 to 14</p> <p>And also include the following bullet points</p> <p>Cannock Heath            Central Farmlands            River Gravels</p>
<p><b>Appendix A</b> In regard of the Cannock Chase SAC Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Measures (SAMM) (should be SAMMM) on page 68 of the text regarding Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal is incorrect. The SAMMM will not shape the assessment of significant effects. Its purpose is to provide mitigation of Local Plan impacts already identified.</p>	<p>Duly Noted  <b>Recommendation</b>            Typo amendment Appendix A page 68 SAMM to SAMMM.</p> <p>Page 68 Amend text against Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal section of the SAMMM entry to read</p> <p>The SAMMM mitigates for planned housing growth within the 0-15km zone of influence and identified in the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
<p><b>Appendix B</b> There are errors in the Nature Conservation Sites Section. It is Chasewater and Southern Staffordshire Coalfields Heath SSSI. Local Wildlife Sites are Sites of Biological Importance. Cannock Chase AONB is not a nature conservation site. AONBs are designated for landscape quality. The section of Biodiversity is inadequate and fails to reference species or</p>	<p>Duly Noted  <b>Recommendation</b>            Appendix B Page 99 Nature Conservation Sites amend typo Chasewater and Southern Staffordshire Coalfields to Chasewater and Southern Staffordshire Coalfields Heath.</p>

<p>Staffordshire Ecological Record which is the data holder for the data that will be essential for monitoring</p>	<p>Appendix B Page 99 Nature Conservation Sites amend typo Sites of Biological Interest to Sites of Biological Importance</p> <p>Remove reference to Cannock Chase AONB and reposition in the additional Landscape Section. See response to SCC Landscape representation for further information.</p> <p>Add the following text: There are 78 SBI's within Lichfield District; however the total number of sites changes periodically. Up to date information on these sites and their boundaries is provided by Staffordshire Ecological Record.</p> <p>Add the following text: Lichfield District contains a wide variety of species which are defined by and received protection under domestic or European Legislation. Particular protected species that have been encountered within Lichfield District include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bats</li> <li>• Birds</li> <li>• Great crested newts</li> <li>• White clawed crayfish</li> <li>• Water voles</li> <li>• Otters</li> <li>• Badgers</li> <li>• Invertebrates</li> <li>• Reptiles</li> <li>• Plant species</li> </ul>
<p><b>Staffordshire County Council: Landscape</b></p>	
<p>Section 3 European Landscape convention (Florence 2002)</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b></p>

	Include European Landscape convention (Florence 2002) within list of International documents page 14 and Appendix A
Section 4 Built and Natural Environment perhaps this heading would be better titled Cultural Heritage	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> None
There should be a separate paragraph dealing with Landscape Character, which is not the same as Historic Landscape Characterisation, although an understanding of landscape character is informed by Historic Landscape Characterisation. The National Character Area Profiles published by Natural England provide broad scale characterisation, and Planning For Landscape Change which contains more fine grained county level landscape character descriptions Web link. Although Planning For Landscape Change is under review it remains a useful reference documents for the time being.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Agree insert paragraph detailing landscape character between Built and Natural Environment and Environmental Issues page 20. Include Planning for Landscape Change in Other Relevant Plans and Programmes.
Table 1 Sustainability Objective: To protect and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of the District. SCC opinion that these topics are too broad to be dealt with in the same objective, particularly in relation to the decision making criteria given. Suggest a more appropriate objective would be 'To protect and enhance the diverse landscape character of the District', and deal with archaeological /geological assets elsewhere.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> The Sustainability Objective 2 will remain unchanged the Site Specific question will be amended as follows to include the following.  Will it result in the loss of historic landscape features? Will it safeguard sites of archaeological importance (scheduled or unscheduled) and their settings?
Under decision making criteria number 4 "Will the development create a new landscape character? SCC suggest adding – sympathetic with existing character.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Sustainability Indicator 2 Site Specific Question4 amend to read

	Will the development create a new landscape character sympathetic with existing character?
Don't understand the relevance of 5 'Will it prevent sterilisation of mineral resources' in this list of criteria.	Duly Noted the Site Specific Question has been included to encourage the prudent use of natural resources. <b>Recommendation</b> None
Extent and use of detailed characterisation studies should include landscape character assessments (e.g. Planning For Landscape Change or its successor, local Landscape Character assessments).	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Include the following to the list of Other Relevant Plans and Programmes  Planning for Landscape Change Local Landscape Character Assessments.
<b>Cannock Chase Council</b>	
While it is more appropriate for the statutory consultees to comment on the technical detail of this documents, it would be helpful if the scoping report also contained details of the assumptions which will be applied when undertaking the assessment of the plan's allocations (and Policies if applicable), especially as there may potentially be cross boundary implications.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Assumptions are not required to ensure regulation compliance they are however part of a raft of measures to ensure consistency and proportionate delivery of the SA assessment. As such set of assumptions will be developed prior to Stage B of the SA process being undertaken. The assumptions will form a separate standalone appendix of the SA report.
We would also emphasise the importance of keeping the dialogue going as part of the Duty to Co-operate so that relevant information can be shared in the shaping of our restive plans.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Cannock Chase AONB</b>	
Satisfied that LDC is taking a sound approach and we have no detailed comments to make in the SA Scoping report.	Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Burntwood Town Council</b>	



The Town Council received the above Scoping Report at a recent meeting. Members agreed to receive and note the Report, adding that it would be retained for future reference.	Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Armitage with Handsacre Parish Council</b>	
The Armitage with Handsacre Parish Council do not have any comments to make on the report, at this time	Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Walsall Council</b>	
<p><b>Identification of European sites for assessment.</b> The scoping report (page 6) identifies the River Mease SAC and Cannock Chase SAC as the only European sites as being considered to be affected by the implementation of the Local Plan Allocations. It does not include consideration of the Cannock Extension Canal SAC on the basis of the HRA produced in support of the Local Plan Strategy 'Main Modifications of the Lichfield District Local Plan : Strategy Addendum to Habitat Regulations Assessment (January 2014), which concluded:</p> <p>"The modifications propose the safeguarding of a route for a heritage towpath trail utilising the line of the Lichfield Canal and identifies this on the maps contained with the Local Plan. As this is for a path and there is reference to the requirements for further studies to satisfy the requirements for the Habitat Regulations with regard to the construction/reinstatement and watering of a canal which would link to the Cannock Extension Canal, no likely significant effects upon the Cannock Extension Canal will arise from these changes."</p> <p>While impacts to the Cannock Extension Canal SAC were understandably ruled out on the basis, it might be beneficial. Although it is note the Local Plan Allocations document will be developed in conformity with the LPS (2015), that the Cannock Extension Canal SAC be considered as a result of the project</p>	<p>Duly Noted. HRA for the Local Plan Strategy determined that only two European Sites, Cannock Chase SAC and the River Mease SAC could experience significant harm through the delivery of the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is however a typo in relation to the Cannock Extension Canal SAC in Appendix B. Page 99: Change Cannock Extension Canal to Cannock Extension Canal SAC.</p> <p>In addition following comments received from Staffordshire County Council a landscape section has been included in Section 4 Baseline Information. This paragraph will reflect the link between the line of the Lichfield Canal and the Cannock Extension Canal SAC.</p>

<p>potentially featuring in greater detail than in did within the LPS, and /or the emerging documents providing an opportunity to specify the technical/regulatory requirements of the project in order to avoid significant effects to the SAC.</p>	
<p><b>Compliance with SEA Regulation 12 (the assessment of reasonable alternatives).</b> In respect of the HRA, the scoping report states on page 6 that the SAD "will be developed in conformity with the LPS (2015) spatial strategy. It is therefore considered that accepted migration measures are sufficient to support the Allocations Documents."</p> <p>While, on page 33, the scoping report states:          "Policy considerations within the Adopted Local Plan Strategy (2015) and those also include those contained with Neighbourhood Plans may act to restrict alternatives options assessed."</p> <p>It could be interpreted from the above extracts that the LPA plans not to consider what might be reasonable alternatives for some of its allocation options as a result of existing Local Plan policies. While these policies might well have been tested and informed at examination, having been assessed alongside reasonable alternatives, I am unsure as to whether it is appropriate to restrict the identification of new reasonable alternatives options on this basis, particularly as they might offer improved or more appropriate outcomes.</p>	<p>Duly Noted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b>          In terms of p6 reference. Natural England (one of the three statutory consultees) within their representation accept this approach in principle – no amendments proposed.</p> <p>In terms of the p33 reference. The intention was not to artificial restricted the options assessed at Stage B (1) by imposing adopted policy requirements before SA assessment. To avoid confusion this sentence will be removed from the text.</p>
<p><b>Appendix A (page 68)</b>          It is stated under the heading 'Cannock Chase SAC Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Measures (SAMM)          "A list of priority project are identified to mitigate for a 15% increase in visitors numbers."          The most recently produced housing monitoring, within 15km of the SAC, indicates that there are matters to be addressed in</p>	<p>Duly Noted. Lichfield District is a member of the Cannock Chase SAC Partnership.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b>          None</p>

relation to the above statement. Walsall Council is working with the Cannock Chase SAC Partnership to agree what evidence is relevant to the consideration of housing numbers. This matter is of fundamental importance to additional work that might be commissioned to support Lichfield's emerging Local Plan Allocations.

### Local Plan Allocations Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report: Consultation Sheet

To avoid duplication of objectives a number of the responses in table 1 were amended, the table below provides the updated response.

Table 2:

Comment	Original response	Amended Response
<b>Statutory Consultee: Natural England</b> In terms of wider themes we note that the district's high level of car use and 'out commuting'. The Council should consider related air quality impacts on 'ecological receptors' (semi natural habitats and their wildlife) in order to understand potential effects arising from site allocations.	Duly Noted Recommendation The following site specific question will be added to Table 1 against Sustainability Objective Seek to improve air, soil and water quality.	Duly noted Recommendation the following site specific questions will appear against Sustainability Objective 9 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Which Source Protection Zone does the development fall within?</li> <li>2. Does the site fall within the River Mease SAC?</li> <li>3. Is the site within or directly connected by road to an AQMA?</li> <li>4. Will it result in the loss of quality agricultural land?</li> </ol>
Statutory Consultee: Natural England Sustainability objective – 'To protect and enhance the rich diversity of natural	Duly Noted Recommendation	Duly Noted Recommendation The Following indicator will be added to the Site Specific Questions Table 1 related to the Sustainability Objective 2

<p>archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of the district’.</p> <p>Site Specific questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it promote and maintain an attractive and diverse landscape.</li> <li>2. Will it protect areas of highest landscape quality</li> <li>3. Will it improve areas of lower landscape quality</li> <li>4. Will the development create a new landscape character?</li> </ol> <p>We refer the Council to the Statements of Environmental Opportunity (SEO) for the relevant NCA profile and the ‘special qualities of the Cannock Chase AONB (see AONB Management Plan 2014-19).</p> <p>Where proposals are for over 100 homes and /or 3 Ha in extent Natural England consider this may represent a strategic site Landscape &amp; Visual Impact Assessment should be carried out accordingly. The Following NPPF material is relevant:</p> <p>Para 17. Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land use planning principles should underpin plan making ... planning should .. take account of the different roles and character of different areas... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.</p>	<p>The Following indicator will be added to the Site Specific Questions Table 1 related to the Sustainability Objective 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proximity to an internationally or nationally designated landscape</li> <li>2. In terms of Landscape Character Types what is the sites sensitive rating?</li> <li>3. Proximity to an internationally or nationally designated geodiversity sites.</li> <li>4. Is it on previously undeveloped land?</li> <li>5. Does it offer the opportunity to promote landscape connectivity?</li> <li>6. Does it offer the opportunity to improve or create the landscape character of the District?</li> </ol> <p>The following questions will remain</p> <p>Will it improve existing green infrastructure including National Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiatives?</p> <p>Will it prevent the sterilisation of mineral resources</p> <p>In addition the Assumption Appendix will provide further clarity in regard to assessment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does it respect and protect existing landscape character?</li> <li>2. Will it protect sites of geological importance?</li> <li>3. Does it offer the opportunity to improve and promote landscape connectivity sympathetic to the existing District landscape character?</li> <li>4. Will it lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?</li> <li>5. Will it improve existing green infrastructure including National Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative?</li> <li>6. Will it result in the loss of historic landscape features?</li> <li>7. Will it safeguard sites of archaeological importance and their settings?</li> </ol> <p>Note: Question 4, Is it on previously undeveloped land. Has been removed due to duplication. The following questions appears against Sustainability Objective 5.</p> <p>Will it result in the loss of land that has not previously been developed?</p>
--	--	---

<p>Para 109 The Planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes....</p> <p>Para 170 Where appropriate, Landscape character assessments should also be prepared, integrated with assessment of historic landscape character, and for areas where there are major expansion options assessments of Landscape sensitivity.</p>		
<p>Sustainability Objective - “ Maximise the use of previously developed land/buildings and the efficient use of Land”</p> <p>We refer you to our comments above on landscape character and multifunctional GI. Regarding the wording of the detailed indicator – would number of units be valuable too? I.e. to give a sense of scale as well as the percentage balance being achieved.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation</p> <p>Table 1 Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Questions, amend bullet point to read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would the development of the site involve the loss of greenfield?</li> </ol> <p>Bullet point 4 to be removed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Would the development of the site involve the loss of gardens?</li> </ol> <p>Table 1 Sustainability Objective 5, Detailed Indicator, amend to read:</p> <p>% of permissions granted on previously developed land.</p> <p>Table 1 Sustainability Objective 5 Detailed indicator add.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Will it result in the loss of land that has not previously been developed?</li> <li>4. Is the site capable of supporting higher density development and/or a mix of uses?</li> <li>5. Does the site allow for the re-use of existing buildings?</li> <li>6. Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land within the District?</li> </ol>

	Number of homes granted permission on previously developed land.	
<p>Sustainability Objectives – “Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainability modes of travel and increased opportunities for non- car travel”.</p> <p>Our comments about ‘site specific questions’ apply equally here. The performance of individual sites in terms of SA/SEA will reflect their strategic location and relationship with existing infrastructure. Detailed indicators should refer to sustainable transport links (bus routes, Cycleway and paths) created or enhanced through the provision of multi – functional GI.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation</p> <p>Add the following against Table 1 Sustainability Objective 6 Detailed Indicator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to bus services</li> <li>• Access to cycle ways</li> <li>• Increase in the provision of multi-functional space; Cycle and walking networks that include green Infrastructure gain.</li> </ul> <p>Remove the following indicators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic Counts on selected strategic roads in the District</li> <li>2. Journey to work by mode</li> <li>3. Access to bus services</li> </ol> <p>In addition see recommended amendments made against SCC highway comments.</p> <p>In addition the assumptions will further link sites to existing sustainable transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation</p> <p>The following site Specific Questions against Table 1 Sustainability Objective 6 will be used.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the site location encourage the use of existing sustainable modes of travel?</li> <li>2. Will it reduce the overall impact on traffic sensitive areas?</li> <li>3. Will it help develop walking, cycling and bus networks to enable residents access to employment, services and facilities?</li> <li>4. Will it help develop rail transport networks to access employment, services and facilities?</li> </ol>
<p><b>Staffordshire County Council : Ecology</b></p> <p>In Table 1 Indicators for designated sites should refer to site condition rather than number of sites as the number of sites or their size is not within Local Plan influence. Sites outside the District but affected by the Plan need to be included – e.g.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation</p> <p>The following text will replace the Detailed Decision Making Criteria and Detailed Indicator Information that relates to Sustainability Objective Table 1.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation</p> <p>The following site Specific Questions against Table 1 Sustainability Objective 1 will be used.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it conserve protected/priority species?</li> </ol>

<p>Cannock Chase SAC and the River Mease SAC outside of the District. WE recommend the indicator be percentage of international/national sites in favourable condition. This reflects Natural England's Condition assessment phraseology. An indicator for Local Wildlife Sites (sites of Biological Importance) should be included.</p>	<p>Detailed Decision making Criteria</p> <p>Why</p> <p>Site Specific Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What affect will there be on protected /priority species</li> <li>2. What affect will there be on priority habitats and local nature conservation sites?</li> <li>3. What affect will there be on statutory designated sites?</li> <li>4. What affect will there be on veteran trees?</li> <li>5. Will it reduce ecological connectivity?</li> <li>6. What affect will there be on the RIGS sites</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Will it conserve protect priority habitats and local nature conservation sites?</li> <li>3. Will it protect statutory designated sites?</li> <li>4. Will it encourage ecological connectivity (including green corridors and water courses)?</li> </ol> <p>Note</p> <p>Impact on RIGS Sites is measured through Sustainability Objective 2 Site Specific Question 2.</p>
--	--	--

## **APPENDIX B (ii) – LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**





## Local Plan Allocations Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report: Consultation Sheet

Comment	Response
<b>Statutory Organisation: Historic England</b>	
<p>Historic England has published guidance on the SA/SEA process and the historic environment which may be of interest – this can be found at <a href="https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/strategic-environ-assessment-sustainability-appraisal-historic-envirnment/SA_SEA_final.pdf">https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/strategic-environ-assessment-sustainability-appraisal-historic-envirnment/SA_SEA_final.pdf</a>. This includes a list of international, national and local plans and programmed that could usefully supplement the list on pages 14-16.</p>	<p>Duly noted,</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The following documents will be included in the review of Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNESCO World Heritage Convention 1979</li> <li>• European Landscape Convention (Florence Convention)</li> <li>• The Convention for the protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada Convention).</li> <li>• The European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (Valetta Convention)</li> <li>• National Policy Statement for Waste Water March 2012</li> <li>• National Policy Statement for Energy July 2011</li> <li>• Streets for all: Guidance for Practitioners- English Heritage's regional manuals on the design and management of streets and public open spaces</li> </ul>
<p>We welcome the section on the built and natural environment baseline data on page 20. In our view, this should be expanded to include data on Heritage at Risk within the district (<a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/</a>) as well as locally designated heritage assets. The Staffordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) will also offer information to identify areas that have a high potential for archaeology.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p>Information requested is contained within the following sections of Appendix B</p> <p><b>Main Heading</b></p> <p>Archaeology</p> <p><b>Sub Headings</b></p> <p>Landscape Character</p> <p>Historic Farmsteads</p> <p>Historic Environment</p>

	<p>Conservation Areas Listed Buildings <b>Recommendation</b> None</p>
We also welcome SA objectives 2, 3, and 4 – all of which relate to the historic environment to differing degrees.	<p>Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> None</p>
In terms of the last two boxes of page 25, it would be helpful to be consistent and insert some text explaining <b>Why</b> the sustainability objective is included. As per the objectives across pages 24-30. Here, this could be along the lines of ‘To ensure new development does not affect the significance of the local historic environment.	<p>Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> Insert “<i>To ensure new development does not affect the significance of the local historic environment</i>”. In the why sections for Objective 2 and 3 pages 25.</p>
In the last section of page 25 we feel that there is something of a disconnect between the proposed decision making criteria and the suggested indicators. We do not feel that the suggested indicators would be able to clearly demonstrate whether the Local Plan Allocations documents had positively or otherwise addressed the baseline findings. This could be addressed by inserting a new question 5, along the lines of ‘Will it offer opportunities to bring heritage assets back into active use?’	<p>Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> Against the <b>Detailed Decision Making Criteria</b> relating to SA indicator 3 include the addition of the following question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it offer opportunities to bring heritage assets back into active use?</li> </ul>
The text against <b>Why</b> in the first box on page 26 could be extended to include the words ‘...jobs and services <i>and to ensure the retention of local distinctiveness and character</i> ’.	<p>Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> Amend the <b>Why</b> sentence relating to SA indicator 4.</p> <p><b>Why</b> To reduce the need to travel through closer integration of housing, jobs and services and to ensure the retention of local distinctiveness and character.</p>
In relation to possible mitigation strategies we would note that the NPPF makes clear that harm should always be avoided in	<p>Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b></p>

the first instance in relation to mitigation be considered – any harm and mitigation proposals need to be fully justified and evidenced to ensure they will be successful in reducing harm.	none
<b>Statutory Organisation: Natural England</b>	
We acknowledge the passage of time since the SA for the LPS took place and have aimed to facilitate the Council achieving the relevant outcomes described in the NPPF with a focus in particular upon maximising opportunities and recognising synergies between the various interests themes.	Duly noted (support for the amendments to the SA Objectives) <b>Recommendation</b> none
NE advises that the council scopes in issues only where there are likely to be significant effects (either positive or negative). We recognise that a balance needs to be struck between a robust review of the evidence base now, as compared with that in 2007. We offer advice below on those themes and issues where we believe SA/SEA can add particular value to the allocations stage of the LPS.	Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</b> “The allocations Document will be developed in conformity with the LPS (2015) spatial strategy. It is therefore considered that accepted mitigation measures are sufficient to support the Allocations Documents.” (p6 HRA). We accept this approach in principle provided that no substantive issues have been pushed down to HRA at the project level (e.g. Hatherton & Lichfield canal restoration project) that might benefit from further consideration on the basis of new information that has been added to the evidence base since the SA for the LPS.	Duly Noted. Confirmation that no additional information has been submitted in regard to the Hatherton & Lichfield Canal Transportation Project. Mindful that during the SA process that the existing mitigation measures remain if amendments are required these are addressed in the SA process. Recommend direct discussions with Natural England. <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Sources of info</b> Sources of Good Practice/Information NE has a range of data sources that may be useful in the production of an SA. Our data sets are now all downloadable and responsible authorities should be referred to the website at (weblink). Other data sources include:	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> none

<p>MAGIC (Defra's GIS package for environmental assets)</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment for National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty</p> <p>Management Plans for National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty</p> <p>SSI/European Sites condition assessments</p> <p>National Character Areas</p>	
<p><b>Comments on the detail</b></p> <p><b>1. Relationship with other relevant plans and programmes</b></p> <p>Please refer to our comments above regarding the balance to be struck between checking and updating the evidence base and the opportunity, in recognition of the subsidiary nature of site allocations to the overall Local Plan Strategy, to adopt an approach to SA/SEA at the allocations stage which focuses in on a finer grain of detail consistent with the nature of site allocations.</p> <p>We welcome the comprehensive list included in the report and note that the Cannock Chase Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Measures (SAMMM) and the R.Mease SAC related plans have been included in the regional and local plans and programmes evidence base respectively.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>
<p><b>2. The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and their likely evolution without implementation of the plan or programme.</b></p> <p>We are satisfied that the relevant aspects of the environment have been identified but we offer comments below on how the sustainability objectives arising from a sustainable development approach employing multi-functional green infrastructure.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>

<p><b>3. The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.</b></p> <p>We are satisfied that the environmental characteristics of the <u>district</u> have been identified.</p> <p>At this stage, over and above existing initiatives such as the River Mease and Cannock Chase SAC projects the scoping report does not appear to explicitly identify further locations likely to be significantly affected in terms of landscape and biodiversity.</p> <p>We comment separately (below) on sources of information that may be used to help inform subsequent stages of the SA/SEA process for those areas e.g. Cannock Chase AONB and its setting (AONB 'special qualities' and National Character Area profile 'Statements of Environmental Opportunity').</p> <p>In terms of wider themes we note the district's high levels of car use and 'out commuting'. The Council should consider related air quality impacts on 'ecological receptors' (semi natural habitats and their wildlife) in order to understand potential effects arising from site allocations The Highway Agency 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' provides the accepted methodology for the assessment of such impacts while the Air Pollution Information System (APIS) describes the nature and causes of adverse impacts on ecological receptors from air pollution.</p>	<p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> None.</p> <p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> Section 4: Baseline Information inclusion of a Landscape focused paragraph under Built and Natural Environment heading.</p> <p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> None</p> <p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> The following site specific question will be added to Table 1 against Sustainability Objective Seek to improve air, soil and water quality.</p>
<p><b>4. Existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme</b></p> <p>We welcome the reports reference to the River Mease SAC and Cannock Chase SAC in relation to environmental pressures on these European designated sites.</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> None</p>

<p><b>5. The environmental protection objectives relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation</b></p> <p>Biodiversity – “1. To promote biodiversity and through protection, enhancement and management of species and Habitats”.</p> <p>Is this a Typo? Should it read” To promote biodiversity through the protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats?</p> <p>6. To reduce, manage and adopt to the impacts of climate change” – Typo - <u>adapt</u> to...</p> <p>Table 1- Allocations Scoping report Sustainability Objectives – Comments on the “ Detailed decision making questions” and “detailed indicators”</p> <p>Biodiversity – ‘Site specific questions’. We would encourage you to consider the ‘helicopter view’ i.e. district wide, parish, groups of sites. A focus on each specific site (individually) may overlook SA/SEA issues that are relevant at a larger scale and contribute to decision over which individual sites (or groups of sites) should proceed. A ‘cascade ‘approach may be needed from the district down to the individual site. This approach reflects the Lawton Review whereby biodiversity is safeguarded for the future by achieving a biodiversity resource which is ‘Bigger, better, more and joined’. Please refer also to our comments below regarding multifunctional green infrastructure.</p>	<p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> Amend Sustainability Objective Number 1 to read: To promote biodiversity through the protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats. Page 23, 24</p> <p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> Amend Sustainability Objective 7 to read: To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change. Page 23, 29.</p> <p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b> See amended Site Specific Questions and indicators listed against Staffordshire County Council : Ecology rep box three.</p>
---	---

9



<p>Sustainability objective – ‘To protect and enhance the rich diversity of natural archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of the district’.</p> <p>Site Specific questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it promote and maintain an attractive and diverse landscape</li> <li>2. Will it protect areas of highest landscape quality</li> <li>3. Will it improve areas of lower landscape quality</li> <li>4. Will the development create a new landscape character.</li> </ol> <p>We refer the Council to the Statements of Environmental Opportunity (SEO) for the relevant NCA profile and the ‘special qualities’ of the Cannock Chase AONB (see AONB Management Plan 2014-19).</p> <p>Where proposals are for over 100 homes and/or 3Ha in extent Natural England consider this may represent a strategic site. Landscape &amp; Visual Impact Assessment should be carried out accordingly. The following NPPF material is relevant:</p> <p>Para 17. Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land use planning principles should underpin plan-making .....planning should... take account of the different roles and character of different areas, ... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.</p> <p>Para 109 The Planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes...</p> <p>Para 170 Where appropriate, landscape character assessments should also be prepared, integrated with assessment of historic landscape character, and for areas where there are major expansion options assessments of landscape sensitivity.</p>	<p>Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation.</b></p> <p>The following indicator will be added to the Site Specific Questions Table 1 related to the Sustainability Objective 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proximity to an internationally or nationally designated landscape</li> <li>2. In terms of Landscape Character Types what is the sites sensitivity rating?</li> <li>3. Proximity to an internationally or nationally designated geodiversity sites</li> <li>4. Is it on previously undeveloped land?</li> <li>5. Does it offer the opportunity to promote landscape connectivity?</li> <li>6. Does it offer the opportunity to improve or create the landscape character of the District?</li> </ol> <p>The following questions will remain.</p> <p>Will it improve existing green infrastructure including National Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiatives.</p> <p>Will it prevent the sterilisation of mineral resources.</p> <p>In addition the Assumption Appendix will provide further clarity in regard to assessment.</p>
---	---

<p>Site Specific questions</p> <p>5. Will it improve existing green infrastructure including national Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative.</p> <p>We welcome this question and refer you to ur comments above regarding the need to consider the context for each site in terms of the adverse impacts or positive opportunities it presents in terms of SA/SEA , from the district level down to the site specific level.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None.</p>
<p>Detailed Indicator: 3 The proportion of housing completions on sites of 10 or more which have been supported, at the planning applications stage by an appropriate and effective landscape character and visual assessment with appropriate landscape proposals.</p> <p>AGI led approach would help provide the framework for such mitigation (&amp; enhancement) measures.</p>	<p>Duly Noted. The adopted Local Plan Strategy and Supplementary Planning Document support the delivery of Green Infrastructure holistic approach.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>
<p>Sustainability Objective: Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrate effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas, and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character.</p> <p>NCA profiles and SCC 'Planning for landscape change' SPD contribute to the evidence base and would help to facilitate a GI led approach. The Site Allocations part of the local plan process provides a platform for the implementation of the strategic approach in the LPS. Clear linkage between the allocated sites' performance in terms of offering opportunities e.g. improvements in <u>Landscape character</u> and <u>creating and linking GI</u> would be desirable and positive.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the Site Specific Questions relating to the Sustainability Objective 2, See above.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>
<p>Sustainability Objective – “Maximise the use of previously developed land/buildings and the efficient use of Land”</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

<p>Site specific questions –formatting typo to correct. Detailed indicator – “% of permissions granted on previously developed land as a % of previously developed land available within the District”.</p> <p>We refer you to our comments above on landscape character and multifunctional GI. Regarding the wording of the detailed indicator – would <u>numbers of units</u> be valuable too? i.e. to give a sense of the <u>scale</u> as well as the percentage balance being achieved.</p>	<p>Table 1 Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Questions, amend bullet point 3 to read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would the development of the site involve the loss of greenfield?</li> </ol> <p>Bullet point 4 to be removed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Would the development of the site involve the loss of gardens?</li> </ol> <p>Table 1 Sustainability Objective 5, Detailed Indicator, amend to read:</p> <p>% of permissions granted on previously developed land.</p> <p>Table 1 Sustainability Objective 5 Detailed Indicator add.</p> <p>Number of homes granted permission on previously developed land.</p>
<p>Sustainability Objective – “Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of travel and increased opportunities for non-car travel”.</p> <p>Our comments about ‘site specific questions’ apply equally here. The performance of individual sites in terms of SA/SEA will reflect their strategic location and relationship with existing infrastructure. Detailed indicators should refer to sustainable transport links (bus routes, cycleway and paths) created or enhanced through the provision of multi-functional GI.</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Add the following against Table 1 Sustainability Objective 6 Detail Indicator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to bus services</li> <li>• Access to cycle ways</li> <li>• Increase in the provision of multi-functional space: cycle and walking networks that include green Infrastructure gain.</li> </ul>

	<p>Remove the following Indicators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic Counts on selected strategic roads in the District</li> <li>2. Journey to work by mode</li> <li>3. Access to bus services</li> </ol> <p>In addition see recommended amendments made against SCC highway comments.</p> <p>In addition the assumptions will further link sites to existing sustainable transport infrastructure.</p>
We welcome reference to sustainable transport links under the sustainability objectives for climate change mitigation and adaption.	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>
<p><b>6 The likely significant effects on the environment</b></p> <p>1. Biodiversity – Themes 11, 14, and 15 are recorded as ‘potential incompatibility’. We acknowledge the potential, however this is a matter of perspective as multifunctional GI offers a model whereby these themes (11, 14 and 15) within SA/SEA can positively benefit from multi-functional GI.</p> <p>Similar comments apply in respect of themes 2 (with regard to 11 and 14) and 4 (with regard to 11).</p>	<p>Duly Noted. We are aware of and understand the potential opportunities which could be identified, they feature as key compounds within a number of the Districts SPD’s.</p> <p>Amendments to Site Specific Questions and Detailed Indicators relating to Sustainability Objective 1, 6 and 2 do however further identify the benefits of GI and identify the linkages.</p> <p>However, a significant benefits are likely to only become apparent at detailed design stage and secured through application.</p> <p>As such ‘potential incompatibility’ remains.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>
<b>7 The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan and programme.</b>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p>Sustainability Objective 9:</p> <p>Seek to improve air, soil and water quality.</p>

<p><u>Soils</u></p> <p>The site allocations SA/SEA should consider the scale of impacts arising from the proposed housing and employment site resources across the district and describe what avoidance and mitigation measures may be used to minimise loss of the district's soil resource including 'best and most versatile land'. Site allocations' performance in this respect should form an important criteria for inclusion in the site selection decision-making process.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Table 1 sustainability Indicator 9, the following Soil related Detailed Indicator to be added.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of permissions granted on previously developed land.</li> </ul> <p>No further amendments are recommended see response to comments made by the Environment Agency.</p>
<p><u>Climate Change &amp; green infrastructure (GI)</u></p> <p>A positive opportunity arises in respect of this site allocations stage in the local plan process. Synergies between climate change mitigation/adaption and multi-functional GI are strong and have recently been expressed as 'nature based solutions'. These address the value of nature for people and what bio diverse, multifunctional green infrastructure can do for us. It has the potential to: Cool buildings, reduce need for air conditioning, reduce 'urban heat island' effect, help reduce flooding and water pollution, provide recreation and green transport routes, store carbon, increase biodiversity, health, climate change adaption.</p> <p>SA/SEA criteria might include – location (relative to existing development), proximity to public transport routes/routes that could be reinstated, massing/orientation opportunities (topography/aspect – solar gain) etc.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p>Amendments have been made to the Sustainability Objective 6 in relation to GI and sustainable transport links. Adopted SPD's clearly outline the role of GI in addressing Climate Change.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>
<p><b>Statutory Organisation :Environment Agency</b></p>	
<p><b>Environmental Issues</b> From an EA perspective, the River Mease SAC is probably the most important area of protection in the district. The section in Lichfield District however, is relatively</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>

<p>rural and is unlikely to be subject to much development, unlike further up the catchment in North West Leicestershire that is more urbanized and has more pressure on it. The most likely threats in Lichfield District are from farming, i.e. pesticides/ammonia/grazing on the banks and non-mains foul drainage systems on small developments not working properly. We would not therefore expect significant impacts on this are when applying the SA Framework to the Site Allocation process.</p>	
<p>With reference to the flood risk element, we would concur that the main areas of floodplain are in the rural areas of the River Trent and Tame valleys so would expect very few if any, greenfield sites to be allocated in the floodplains given the extensive areas of Floodplain Zone 1 around our major settlements and elsewhere.</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> None</p>
<p><b>Sustainability Framework</b> For the Sustainability Framework, we suggest you consider a follow up question for the Sustainability Objective 'To reduce and manage flood risk'. Following the question Is the site located outside an area at risk from flooding? Does it pass the Sequential Test? This will help to ascertain whether a site is that in the floodplain is there legitimately form a policy perspective.</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Table 1 page 24, To reduce and manage flood risk add the following questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the site pass the Sequential Test?</li> </ul>
<p>We suggest Green/blue Corridors to refer to green networks and watercourses together in the objective To promote Biodiversity through protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats.</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Table 1 Page 24 Sustainability Objective 1, To promote biodiversity and through protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats, Site Specific Question 3 amend from</p> <p>3 What affect will there be on green corridors /water courses?</p> <p>To</p>

	3 What affect will there be on green networks and watercourses?
<p>The objective Seek to improve air, soil and water quality – Will it reduce water pollution? Is not particularly clear or specific. For example, just off site or in the nearest watercourse? What type of pollution – Foul, runoff from developments as suspended solids such as dirt or oil/petrol? There is probably only one scenario where water quality issues could not be overcome and that would be lack of foul capacity going into the River Mease SAC for example. Depending on what type of water pollution you had in mind, you could ask whether the development would be likely to utilise SuDs or whether there is capacity in the receiving Sewage Treatment works; you may have this information to hand from either a Water Cycle Study or an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	<p>Duly Noted. Agree that the effect of new development on water quality will depend on factors such as whether there is capacity at the relevant sewage treatment works to accommodate the new development, which cannot be assessed at this stage unless directly related to sites within the River Mease SAC. It is recognised that Development Management Policies (Policy NR9: Water Quality) may require any necessary upgrades to be made before development proceeds.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Table 1, Sustainability Objective : Seek to improve air, soil and water quality amend as follows;</p> <p><b>Why</b> To reduce air, water and soil pollution.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Questions</b> Which Source Protection Zone does the development fall within? Does the site fall within River Mease SAC? Is the site within or directly connected by road to an AQMA? Is the site mainly or entirely on brownfield land? If the site is on greenfield land which class of agricultural quality is it?</p>
<p><b>Document List</b> In this document list, I cannot see the Planning Practice Guide included anywhere. This offers lots of useful advice on Policy Guidance for Water Quality, Sustainability Drainage and Flood Risk amongst much else. Locally, you may also wish to review the Tame Valley Wetlands Landscape</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Insert the following under the National Planning Practice Guidance (2014) reference in Appendix A page 56</p>

<p>Partnership Scheme (TVWLPS) Landscape Conservation action Plan (LCAP) in order to assess any impacts or potential conflict with the Site Allocations.</p>	<p>National Planning Practice Guidance (2014) The National Planning Practice Guidance provides technical guidance in topic areas in order to support policies set out within the NPPF. It aims to allow for sustainable development as guided by the NPPF. The allocation documents should seek to ensure that it reflects the objectives</p> <p>Insert the following under CAMS: Staffordshire Trent Valley Abstraction Licensing Strategy, Environment Agency (2013) reference in Appendix A page 70</p> <p>Tame Valley Wetlands Landscape Partnership Scheme Landscape Conservation Action Plan Landscape scale approach to restoring conserving and reconnecting the physical and cultural landscape of the Tame Valley.</p> <p>Allocations within the identified wetland area should consider the key priorities of the vision.</p>
<p><b>Staffordshire County Council</b></p>	
<p>Thank you for consulting SCC on the SA scoping report we acknowledge that we are not a statutory consultee and appreciate the opportunity to input in relation to the Duty to Co-operate and joint working. We will seek to engage with you throughout the plan preservation including the SA as it is produced.</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> none</p>
<p>We are content with the general approach set out in the scope and support the incorporation of a Health Impact Assessment in to the SA. We would suggest that you should engage with us on evidence gathering and preparation of the SA moving forward.</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> none</p>
<p><b>Staffordshire County Council: Highways</b></p>	



<p><b>Section 4</b> Baseline information – transport (page 22) the bus accessibility statistic should be updated to 71% for Lichfield City or 61% for Lichfield District which is accurate to October 2016 bus timetable information</p>	<p>Duly Noted  <b>Recommendation</b>  Page 22 para 2 change 83% to 71%.</p>
<p><b>Appendix B</b> p 108, row relating to Traffic Congestion – could the last bullet point be changed to say ‘manage routing of heavy commercial vehicles and consider the provision of lorry park at Fradley.</p>	<p>Duly Noted  <b>Recommendation</b>  Page 108 Traffic Congestion Bullet 10  Replace with “Manage routing of heavy commercial vehicles and consider the provision of lorry park at Fradley”.</p>
<p><b>Table 1</b> Allocation Scoping Report Sustainability Objectives – for the sustainability objective ‘reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development. Efficient use of existing sustainable modes of travel and increased opportunities of non-car travel’ includes the following site specific questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it use and enhance existing transport infrastructure</li> <li>2. Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment</li> <li>3. Will it reduce journeys undertaken by car by encouraging alternatives modes of transport.</li> <li>4. Will it increase accessibility to services and facilities</li> <li>5. Will it reduce the overall impact on traffic sensitive areas.</li> </ol>	<p>Duly Noted  <b>Recommendation</b>  None</p>
<p>It may be useful to separate out walking and cycling from bus and rail to highlight the differences between sites. The most sustainable sites are those where residents can utilise public transport as well as access services and facilities by walking in and cycling. Superfast broadband, home working and car sharing would be ways to reduce trips by car.</p>	<p>Duly noted  <b>Recommendation</b>  Add the following site specific questions to Sustainability Objective 6 page 29 enable separation and improve the ability to accurately score sites.</p> <p>Will it help to develop walking and cycling networks to enable residents to access to employment, services and facilities?</p>

	Will it help develop bus and rail transport networks to access employment, services and facilities?
<b>Question 2</b> may be difficult to score as none of the sites are likely to lead to road schemes apart from site accesses but the delivery of a walk and cycle route can have negative impacts on the environment. For example a cycle route is unacceptable if it crosses an environmentally sensitive area; lighting in walk/cycle bridge is unacceptable for bats; air quality issues due to buses; and the selection of paving; signing; coloured paint on roads requires careful selection in a conservation area.	Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> Remove Question 2 Sustainability Objective 6 page 29. The question is included as part of amendments proposed in previous recommendations and will enable clear scoring.
<b>Question 3</b> no development can reduce journeys undertaken by car. We are working to provide development in the most sustainable locations to enable the new residents to undertake as many journeys as possible by non-car modes. The question used in the previous sustainability appraisal is better phrased 'will it provide opportunities to reduce trips by car?'	Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> Replace Question 3 Sustainability Objective 6 page 29 Will it reduce journeys undertaken by car by encouraging alternative modes of transport? With Will it provide opportunities to reduce trips by car?
<b>Question 4</b> can relate to increased accessibility to services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport or to the provision of additional services and facilities by the development itself.	Duly noted <b>Recommendation</b> Remove Question 4.
<b>Staffordshire County Council: Ecology</b>	
The statement on page 6 in regard of Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) only applies if the site allocations for residential are in accordance with spatial strategy figures within the 15km zone of influence on the Cannock Chase SAC and that windfalls have not meant that the proposed figures will be exceeded. Should housing allocation figures be above the assessed in HRA of the spatial strategy further HRA will be required. The Cannock Chase SAC Partnership is in the process	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> None

of commissioning assessment of the impacts of increased housing allocations to enable impacts and mitigation requirements to be assessed.	
The Built and Natural Environment section on page 20 fails to mention the natural environment including sites of international and national importance let alone locally important sites and habituates and species of principal importance. Neither is landscape character mentioned. This is a significant omission.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> See landscape comments
In Table 1 Indicators for designated sites should refer to site condition rather than number of sites as the number of sites or their size is not within Local Plan influence. Sites outside the District but affected by the Plan need to be included – e.g. Cannock Chase SAC and the River Mease SAC outside of the District. We recommend the indicator be percentage of international/national sites in favourable condition. This reflects Natural England condition assessment phraseology. An indicator for Local Wildlife Sites (sites of Biological Importance) should be included.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> The following text will replace the Detailed Decision Making Criteria and Detailed Indicator information that relates to Sustainability Objective Table 1.  <b>Detailed Decisions making Criteria</b>  <b>Why</b> <b>Site Specific Questions:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What affect will there be on protected/priority species</li> <li>2. What affect will there be on priority habitats and local nature conservation sites?</li> <li>3. What affect will there be on statutory designated sites?</li> <li>4. What affect will there be on veteran trees?</li> <li>5. What affect will there be on green corridors and water courses?</li> <li>6. Will it reduce ecological connectivity?</li> <li>7. What affect will there be on the RIGS site</li> </ol> <b>Detailed Indicator</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Performance SBAP Action Plan Targets</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Amount of priority habitat created, restored or maintained as part of the site allocation.</li> <li>3. Amount of green and blue infrastructure restored or maintained as part of the site allocation</li> <li>4. Increased links between woodland, hedgerows, copes, individual trees – including veteran and aged trees.</li> <li>5. Number of and area of RIGS within the District.</li> </ol>
We also note that the proposed indicators fail to answer most of the questions and recommend a rethink.	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>See amended Table 1 Sustainability Objective 1 Detailed Decision Making Criteria and Detailed Indicator above.</p>
There is no mention of water quality or ecological status despite Water Framework Directive requirements for Local Plans to contribute to objectives.	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>See amended Table 1 Sustainability Objective 1 Detailed Decision Making Criteria and Detailed Indicator above</p>
In Table 1 there appears to be a typo in the biodiversity Detailed Indicator column for item 1 which should read Lowland Heathland (i.e. without the slash). There appears to be a typo in the biodiversity Detailed Indicator column for item 3 which should read either wildflower grassland or species-rich grassland. There appears to be a typo in the biodiversity Detailed indicator column for item 6 which makes no sense as worded.	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>See amended Table 1 Sustainability Objective 1 Detailed Decision Making Criteria and Detailed Indicator above.</p>
<b>Appendix A</b> There is missing text under Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan (SBAP ) On page 66	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Typo amendment Appendix A page 66 Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan in the key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal</p> <p>Amend 4 to 14</p> <p>And also include the following bullet points</p>

	<p>Cannock Heath Central Farmlands River Gravels</p>
<p><b>Appendix A</b> In regard of the Cannock Chase SAC Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Measures (SAMM) (should be SAMMM) on page 68 of the text regarding Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal is incorrect. The SAMMM will not shape the assessment of significant effects. Its purpose is to provide mitigation of Local Plan impacts already identified.</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Typo amendment Appendix A page 68 SAMM to SAMMM.</p> <p>Page 68 Amend text against Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal section of the SAMMM entry to read</p> <p>The SAMMM mitigates for planned housing growth within the 0-15km zone of influence and identified in the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
<p><b>Appendix B</b> There are errors in the Nature Conservation Sites Section. It is Chasewater and Southern Staffordshire Coalfields Heath SSSI. Local Wildlife Sites are Sites of Biological Importance. Cannock Chase AONB is not a nature conservation site. AONBs are designated for landscape quality. The section of Biodiversity is inadequate and fails to reference species or Staffordshire Ecological Record which is the data holder for the data that will be essential for monitoring</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Appendix B Page 99 Nature Conservation Sites amend typo Chasewater and Southern Staffordshire Coalfields to Chasewater and Southern Staffordshire Coalfields Heath.</p> <p>Appendix B Page 99 Nature Conservation Sites amend typo Sites of Biological Interest to Sites of Biological Importance</p> <p>Remove reference to Cannock Chase AONB and reposition in the additional Landscape Section. See response to SCC Landscape representation for further information.</p> <p>Add the following text: There are 78 SBI's within Lichfield District; however the total number of sites changes periodically.</p>

	<p>Up to date information on these sites and their boundaries is provided by Staffordshire Ecological Record.</p> <p>Add the following text: Lichfield District contains a wide variety of species which are defined by and received protection under domestic or European Legislation. Particular protected species that have been encountered within Lichfield District include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bats</li> <li>• Birds</li> <li>• Great crested newts</li> <li>• White clawed crayfish</li> <li>• Water voles</li> <li>• Otters</li> <li>• Badgers</li> <li>• Invertebrates</li> <li>• Reptiles</li> <li>• Plant species</li> </ul>
<b>Staffordshire County Council: Landscape</b>	
Section 3 European Landscape convention (Florence 2002)	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Include European Landscape convention (Florence 2002) within list of International documents page 14 and Appendix A</p>
Section 4 Built and Natural Environment perhaps this heading would be better titled Cultural Heritage	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>
There should be a separate paragraph dealing with Landscape Character, which is not the same as Historic Landscape Characterisation, although an understanding of landscape character is informed by Historic Landscape Characterisation.	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Agree insert paragraph detailing landscape character between Built and Natural Environment and Environmental Issues page 20.</p>

<p>The National Character Area Profiles published by Natural England provide broad scale characterisation, and Planning For Landscape Change which contains more fine grained county level landscape character descriptions Web link. Although Planning For Landscape Change is under review it remains a useful reference documents for the time being.</p>	<p>Include Planning for Landscape Change in Other Relevant Plans and Programmes.</p>
<p>Table 1 Sustainability Objective: To protect and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of the District. SCC opinion that these topics are too broad to be dealt with in the same objective, particularly in relation to the decision making criteria given. Suggest a more appropriate objective would be 'To protect and enhance the diverse landscape character of the District', and deal with archaeological /geological assets elsewhere.</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> The Sustainability Objective 2 will remain unchanged the Site Specific question will be amended as follows to include the following.</p> <p>Will it result in the loss of historic landscape features? Will it safeguard sites of archaeological importance (scheduled or unscheduled) and their settings?</p>
<p>Under decision making criteria number 4 "Will the development create a new landscape character? SCC suggest adding – sympathetic with existing character.</p>	<p>Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Sustainability Indicator 2 Site Specific Question4 amend to read</p> <p>Will the development create a new landscape character sympathetic with existing character?</p>
<p>Don't understand the relevance of 5 'Will it prevent sterilisation of mineral resources' in this list of criteria.</p>	<p>Duly Noted the Site Specific Question has been included to encourage the prudent use of natural resources. <b>Recommendation</b> None</p>

Extent and use of detailed characterisation studies should include landscape character assessments (e.g. Planning For Landscape Change or its successor, local Landscape Character assessments).	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Include the following to the list of Other Relevant Plans and Programmes  Planning for Landscape Change Local Landscape Character Assessments.
<b>Cannock Chase Council</b>	
While it is more appropriate for the statutory consultees to comment on the technical detail of this documents, it would be helpful if the scoping report also contained details of the assumptions which will be applied when undertaking the assessment of the plan's allocations (and Policies if applicable), especially as there may potentially be cross boundary implications.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> Assumptions are not required to ensure regulation compliance they are however part of a raft of measures to ensure consistency and proportionate delivery of the SA assessment. As such set of assumptions will be developed prior to Stage B of the SA process being undertaken. The assumptions will form a separate standalone appendix of the SA report.
We would also emphasise the importance of keeping the dialogue going as part of the Duty to Co-operate so that relevant information can be shared in the shaping of our restive plans.	Duly Noted <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Cannock Chase AONB</b>	
Satisfied that LDC is taking a sound approach and we have no detailed comments to make in the SA Scoping report.	Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Burntwood Town Council</b>	
The Town Council received the above Scoping Report at a recent meeting. Members agreed to receive and note the Report, adding that it would be retained for future reference.	Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Armitage with Handsacre Parish Council</b>	
The Armitage with Handsacre Parish Council do not have any comments to make on the report, at this time	Duly Noted. <b>Recommendation</b> None
<b>Walsall Council</b>	



<p><b>Identification of European sites for assessment.</b> The scoping report (page 6) identifies the River Mease SAC and Cannock Chase SAC as the only European sites as being considered to be affected by the implementation of the Local Plan Allocations. It does not include consideration of the Cannock Extension Canal SAC on the basis of the HRA produced in support of the Local Plan Strategy 'Main Modifications of the Lichfield District Local Plan : Strategy Addendum to Habitat Regulations Assessment (January 2014), which concluded:</p> <p>"The modifications propose the safeguarding of a route for a heritage towpath trail utilising the line of the Lichfield Canal and identifies this on the maps contained with the Local Plan. As this is for a path and there is reference to the requirements for further studies to satisfy the requirements for the Habitat Regulations with regard to the construction/reinstatement and watering of a canal which would link to the Cannock Extension Canal, no likely significant effects upon the Cannock Extension Canal will arise from these changes."</p> <p>While impacts to the Cannock Extension Canal SAC were understandably ruled out on the basis, it might be beneficial. Although it is note the Local Plan Allocations document will be developed in conformity with the LPS (2015), that the Cannock Extension Canal SAC be considered as a result of the project potentially featuring in greater detail than in did within the LPS, and /or the emerging documents providing an opportunity to specify the technical/regulatory requirements of the project in order to avoid significant effects to the SAC.</p>	<p>Duly Noted. HRA for the Local Plan Strategy determined that only two European Sites, Cannock Chase SAC and the River Mease SAC could experience significant harm through the delivery of the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is however a typo in relation to the Cannock Extension Canal SAC in Appendix B. Page 99: Change Cannock Extension Canal to Cannock Extension Canal SAC.</p> <p>In addition following comments received from Staffordshire County Council a landscape section has been included in Section 4 Baseline Information. This paragraph will reflect the link between the line of the Lichfield Canal and the Cannock Extension Canal SAC.</p>
<p><b>Compliance with SEA Regulation 12 (the assessment of reasonable alternatives).</b> In respect of the HRA, the scoping report states on page 6 that the SAD "will be developed in</p>	<p>Duly Noted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

<p>conformity with the LPS (2015) spatial strategy. It is therefore considered that accepted migration measures are sufficient to support the Allocations Documents.”</p> <p>While, on page 33, the scoping report states:</p> <p>“Policy considerations within the Adopted Local Plan Strategy (2015) and those also include those contained with Neighbourhood Plans may act to restrict alternatives options assessed.”</p> <p>It could be interpreted from the above extracts that the LPA plans not to consider what might be reasonable alternatives for some of its allocation options as a result of existing Local Plan policies. While these policies might well have been tested and informed at examination, having been assessed alongside reasonable alternatives, I am unsure as to whether it is appropriate to restrict the identification of new reasonable alternatives options on this basis, particularly as they might offer improved or more appropriate outcomes.</p>	<p>In terms of p6 reference. Natural England (one of the three statutory consultees) within their representation accept this approach in principle – no amendments proposed.</p> <p>In terms of the p33 reference. The intention was not to artificial restricted the options assessed at Stage B (1) by imposing adopted policy requirements before SA assessment. To avoid confusion this sentence will be removed from the text.</p>
<p><b>Appendix A (page 68)</b></p> <p>It is stated under the heading ‘Cannock Chase SAC Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Measures (SAMM)</p> <p>“A list of priority project are identified to mitigate for a 15% increase in visitors numbers.”</p> <p>The most recently produced housing monitoring, within 15km of the SAC, indicates that there are matters to be addressed in relation to the above statement. Walsall Council is working with the Cannock Chase SAC Partnership to agree what evidence is relevant to the consideration of housing numbers. This matter is of fundamental importance to additional work that might be commissioned to support Lichfield’s emerging Local Plan Allocations.</p>	<p>Duly Noted. Lichfield District is a member of the Cannock Chase SAC Partnership.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>None</p>

# **APPENDIX C – LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

## Appendix C

## International/European:

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
New York Sustainable Development Summit, 2015		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable consumption and production patterns,</li> <li>• Accelerate the shift towards sustainable consumption and production – 10 year framework of programmes of action,</li> <li>• Reverse trend in loss of natural resources,</li> <li>• Renewable energy and energy efficiency,</li> <li>• Urgently and substantially increase (global) share of renewable energy,</li> <li>• Significantly reduce rate of biodiversity loss by 2010.</li> </ul>	<p>No targets or indicators, however actions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater resource efficiency,</li> <li>• Support business innovation and take-up of best practice in technology and management,</li> <li>• Waste reduction and producer responsibility,</li> <li>• Sustainable consumer consumption and procurement,</li> <li>• The need to limit global temperatures rising no more than 2c.</li> </ul> <p>Create a level playing field for renewable energy and efficiency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New technology development,</li> <li>• Push on energy efficiency,</li> <li>• Low-carbon programmes,</li> <li>• Reduced impacts on biodiversity.</li> </ul>	<p>The Allocations Document could encourage greater efficiency of resources including encouraging renewable energy.</p> <p>The SA process for the Allocations document will need protect and enhance biodiversity.</p>
EC Habitats Directive, 1992		
<p>The Habitats Directive (together with the Birds Directive) forms the cornerstone of Europe's nature conservation policy. It is built around two pillars: the Natura 2000 network of protected sites and the strict system of species protection. All in all the directive protects over 1,000 animals/ and plant species and over 200 so called "habitat types" (e.g. special types of forests, meadows, wetlands, etc.) which are of European importance.</p>	<p>The directive requires member states to identify natural habitats and species of community interest, which may occur in their territories. States must maintain or achieve a favourable conservation status for these species and habitats through designation of protected 'Special Areas for Conservation' (SACs), and also through special measures to protect individual species. In the UK this has been/ will be implemented through the maintenance and extension of the ~8% of land area covered by SSSIs (Sites of Special Scientific</p>	<p>The SA will need to consider the impact of development on biodiversity, habitats and species in relation to SAC's.</p>

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	Interest). SSSIs were set up under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.	
<b>UN Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992</b>		
Signed by 150 government leaders at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the Convention on biological Diversity is dedicated to promoting sustainable development. Conceived as a practical tool for translating the principles of Agenda 21 into reality, the Convention recognises that biological diversity is about more than plants, animals and micro-organisms and their ecosystems – it is about people and our need for food security, medicines, fresh air and water, shelter, and a clean and healthy environment in which to live.	<p>At the convention it was agreed that member states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affirm that the conservation of biological diversity is a common concern for humankind;</li> <li>• Concern that biological diversity is being significantly reduced by certain human activities;</li> <li>• Note that it is vital to anticipate, prevent and attack the causes of significant reduction or loss of biological diversity at source;</li> <li>• Note also that where there is a threat of significant reduction or loss of biological diversity, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to avoid or minimise such a threat;</li> <li>• Note further that the fundamental requirement for the conservation of biological diversity is the in-situ conservation of ecosystems and natural habitats and the maintenance and recovery of viable populations of species in their natural surroundings.</li> </ul>	The SA will need to ensure that biodiversity, habitats and species are addressed.
<b>EU Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC) and previous directives (96/62/EC; 99/30/EC; 2002/3/EC)</b>		
<p>Directive which merges previous legislation into a single directive (except for the fourth daughter directive) with no change to existing air quality objectives. Relevant objectives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain ambient air quality where it is good and improve it in other cases respect to sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter and lead.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No targets or indicators.</li> <li>• Includes thresholds for pollutants.</li> </ul>	SA should consider the maintenance of good air quality and the measures that can be taken to improve it through, for example, an encouragement to reduce vehicle movements.
<b>EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC)</b>		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<p>Establishes a framework for the protection of inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal waters and ground water which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevents further deterioration, protects and enhances the status of aquatic ecosystems and, with regard to their water needs, terrestrial ecosystems and wetlands directly depending on the aquatic ecosystem;</li> <li>• Promotes sustainable water use based on a long-term protection of available water resources;</li> <li>• Aims at enhanced protection and improvement of the aquatic environment inter alia, through specific measures for the progressive reduction of discharges, emissions and losses of priority substances and the cessation or phasing-out of discharges, emissions and losses of the priority hazardous substances;</li> <li>• Ensures the progressive reduction of pollution of groundwater and prevents its further pollution;</li> <li>• Contributes to mitigating the effects of floods and droughts.</li> </ul>	<p>The achievement of “good status” for chemical and biological river quality. Production of River Basin Management Plans.</p>	<p>The SA should consider how the water environment can be protected and enhanced. This will come about through reducing pollution and abstraction. Protection and enhancement of water courses can also come about through physical modification. Spatial planning will need to consider whether watercourse enhancement can be achieved through working with developers.</p>
<b>EU Nitrates Directive (91/676/EEC)</b>		
<p>This Directive has the objective of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing water pollution caused or induced by nitrates from agricultural sources;</li> <li>• Preventing further such pollution.</li> </ul>	<p>Provides for the identification of vulnerable areas.</p>	<p>SA should consider impacts of development upon any identified nitrate sensitive areas where such development falls to be considered within its scope. Policies should consider objective to promote environmentally sensitive agricultural practices.</p>
<b>Drinking Water Directive (98/83/EC)</b>		
<p>Provides for the quality of drinking water.</p>	<p>Standards are legally binding.</p>	<p>SA should recognise that development can impact upon water quality and include priorities to protect the resources.</p>
<b>EU Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds (79/409/EEC)</b>		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
Identifies 181 endangered species and sub-species for which the Member States are required to designate Special Protection Areas. Makes it a legal requirement that EU countries make provision for the protection of birds. This includes the selection and designation of Special Protection Areas.	Target Actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of protected areas;</li> <li>• Upkeep and management;</li> <li>• Re-establishment of destroyed biotopes.</li> </ul>	SA should seek to protect and enhance wild bird populations, including the protection of SPAs.
<b>EU Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (92/43/EEC) and Subsequent Amendments</b>		
Directive seeks to conserve natural habitats. Conservation of natural habitats requires Member States to identify Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and to maintain, where necessary landscape features of importance to wildlife and flora. The amendments in 2007: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplify the species protection regime to better reflect the Habitats Directive;</li> <li>• Provide a clear legal basis for surveillance and monitoring of European Protected Species (EPS);</li> <li>• Toughen the regime on trading EPS that are not native to the UK;</li> <li>• Ensure that the requirement to carry out appropriate assessments on water abstraction consents and land use plans is explicit.</li> </ul>	There are no formal targets or indicators.	SA process and therefore the Allocations Document should seek to protect landscape features of habitat importance.
<b>EU Directive on Waste (75/442/EEC; 06/12/EC; 2008/98/EC as amended)</b>		
Seeks to prevent and to reduce the production of waste and its impacts. Where necessary waste should be disposed of without creating environmental problems. Seeks to protect the environment and human health by preventing or reducing the adverse impacts of the generation and management of waste and by reducing overall impacts of resource use and improving the efficiency of such use.	Promotes the development of clean technology to process waste, promoting recycling and re-use. The Directive contains a range of provision including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The setting up of separate collections of waste where technically, environmentally and economically practicable and appropriate to meet the necessary quality standards for the relevant recycling sectors – including by 2015 separate collection for at least paper, metal, plastic and glass.</li> </ul>	SA process and therefore the Allocations Document should seek to minimise waste, and the environmental effects caused by it.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household waste recycling target – the preparing for the re-use and the recycling of waste materials such as at least paper, metal, plastic and glass from households and possibly other origins as far as these waste streams are similar to waste from households, must be increased to a minimum of 50% by weight by 2020.</li> <li>Construction and demolition waste recovery target – the preparing for re-use, recycling and other material recovery of non-hazardous construction and demolition waste must be increased to a minimum of 70% by weight by 2020.</li> </ul>	
<b>EU Directive on the Landfill of Waste (99/31/EC)</b>		
Sets out requirements to ensuring that where landfilling takes place the environmental impacts are understood and mitigated against.	By 2006 biodegradable municipal waste going to landfills must be reduced to 75% of the total amount (by weight) of biodegradable municipal waste produced in 1995 or the latest year before 1995 for which standardised Eurostat data is available.	Allocation Document should consider landfilling with respect to environmental factors. Note: relationship to Regional Guidance Staffordshire and Stoke-on –Trent Joint Waste Local Plan 2010-2026.
<b>EU Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive (2015/720/EC; 94/62/EC)</b>		
The Directive lays down measures aimed, as a first priority, at preventing the production of packaging waste and, as additional fundamental principles, at reusing packaging, at recycling and other forms of recovering packaging waste, reducing the final disposal of such waste.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Between 50-65% by weight of packaging waste will be recycled.</li> <li>25-45% by weight of the totality of packaging materials contained in packaging waste will be recycled with a minimum of 15% by weight for each packaging material.</li> </ul>	Allocations Document must adhere to the relevant national legislation. Note: relationship to Regional Guidance Staffordshire and Stoke-on–Trent Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy 2010-2026.
<b>Renewed EU Sustainable Development Strategy (2006)</b>		
In June 2001, the first European sustainable development strategy was agreed by EU Heads of State. The Strategy sets out how the EU can meet the needs of present generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. The Strategy proposes headline objectives and lists seven key challenges:	<p>The overall objectives in the Strategy are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safeguard the earth's capacity to support life in all its diversity, respect the limits of the planet's natural resources and ensure a high level of protection and improvement of the quality of the environment. Prevent and reduce environmental pollution and promote sustainable consumption</li> </ul>	Allocation Document should aim to create a pattern of development consistent with the objectives of the Strategy and in turn promote sustainable development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate change and clean energy,</li> </ul>		



Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable transport,</li> <li>• Sustainable consumption and production,</li> <li>• Conservation and management of natural resources,</li> <li>• Public health,</li> <li>• Social inclusion, demography and migration,</li> <li>• Global poverty.</li> </ul>	<p>and production to break the link between economic growth and environmental degradation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote a democratic, socially inclusive, cohesive, healthy, safe and just society with respect for fundamental rights and cultural diversity that creates equal opportunities and combats discrimination in all its forms.</li> <li>• Promote a prosperous, innovative, knowledge-rich, competitive and eco-efficient economy which provides high living standards and full and high-quality employment throughout the European Union.</li> <li>• Encourage the establishment and defend the stability of democratic institutions across the world, based on peace, security and freedom. Actively promote sustainable development worldwide and ensure that the policies are consistent with global sustainable development and its international commitments.</li> </ul>	
<b>UNFCCC (1997) The Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC</b>		
The Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC established the first policy that actively aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by industrialised countries.	Construction is a significant source of greenhouse gas emissions due to the consumption of materials and use of energy. The Kyoto Protocol aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions of the UK by 2008-2012.	The Kyoto Protocol is influential to achieving sustainable development as it encourages transition to a low carbon economy. Therefore it is an integral factor in planning documents.
<b>World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) Our Common Future (The Brundtland Report)</b>		
<p>The Brundtland Report is concerned with the world's economy and its environment. The objective is to provide an expanding and sustainable economy while protecting a sustainable environment. The Report was in response to a call by the United Nations which sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To propose long-term environmental strategies for achieving sustainable development by the year 2000 and beyond;</li> </ul>	The report issued a multitude of recommendations with the aim of attaining sustainable development and addressing the problems posed by a global economy that is intertwined with the environment.	The Brundtland Report provided the original definition of sustainable development. The accumulated effect of the SA objectives seek to achieve sustainable development.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To recommend ways in which the environment may be translated into greater co-operation among countries of the global South and between countries at different stages of economic and social development and lead to the achievement of common and mutually supportive objectives that take account of the interrelationships between people, resources, environment and development;</li> <li>• To consider ways and means by which the international community can deal more effectively with environmental concerns;</li> <li>• To help define shared perceptions of long-term environmental issues and the appropriate efforts needed to deal successfully with the problems of protecting and enhancing the environment, a long term agenda for action during the coming decades, and aspirational goals for the world community.</li> </ul>		
European Structural and Investment Funds Growth Programme 2014-2020 (July)		
<p>The European Structural and Investment Funds programme provides funds to help local areas grow. The funds support investment in innovation, businesses, skills and employment and create jobs.</p>	<p>Running from 2014 to 2020, there are three types of funds involved in the programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) focuses on improving the employment opportunities, promoting social inclusion and investing in skills by providing help to people who need support in fulfilling their potential.</li> <li>• European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) supports research and innovation, small to medium sized enterprises and creation of a low carbon economy.</li> <li>• European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) supports rural</li> </ul>	<p>A need to recognise of the direction of the strategy in terms of facilitating sustainable economic growth.</p>

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	businesses to grow and expand, improve knowledge and skills and get started.	
<b>The UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)</b>		
The Convention aims at the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value.	The Convention sets out the duties of States' Parties in identifying potential sites and their role in protecting and preserving them. By signing the Convention, each country pledges to conserve not only the World Heritage sites situated on its territory, but also to protect its national heritage. The States' Parties are encouraged to integrate the protection of the cultural and natural heritage into regional planning programmes, set up staff and services at their sites, undertake scientific and technical conservation research and adopt measures which give this heritage a function in the day-to-day life of the community.	Allocations Document could influence the historic environment in several ways, including protecting and conserving historic structures and features, as well as reducing carbon dioxide emissions.
<b>European Strategy for Sustainable Development (2009)</b>		
This strategy provides an EU-wide policy framework to deliver sustainable development, i.e. to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit climate change and its effects by meeting commitments under Kyoto Protocol and under the framework of the European Strategy on Climate Change. Energy efficiency, renewable energy and transport will be the subject of particular efforts.</li> <li>• Limiting the adverse effects of transport and reducing regional disparities and do more to develop transport that is environmentally friendly and conducive to health.</li> <li>• To promote more sustainable modes of production and consumption with attention paid to how much ecosystems can tolerate.</li> <li>• Sustainable management of natural resources in particular the EU must make efforts in agriculture, fisheries and forest management; see to it that the Natura 2000 network is completed; define and implement priority actions to protect biodiversity,</li> </ul>	These issues need to be incorporated into the SA appraisal process.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	<p>and make sure that aspects associated with the seas and oceans are duly taken into account. Recycling and re-use must also be supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limiting major threats to public health.</li> <li>• Social exclusion and poverty and mitigate the effects of an ageing society.</li> <li>• The fight against global poverty.</li> </ul>	
<b>Our Life Insurance, Our Natural Capital: An EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 (2011)</b>		
This strategy is aimed at reversing biodiversity loss and speeding up the EU's transition towards a resource efficient and green economy.	<p>The EU 2020 biodiversity target is underpinned by the recognition that, in addition to its intrinsic value, biodiversity and the services it provides have significant economic value that is seldom captured in markets. Because it escapes pricing and is not reflected in society's accounts, biodiversity often falls victim to competing claims on nature and its use.</p> <p>The 2020 headline target is: Halting the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services in the EU by 2020, and restoring them in so far as feasible, while stepping up the EU contribution to averting global biodiversity loss.</p>	Ensuring that biodiversity forms part of the SA assessment and that biodiversity mitigation measures to reduce the impact of development on the environment are addressed.
<b>Energy Efficiency Plan (2011)</b>		
Energy efficiency is at the heart of the EU's Europe 2020 Strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth and of the transition to a resource efficient economy. Energy efficiency is one of the most cost effective ways to enhance security of energy supply, and to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants.	The European Union has set itself a target for 2020 of saving 20% of its primary energy consumption compared to projections.	The need to ensure that energy efficiency forms part of the mitigation strategy to reduce the impact of climate change upon the environment.
<b>Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (1979)</b>		
The principal aims of the Conservation are to ensure conservation and protection of wild plant and animal species and their natural habitats (listed in Appendices I and II of the Convention), to increase cooperation between contracting parties, and to regulate the	<p>At the Convention it was agreed that Member States would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise that wild flora and fauna constitute a natural heritage of aesthetic, scientific, cultural, recreational, economic and intrinsic value that</li> </ul>	Ensure that habitats and species are addressed through the SA.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
exploitation of those species (including migratory species) listed in Appendix 3 of the Convention. To this end the Convention imposes legal obligations on contracting parties, protecting over 500 wild plant species and more than 1000 wild animal species.	<p>needs to be preserved and handed on to future generations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise the essential role played by will for flora and fauna in maintaining biological balances;</li> <li>• Note that numerous species of wild flora and fauna are being seriously depleted and that some of them are threatened with extinction;</li> <li>• Be aware that conservation of natural habitats is a vital component of the protection and conservation of wild flora and fauna;</li> <li>• Recognise that the conservation of wild flora and fauna should be taken into consideration by the governments in their national goals and programmes, and that international co-operation should be established to protect migratory species in particular.</li> </ul>	
EU Seventh Environmental Action Programme of the European Community		
<p>Identifies three key objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to protect, conserve and enhance the Union's natural capital</li> <li>• to turn the Union into a resource-efficient, green, and competitive low-carbon economy</li> <li>• to safeguard the Union's citizens from environment-related pressures and risks to health and wellbeing</li> </ul>	<p>Four so called "enablers" will help Europe deliver on these goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• better implementation of legislation</li> <li>• better information by improving the knowledge base</li> <li>• more and wiser investment for environment and climate policy</li> <li>• full integration of environmental requirements and considerations into other policies</li> </ul> <p>Two additional horizontal priority objectives complete the program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to make the Union's cities more sustainable to help the Union address international environmental and climate challenges more effectively.</li> </ul>	Ensure that the Allocations SA takes into account the objectives.
UNESCO World Heritage Convention 1972		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
The General Conference of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organizations adopted on 1972 the Recommendation concerning the Protection at National Level of the Cultural and Natural Heritage. Provides a permanent framework, legal, administrative and financial for international cooperation in safeguarding mankind's cultural and natural heritage, and introduces the specific notion of a world heritage whose importance transcends all political and geographical boundaries.	The most significant feature of the 1972 World Heritage Convention is that it links together in a single document the concepts of nature conservation and the preservation of cultural properties. The convention recognizes the way in which people interact with nature, and the fundamental need to preserve the balance between the two. Strategic Objectives the five Cs Credibility Conservation Capacity –building Communication Communities.	Ensure that the Allocations SA takes into account the objectives
<b>European Landscape Convention (Florence Convention)</b>		
The European Landscape Convention introduced a Europe-wide concept focused on the quality of landscape protection, management and planning.	The Convention aims are to promote landscape protection, management and planning.	Ensure that the Allocations SA takes into account the objectives
<b>The convention for the protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada Convention)</b>		
Provides a definition for architectural heritage includes the creation of an inventory of architectural heritage and to implement statutory measures to protect such heritage.	Aim to adopt integrated conservation policies within the planning system that will promote the conservation and enhancement of architectural heritage.	Ensure that the Allocations SA takes into account the objectives
<b>The European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (Valetta Convention)</b>		
Defines archaeological heritage with the aims to make and maintain an inventory of it and to legislate for the protection. The emphasis is on protection of sites for future study and the reporting of chance finds, the control of excavations and the use of metal Detectors.	Aims to allow the input of expert archaeologists into the making of planning policies and planning decisions.	Ensure that the Allocations SA takes into account the objectives

National:

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<b>Securing the Future – the UK Sustainable Development (2005)</b>		
<p>The Strategy has 5 guiding principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Living within environmental limits</li> <li>• Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society</li> <li>• Achieving a sustainable economy</li> <li>• Promoting good governance</li> <li>• Using sound science responsibly</li> </ul> <p>4 Strategic Priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable consumption and production</li> <li>• Natural resource protections</li> <li>• Environmental enhancement</li> <li>• Sustainable communities</li> </ul>	<p>The Strategy contains a new set of indicators to monitor progress towards sustainable development in the UK. Those most relevant at the district level include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenhouse gas emissions</li> <li>• Road freight (CO2 emissions and tonne km, tonnes and GDP)</li> <li>• Household waste (a) rising (b) recycled or composted</li> <li>• Local environmental quality</li> </ul>	<p>Consider how the Allocations Documents can contribute to Sustainable Development Strategies Objectives.</p>
<b>The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981)</b>		
<p>The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 consolidates and amends existing national legislation to implement the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention) and Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds (Birds Directive) in Great Britain (NB Council Directive 79/409/EEC has now been replaced by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds (codified version)).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of wildlife</li> <li>• Notification and confirmation of SSSIs</li> <li>• Protection of Habitats</li> </ul>	<p>Ensure that the SA addresses biodiversity, and nature conservation sites including SSSIs.</p>
<b>Countryside Rights of Way Act (2000)</b>		
<p>The provisions it contains being brought into force in incremental steps over subsequent years. Containing five Parts and 15 Schedules, the Act provides for public access on foot to certain types of land, amends the law relating to public rights of way, increases measures for the management and protection for Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and strengthens wildlife enforcement legislation, and provides for better management of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Act provides a new right of public access on foot to areas of open land.</li> <li>• The Act also provides safeguards which take into account the needs of landowners and occupiers, and of other interests, including wildlife.</li> <li>• The Act improves the rights of way legislation by encouraging the creation of new routes and clarifying uncertainties about existing rights.</li> <li>• The Act places a duty on Government Departments and the National Assembly for Wales</li> </ul>	<p>Ensure that countryside issues are addressed in within the Allocations Document.</p>

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	to have regard for the conservation of biodiversity and maintain lists of species and habitats for which conservation steps should be taken or promoted, in accordance with the Convention on Biological Diversity.	
<b>Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006)</b>		
The Act is designed to help achieve a rich and diverse natural environment and thriving rural communities through modernised and simplified arrangements for delivering Government policy. The Act implements key elements of the Government's Rural Strategy published in July 2004.	The Act makes provision in respect of biodiversity, pesticides harmful to wildlife and the protection of birds, and in respect of invasive non-native species. It alters enforcement powers in connection with wildlife protection, and extends time limits for prosecuting certain wildlife offences. It addresses a small number of gaps and uncertainties which have been identified in relation to the law on Sites of Special Scientific Interest. It amends the functions and constitution of National Park Authorities, the functions of the Broads Authority and the law on rights of way.	Ensure that SA addresses biodiversity, and nature conservation sites.
<b>Rural Strategy (DEFRA, 2004)</b>		
The Government's three priorities for rural policy are: 1. Economic and Social Regeneration – supporting enterprise across rural England, but targeting greater resources at areas of greatest need. • Building on the economic success of the majority of the rural areas. • Tackling the structural economic weaknesses and accompanying poor social conditions. 2. Social Justice for All – tackling rural social exclusion wherever it occurs and providing fair access to services and opportunities for all rural people. • Social priorities are to ensure fair access to public services are affordable • In both more and less prosperous areas, to tackle social exclusion wherever it occurs	No targets or indicators.	Ensure support is given to the overarching themes contained within the Rural Strategy.



Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
3. Enhancing the Value of our Countryside – protecting the natural environment for this and future generations.		
Environment Agency (2009) 'Water for people and the environment' – Water Resources Strategy for England and Wales		
<p>Strategy sets out how resources in England and Wales should be managed and provides a plan of how to use them in a sustainable way, now and in the future. The Strategy aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enable habitats and species to adapt better to climate change;</li> <li>• Allow the way we protect the water environment to adjust flexibly to a changing climate;</li> <li>• Reduce pressure on the environment caused by water taken for human use;</li> <li>• Encourage options resilient to climate change to be chosen in the face of uncertainty;</li> <li>• Better protect vital water supply infrastructure;</li> <li>• Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from people using water, considering the whole life-cycle of use;</li> <li>• Improve understanding of the risks and uncertainties of climate change.</li> </ul>	<p>Target set for England, that the average amount of water used per person in the home is reduced to 130 litres each day by 2030.</p>	<p>Ensure broad objectives within the Strategy are taken on board.</p>
Sustainable Energy Act (2008)		
<p>The Act aims to promote sustainable energy development and use and report on progress regarding cutting the UK's carbon emissions and reducing the number of people living in fuel poverty.</p>	<p>Specific targets are set by the Secretary of State as energy efficiency aims.</p>	<p>The Act requires the encouragement and reporting on the UK's attempts to increase energy efficiency and renewable energy use.</p>
Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (2007) DEFRA		
<p>The Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sets out a way forward for work and planning on air quality issues;</li> <li>• Sets out the air quality standards and objectives to be achieved;</li> </ul>	<p>The Air Quality Strategy sets out objectives for a range of pollutants that have not been reproduced here due to space constraints.</p>	<p>Allocation Document should take account of the Strategy where there are likely to be issues relating to air quality.</p>

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduces a new policy framework for tackling fine particles,</li> <li>Identifies potential new national policy measures which could give further health benefits and move closer towards meeting the Strategy's objectives.</li> </ul>		
<b>The Planning Act (2008)</b>		
Introduced a system for nationally significant infrastructure planning, alongside further reforms to the Town and Country Planning system. A major component of this legislation is the introduction of an independent Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC), to take decisions on major infrastructure projects (transport, energy, water and waste). To support decision-making, the IPC will refer to the Government's National Policy Statements (NPSs), which will provide a clear long-term strategic direction for nationally significant infrastructure development.	No key targets.	Should take into account any relevant National Policy Statements when published.
<b>The Climate Change Act (2008)</b>		
<p>This Act aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To improve carbon management and help the transition towards a low carbon economy in the UK;</li> <li>To demonstrate strong UK leadership internationally, signalling that the UK is committed to taking its share of responsibility for reducing global emissions in the context of developing negotiations on a post 2012 global agreement at Copenhagen.</li> </ul>	<p>The Act sets legally binding targets – Greenhouse gas emission reductions through action in the UK and abroad of at least 80% by 2050, and reductions in CO2 emissions of at least 26% by 2020, against a 1990 baseline. The 2020 target will be reviewed soon after Royal Assent to reflect the move to all greenhouse gases and the increase in the 2050 target to 80%. Further the Act provides for a carbon budgeting system which caps emissions over five year periods, with three budgets set at a time.</p>	Act sets out a clear precedent for the UK to lead in responding to the threats climate change provides
<b>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</b>		
In addition to normal planning framework set out in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990:	Protecting and enhancing the <u>historic environment</u>	Policies relating to listed buildings and their settings and conservation areas must address the statutory

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides specific protection for buildings and areas of special architectural or historic interest</li> <li>the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 provides specific protection for scheduled monuments</li> </ul>		considerations of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (see in particular sections 16, 66 and 72) as well as satisfying the relevant policies within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan.
<b>National Heritage Protection Plan</b>		
The objective of the National Heritage Protection Plan is to make the best use of our resources so that England's vulnerable historic environment is safeguarded in the most cost-effective way at a time of massive social, environmental, economic and technological change	Includes an action Plan but should be noted that the timeframe is 20011-2015	The Allocations documents through the SA should seek to contribute towards the protection and improving access to cultural heritage.
<b>England Biodiversity Strategy Climate Change Adaption Principles Conserving Biodiversity in a Changing World (2008)</b>		
The document includes a number of board principles	No specific relevant targets identified	The Allocations document should seek to comply with the principles identified within the strategy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conserve existing biodiversity</li> <li>Conserve protected areas and all other high quality habitats</li> <li>Reduce sources of harm not linked to climate</li> <li>Maintain existing ecological networks</li> <li>Create buffer zones around high quality habitats</li> <li>Make space for the natural development of rivers and coasts</li> <li>Establish ecological networks through habitat restoration and creation</li> <li>Integrate adaptation and mitigation measures</li> </ul>		
<b>Government forestry and Woodlands Statement</b>		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<p>Seeks to maximise the environmental, economic and social benefits of trees and woodlands forests, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring that trees, woods and forest are resilient to and mitigate the impacts of climate change</li> <li>• Protecting and enhancing the environmental resources of water, soil, air biodiversity and landscapes.</li> <li>• Protecting and enhancing the cultural and amenity values of trees and woodland</li> <li>• Increasing the contribution that trees, woods and forests make to the quality of life.</li> <li>• Improving the competitiveness of woodland businesses and promote the development of new or improved markets for sustainable woodland products.</li> </ul>	No specific relevant targets identified	The Allocations document should seek to ensure that new developments contribute towards the protection of existing, and the delivery of new woodland trees.
<b>Biodiversity Duty: Public authority duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity (2014)</b>		
Sets out the duty of public authorities with regard to conserving biodiversity. Conserving biodiversity can include restoring or enhancing a population or habitat.	No specific targets set.	Incorporate biodiversity into the SA process.
<b>Conserving biodiversity – The UK Approach (2007)</b>		
This statement has been prepared by the UK Biodiversity Standing Committee on behalf of the UK Biodiversity Partnership. Its purpose is to set out the vision and approach to conserving biodiversity within the UK's devolved framework for anyone with a policy interest in biodiversity conservation.	<p>A shared purpose in tackling the loss and restoration of biodiversity.</p> <p>The guiding principles that we will follow to achieve it.</p> <p>Our priorities for action in the UK and internationally.</p> <p>Indicators to monitor the key issues on a UK basis.</p>	Incorporate biodiversity into the SA process.
<b>Safeguarding our soils: A Strategy for England (2009)</b>		
The Strategy supports the aims of the EU Thematic Strategy on Soil Protection and demonstrates the value of national action to protect soils which is responsive to local circumstances.	Vision: by 2030, all England's soils will be managed sustainably and degradation threats tackled successfully. This will improve the quality of England's soils and safeguard their ability to provide essential services for future generations.	Inclusion of soil protection in the SA process and recognition of need to avoid Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land in the delivery of sites.
<b>Low Carbon Transition Plan (2009)</b>		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
This white paper sets out the UK's first ever comprehensive low carbon transition plan to 2020.	<p>This plan will deliver emissions cuts of 18% on 2008 levels by 2020 (and over a one third reduction on 1990 levels).</p> <p>All major UK Government departments have been allocated their own carbon budget and must produce their own plan.</p> <p>Getting 40% of our electricity from low carbon sources by 2020 with policies to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Produce around 30% of our electricity from renewables by 2020 by substantially increasing the requirement for electricity suppliers to sell renewable electricity.</li> </ul>	Consideration of GHG and climate change in SA.
<b>Renewable Energy Strategy (2009)</b>		
This strategy shows how the UK will transition to an energy supply that incorporates renewable technologies.	Goal of 15% of energy from renewables by 2020.	Consideration of GHG and climate change in SA.
<b>Noise Policy Statement for England (2010)</b>		
The aim of this document is to provide clarity regarding current policies and practices to enable noise management decisions to be made within the wider context, at the most appropriate level, in a cost-effective manner and in a timely fashion.	<p>"Environmental noise" which includes noise from transportation sources.</p> <p>"Neighbour noise" which includes noise from inside and outside people's homes.</p> <p>"Neighbourhood noise" which includes noise arising from within the community such as industrial and entertainment premises, trade and business premises, construction sites and noise in the street.</p>	Ensure that noise is adequately captured in SA.
<b>National Infrastructure Plan (2010)</b>		
The plan outlines the scale of the challenge facing UK infrastructure and the major investment that is needed to underpin sustainable growth in the UK. It focuses on the networks and systems – in energy, transport, digital communications, floodwater, waste management and in science – that provide the infrastructure on which our economy depends. The plan gives clarity on the role of Government in specifying what infrastructure	<p>The plan sets out the Government's vision for major infrastructure investment in the UK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maximising the potential of existing road and rail networks;</li> <li>Transforming energy and transport systems to deliver a low carbon economy;</li> <li>Transforming the UK's strategic rail infrastructure;</li> </ul>	Infrastructure forms an important part of the evidence base that will support the delivery of the Allocations Document.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
we need and how it can remove barriers to mobilise both private and public sector resources to maintain our world class infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting future challenges in providing sustainable access to water for everyone;</li> <li>• Protecting the economy from the current and growing risk of floods and coastal erosion;</li> <li>• Reducing waste and improving the way it is treated;</li> <li>• Providing the best superfast broadband in Europe;</li> <li>• Ensuring that the UK remains a world leader in science, research and innovation.</li> </ul>	
The White Paper "Water for Life" (2011)		
Water for Life describes a vision for future water management in which the water sector is resilient, in which water companies are more efficient and customer focused, and in which water is valued as the precious and finite resource it is. It explains that we all have a part to play in the realisation of this vision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over the long-term we will introduce a reformed water abstraction regime, as signalled in the Natural Environment White Paper earlier this year;</li> <li>• We set out changes we can make now to deal with the legacy of over-abstraction of our rivers;</li> <li>• We re-affirm our new catchment approach to dealing with water quality and wider environmental issues;</li> <li>• We will remove barriers to the greater trading of abstraction licenses and bulk supplies of water to make our supply system more flexible;</li> <li>• With the Environment Agency and Ofwat we will provide clearer guidance to water companies on planning for the long-term, and keeping demand down;</li> <li>• We will consult on the introduction of national standards and a new planning approval system for sustainable drainage;</li> <li>• We will encourage water companies to introduce social tariffs to support vulnerable customers;</li> <li>• We will introduce a package of reforms to extend competition in the water sector by increasing choice for business customers and public sector</li> </ul>	Water management needs to be addressed in SA.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	<p>bodies and by making the market more attractive to new entrants;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We will collaborate on a campaign to save water and protect the environment, working with water companies, regulators and customers to raise awareness of the connection between how we use water and the quality of our rivers.</li> </ul>	
<b>The Flood and Water Management Act (2010)</b>		
<p>The Flood and Water Management Act (FWMA) takes forward a number of recommendations from the Pitt Review into the 2007 floods. It places new responsibilities on the Environment Agency, local authorities and property developers (among others) to manage the risk of flooding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local authorities across England and Wales are required to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a strategy for local flood risk management in their areas. These local strategies must include the risk of flooding from surface water, watercourse and groundwater flooding.</li> <li>Lead local authorities must establish and maintain a register of structures which have an effect on flood risk management in their areas.</li> <li>The Act introduces a requirement to improve the flood resistance of existing buildings by amending the Building Act 1984.</li> <li>The Act introduces the requirements for developers of property to construct Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS).</li> <li>Local authorities have a duty to adopt these SUDS once completed. By adoption, the Act means become responsible for maintaining the systems.</li> </ul>	<p>Importance of SUDS in mitigation of the effects of flood risk needs to be addressed in SA.</p>
<b>White Paper – The Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature (2011)</b>		
<p>Outlines the Government's vision for the natural environment over the next 50 years, backed up with practical action to deliver the ambition.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joined-up action at local and national level to create an ecological network resilient to changing pressures.</li> <li>Growing a green economy and recognising that protected natural areas can yield returns many times higher than their protection.</li> </ul>	<p>The importance of nature not just for species but for people too needs to be considered in the SA.</p>

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognising the huge benefits of having contact with nature and how it helps well-being through its positive impact on mental and physical health, improves education, encourages social activity and reduced crime.</li> </ul>	
<b>Biodiversity 2020: A Strategy for England's Wildlife and Ecosystem Services</b>		
<p>This strategy will guide conservation efforts in England over the next decade, including setting the ambition to halt overall loss of England's biodiversity by 2020. In the longer term, the ambition is to move progressively from a position of net biodiversity loss to net gain.</p>	<p>At the Nagoya UN Biodiversity Summit in October 2010, 192 countries and the European Union agreed to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people'.</li> <li>'Take effective and urgent action to halt the loss of biodiversity in order to ensure that by 2020 ecosystems are resilient and continue to provide essential services, thereby securing the planet's variety of life, and contributing to human wellbeing, and poverty eradication...'</li> </ul> <p>In March 2010, the EU agreed to an EU vision and 2020 mission for biodiversity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2050, European Union biodiversity and the ecosystem services it provides – and its natural capital are protected, valued and appropriately restored for biodiversity's intrinsic value and for their essential contribution to human wellbeing and economic prosperity, and so that catastrophic changes caused by the loss of biodiversity are avoided.</li> <li>Halt the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services in the EU by 2020, and restore them insofar as is feasible, while stepping up the EU contribution to averting global biodiversity loss.</li> </ul>	<p>The importance of biodiversity and the need to incorporate the impact of development upon it in needs to be considered in the SA.</p>



Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	<p>The European Commission has adopted a new EU Biodiversity strategy to help meet this goal. The strategy provides a framework for action over the next decade and covers the following key areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conserving and restoring nature,</li> <li>2. Maintaining and enhancing ecosystems and their services,</li> <li>3. Ensuring the sustainability of agriculture, forestry and fisheries,</li> <li>4. Combating invasive alien species,</li> <li>5. Addressing the global biodiversity crisis.</li> </ol>	
<b>Healthy Lives, healthy People: Our Strategy for Public Health in England (DOH 2010)</b>		
<p>The strategy has the following aims</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect the population from serious health threats</li> <li>• Helping people live longer</li> <li>• Healthier and more fulfilling lives</li> <li>• Improving the health of the poorest fastest</li> </ul>	No targets identified	The Allocations document should reflect the objectives of the strategy where relevant.
<b>Enabling the Transition to a Green Economy (2011)</b>		
This document sets out the range of policy tools the Government are using to support the transition to a green economy, the opportunities that are created and the implications for the way in which businesses operate.	<p>The Government's vision is to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grow the economy sustainably and for the long term;</li> <li>• Use natural resources efficiently;</li> <li>• Be more resilient (use of fossil fuels).</li> </ul>	SA needs to take into account the impact of economic development upon the climate and the way in which the SA appraises these impacts and how the plan will mitigate the effects on the environment.
<b>The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010)</b>		
The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 consolidate all the various amendments made to the Conservation Regulations 1994 in respect of England and Wales.	<p>The Regulations provide for the designation and protection of 'European sites', the protection of 'European protected species' and the adaptation of planning and other controls for the protection of European Sites.</p> <p>Under the Regulations, competent authorities i.e. any Minister, government department, public body, or person holding public office, have a general duty, in the</p>	Ensure that biodiversity and nature conservation issues are addressed in SA.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	exercise of any of their functions, to have regard to the EC Habitats Directive.	
<b>Localism Act (2011)</b>		
The Localism Act is one of the key pieces of legislation introduced by the Government. It is a radical shift of power from central government to local communities. The aim is to give power back to people and communities and create the conditions for Big Society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abolition of regional strategies</li> <li>• Duty to cooperate</li> <li>• Neighbourhood Planning</li> <li>• Community Right to Build</li> </ul>	Ensure that evidence collected to support the SA and Allocations Document is locally derived where applicable.
<b>National Planning Policy Framework</b>		
The National Planning Policy Framework sets out government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It sets out the Government's requirements for the planning system only to the extent that it is relevant, proportionate and necessary to do so. It provides a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities.	The entire document presents the Government's approach to development in respect of social, economic and environmental issues.	Allocations Document needs to be in conformity with the NPPF.
<b>A Better Quality of Life – Strategy for Sustainable Development (1999)</b>		
<p>Strategy for sustainable development has four main aims. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;</li> <li>• effective protection of the environment;</li> <li>• prudent use of natural resources; and</li> <li>• maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.</li> </ul>	<p>For the UK, priorities for the future are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more investment in people and equipment for a competitive economy;</li> <li>• reducing the level of social exclusion;</li> <li>• promoting a transport system which provides choice, and also minimises environmental harm and reduces congestion;</li> <li>• improving the larger towns and cities to make them better places to live and work;</li> <li>• directing development and promoting agricultural practices to protect and enhance the countryside and wildlife;</li> <li>• improving energy efficiency and tackling waste;</li> </ul>	Ensure that SA and Allocations Document take account of this strategy.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>working with others to achieve sustainable development internationally.</li> </ul>	
<b>Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2012)</b>		
The Government's overarching aim is to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community.	The Government's aims in respect of traveller sites are that local planning authorities should make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning, working collaboratively to develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites. That plan-making and decision-making should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development, should aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments, make enforcement more effective. To enable the provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure etc.	Ensure that traveller sites are addressed in SA.
<b>Circular 06/05: Biodiversity &amp; Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their impact within the Planning System</b>		
Provides administrative guidance on the application of the law relating to planning and nature conservation as it applies in England. It complements the national planning policy in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.	Policies will need to take account of this guidance.	Ensure that biodiversity and geological conservation issues are addressed in SA.
<b>Infrastructure Act (2015)</b>		
The Infrastructure Act is one of the key pieces of legislation introduced by the Government.	Policies will need to take account of this Act.	Allocations Document needs to take into account this Act.
<b>Living places: Cleaner, Safer, Greener, ODPM (2002)</b>		
Sets out the Government's approach to making cleaner, safer, greener public spaces. Explains why our public spaces are so important. Identifies key components that underpin successful schemes. Maps the main policies of the ODPM, the Home Office, DfT, DEFRA and DCMS that are improving the quality of local environments. Highlights reforms, policies and initiatives.	Various targets are set within the document.	Ensure that public spaces are addressed in SA.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<b>Housing &amp; Planning Act (2016)</b>		
<p>A Bill to make provision about housing, estate agents, rentcharges, planning and compulsory purchase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>place a duty on local planning authorities to actively promote the development of Starter Homes and embed them in the planning system</li> <li>unlock brownfield land to provide homes faster, requiring local authorities to prepare, maintain and publish local registers of specified land</li> <li>support the doubling of the number of custom-built and self-built homes to 20,000 by 2020</li> <li>ensure that every area has a Local Plan</li> <li>reform the compulsory purchase process to make it clearer, fairer and faster</li> <li>simplify and speed up neighbourhood planning</li> </ul>	Policies will need to take account of this Act.	Allocations Document needs to take into account this Act.
<b>Planning &amp; Compulsory Purchase Act (2004)</b>		
The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is a key element of the Government's agenda for speeding up the planning system. The provisions introduce powers which allow for the reform and speeding up of the plans system and an increase in the predictability of planning decisions, the speeding up of the handling of major infrastructure projects and the need for simplified planning zones to be identified in the strategic plan for a region.	Policies will need to take account of this Act.	Allocations Document needs to take into account this Act.
<b>Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations (2012)</b>		
The Community Infrastructure Levy is a new levy that Local Authorities in England and Wales can choose to charge on new developments in their area. The levy is designed to be fairer, faster and more transparent than the previous system of agreeing planning obligations between local councils and developers under Section 106.	Policies will need to take account of this Act.	Lichfield District Council have an adopted CIL, this should be considered as part of any updates to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
<b>Water Act (2014)</b>		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
To make provision about the water industry; about compensation for modification of licences to abstract water; about main river maps; about records of waterworks; for the regulation of the water environment; about the provision of flood insurance for household premises; about internal drainage boards; about Regional Flood and Coastal Committees; and for connected purposes.	Policies will need to take account of this Act.	AAAllocations Document needs to take into account this Act.
High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill 2013/14 to 2015/16		
Provides information on the HS2 hybrid Bill progressing through Parliament for Phase One of the project between London and the West Midlands.	Policies will need to take account of this Bill.	Ensure that high speed rail is addressed in SA and Allocations Document.
Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future (2003)		
The Plan sets out a long-term program of action for delivering sustainable communities in both urban and rural areas. The Plan includes not just a significant increase in resources and major reforms of housing and planning, but a new approach to how we build and what we build.	Document sets out a number of targets	SA needs to ensure sustainable communities issues are addressed.
Planning Our Electric Futures: A white Paper for a secure, affordable and low carbon electricity		
The primary objectives of Electricity Market Reform area are to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ensure the future security of electricity suppliers</li> <li>Drive the decarbonisation of our electricity generation</li> <li>Minimise costs to the consumer</li> </ul>	No specific Targets	The Allocations document should seek to ensure that it reflects the objectives.
The Carbon Plan: Delivering Our Carbon Future		
Government is determined that we should address the twin challenges of tackling climate change and maintain our energy security in a way that minimises costs and maximises benefits to our economy.	No specific Targets	The Allocations Document should seek to support the delivery of low carbon energy generation infrastructure.
Energy Efficiency Strategy		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<p>Sets out the justification for improving energy efficiency by the following actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supporting the finance market</li> <li>• energy efficiency innovation</li> <li>• strengthen the evidence base</li> <li>• controls and information</li> </ul>	Reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80% between 1990 and 2050.	Allocations document should support the delivery of development that is efficient in energy use.
<b>Energy Security Strategy</b>		
<p>The document includes a range of ambitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resilience measures</li> <li>• Energy efficiency</li> <li>• Maximising economic production</li> <li>• Working to improve the reliability of global energy markets</li> <li>• Reliable networks</li> <li>• Decarbonising supplies</li> </ul>		A number of the indicators identified within the documents will be used as indicators for the SA Framework.
<b>Historic England's Regional Streetscape Manuals West Midlands</b>		
Sets out principals of good practice for street design which is reflective of regional historic character	Offer guidance on the way in which the public realm is managed promoting a co-ordinated approach to creating a safe and enjoyable environment appropriate to its surroundings.	The Allocations document should seek to ensure that it reflects the objectives.
<b>National Planning Practice Guidance (2014)</b>		
The national Planning Practice Guidance provides technical guidance in topic areas in order to support policies set out within the NPPF.	It aims to allow for sustainable development as guided by the NPPF	The Allocations document should seek to ensure that it reflects the objectives.

## Regional:

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<b>Strategic Plan 2013 - 2018 Leading for a connected Staffordshire, Staffordshire County Council</b>		
Staffordshire County Councils Strategic Plan sets out values and priorities for 2014-2018. The Strategic Plan outlines a vision, to create a connected Staffordshire,	<p><b>Relevant Operating Principles</b></p> <p><b>Evolve our relationship with residents</b></p>	Regard should be given to the Strategy.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<p>where everyone has the opportunity to prosper, be healthy and happy.</p> <p>As a result of this vision the strategic plan outlines three priority outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be able to access more good jobs and feel the benefits of economic growth</li> <li>• Be healthier and more independent</li> <li>• Feel safer, happier and more supported in and by their community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give a stronger voice and more clout to the people of Staffordshire on the issues that matter to them, not just those issues we have a statutory responsibility to deliver.</li> <li>• Encourage and support all Elected Members to be true community leaders, informing and influencing at a local and county level to create great places to live.</li> <li>• Collaborate with residents and communities to identify the best long-term solutions to problems, whether that's from within the community itself or from the voluntary, private or public sector.</li> </ul> <p><b>Staffordshire County Council will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote Staffordshire as the place to invest, live, learn and visit.</li> <li>• Be the passionate advocate for Staffordshire locally, nationally and internationally, seeking to deal with only the things that matter to our residents.</li> </ul> <p><b>How we work:</b></p> <p>Get more joined up, locally and corporately, so we can work with residents, communities and partners to meet local needs more effectively.</p>	
<b>Staffordshire Local Transport Plan 2011</b>		
<p>Sets out the County Council's proposals for transport provision in the county, including walking, cycling, public transport, car based travel and freight, together with the management and maintenance of local roads and footways.</p>	<p><b>Supporting Growth and Regeneration</b></p> <p>Relevant Policies: 1.1-1.6 and 1.8</p> <p>Relevant Targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the overall employment rate from a 2009 baseline.</li> </ul> <p><b>Making Transport Systems Easier to use and Places Easier to Get to</b></p> <p>Relevant Policies: 3.1-3.4</p> <p>Relevant Targets</p>	<p>Policies identified need to be considered through SA process. Targets identified should be aligned with SA indicators.</p>

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase bus patronage levels 2008/09.</li> <li>• Improve access to town centres 2010 baseline</li> <li>• Decrease inaccessibility levels from a Dec 2010 baseline</li> </ul> <p><b>Improving Safety and Security</b> Relevant Policies: 4.1 and 4.4</p> <p><b>Reducing Road Transport Emissions and Their Effects on the Highway Network</b> Relevant Policies: 5.1.5.2, 5.4 Relevant Target</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce per capita road transport emissions (CO<sub>2</sub>) from a 2008 baseline.</li> </ul> <p><b>Improving Health and Quality of Life</b> Relevant Policies: 6.1-6.6</p> <p><b>Respect the Environment</b> Relevant Policies: 7.1-7.8 Relevant Target</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce per capita road transport emissions (CO<sub>2</sub>) from 2008 Baseline.</li> </ul>	
<b>The National Forest Strategy 2014-2024 (2014)</b>		
<p>Sets out the priorities and key activities to deliver the National Forest to 2024. The strategy prioritises making the most of the asset created and securing the forest's future, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensitive achievement of the landscape change, with increased targeting to get the greatest benefits.</li> <li>• Making the most of forest sites (woodlands and other habitats, attractions, connections and views).</li> <li>• Increasing engagement, enjoyment and well-being by the widest range of people.</li> </ul>	<p>Key objectives for the forest with prescribed indicators which are broken down between two delivery periods, 2014-2019 and 2019-2024.</p>	<p>Regard should be given to the Strategy where geographically applicable.</p>



Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective partnerships taking the forest to the next stage.</li> <li>• Bringing in new income and investment.</li> <li>• The national exemplar role, research and being a centre of excellence</li> <li>• Securing a sustainable lead body into the future based on a balanced funding model and the reputation of the National Forest Company (NFC)</li> </ul>		
<b>Central Rivers Initiative (CRI)</b>		
<p>The Central Rivers Initiative is a broadly based partnership representing key interests who are working together to shape and guide the progressive restoration and revitalisation of the river valley between Burton, Lichfield and Tamworth – an area of central England that covers over 50 square km. Action Plan in place dated 2014.</p>	<p>A number of targets that cover a range of historic and environmental elements and including opportunities for training. The Targets are currently being supported via a Stage One Application to the HLF.</p>	<p>Regard through the detailed site specific questions should be given to the identified actions to enable where appropriate CRI delivery.</p>
<b>Staffordshire Declaration</b>		
<p>The Declaration acknowledges that evidence shows climate change is occurring and that climate change will continue to have far reaching effects on the economy, society and environment. The Declaration welcomes the social, economic and environmental benefits which come from combating climate change and commits Staffordshire to achieve the lower carbon emissions targets agreed by Central Government. This gives Staffordshire the opportunity to lead the climate change response at a local level by: reducing people's energy costs, allowing adaptation to the impacts of climate change, improving the local environment and helping deal with fuel poverty.</p>	<p>The Staffordshire Declaration commits Staffordshire to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage all sectors in our local community to take the opportunity to adapt to the impacts of climate change.</li> <li>• Encourage residents to reduce their own greenhouse gas emissions.</li> <li>• Make public their commitment to action.</li> <li>• Help local communities to develop their own renewable energy projects, or to obtain community benefits from such projects in their area.</li> </ul>	<p>Allocations SA will need to take account of this strategy.</p>
<b>Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Climate Change Risk Register</b>		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
Provides information on where in the county the most vulnerable locations to severe weather and climate change are situated. This tool brings together data from various other sources, including the Environment Agency flood data.	No targets set.	To support the detailed SA process.
Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Minerals Local Plan 1994-2006		
These documents set out policies to guide the determination of planning applications for mineral extraction and identify areas where important mineral resources should be protected from sterilisation by other forms of development.	New plan emerging, with saved policies currently in place. Currently consulting on Main Modifications.	The Allocations document will be in line with the Minerals Local Plan and the emerging document.
Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Waste Local Plan 2010-2026, 2013		
<p>Four strategic objectives summarised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To support new waste development that helps minimise greenhouse gas emissions and incorporates appropriate measures to mitigate and adapt to the unavoidable impacts of climate change.</li> <li>To encourage the maintenance of the network of new and enhanced sustainable waste management facilities so that we can continue to manage waste, at least equivalent to the amount we generate.</li> <li>To encourage appropriate siting and modern design standards and provide opportunities to enhance existing waste management facilities.</li> <li>To support job creation, economic growth and investment by providing sufficient opportunities to develop new waste management infrastructure of the right type in the right place at the right time, and by minimising and mitigating any adverse impacts and avoiding any unacceptable impacts.</li> </ul>	<p>Policy 1: Waste as a resources</p> <p>Policy 2: Targets and broad locations for waste management facilities</p> <p>Policy 3: Criteria for the location of new and enhanced waste management facilities</p> <p>Policy 4: Sustainable design and protection and improvement of environmental quality.</p> <p>Monitoring sections hosts a number of performance indicators to measure policy implementation.</p>	<p>Allocations SA will need to take account of this strategy.</p> <p>SA indicators should be reflective of identified performance indicators.</p>
Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) 2010-2026 (2013)		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<p>SCC, Stoke-on-Trent and the eight Staffordshire Borough and District Councils have worked in partnership to agree a Municipal Waste Management Strategy. This strategy sets an overall vision for sustainable waste management in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent to 2026. Core objectives include: Waste Prevention, Efficiency Savings, Resource Recovery, Carbon Reduction, Infrastructure &amp; Contracts, Municipal Waste.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To maintain zero waste to landfill and reduce the amount of local authority collected municipal and commercial residual waste produced in Staffordshire, benchmarked against the top 10% of residents, thus reducing the overall volume of waste treated, recovered, disposed or recycled.</li> <li>• To achieve efficiency savings across SWP, thus reducing the total budget for waste management below the rate of inflation.</li> <li>• To ensure the maximisation of resource value from collected materials, as a commodity or as energy provision.</li> <li>• To reduce the total carbon emissions for waste collection, processing and disposal activities by 2% year on year, by ensuring consideration in future contracts, infrastructure and procurement decisions.</li> <li>• To provide and support appropriate infrastructure with suitable contracts that ensure value for money, by developing procurement policies to maximise efficiency and sustainability.</li> <li>• To provide efficient and cost effective waste services to local residents and businesses.</li> </ul>	<p>Allocations SA will need to take account of this strategy.</p>
Safer, Fairer, United Communities for Staffordshire 2013-18		
<p>The Strategy is about how different organisations and the public go about making a real and sustained difference to reducing crime and anti-social behaviour and improving community safety.</p> <p>The Strategy sets out a vision for Staffordshire to work together and deliver real, sustainable improvements.</p> <p>Four priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early intervention</li> <li>• Supporting victims and witnesses</li> </ul>	<p><b>Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing feelings of safety</li> <li>• Support vulnerable members of the community</li> <li>• Target high crime areas including businesses</li> <li>• Reduce the impact of the misuse of alcohol and other substances</li> <li>• Maximise impact of 'buildings resilient families and communities'</li> <li>• Reducing re – offending</li> </ul>	<p>Consideration of the priority of the document will need to be given. A relationship between SA indicators should be forged.</p>

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Managing offenders</li> <li>Public confidence</li> </ul>	Note Shared Priorities with Local document.	
<b>Sustainable Community Strategy (Staffordshire) 2008-2023</b>		
The overarching plan for promoting and improving the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of Staffordshire. Four overarching priorities; a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable economy; strong, safe and cohesive communities; improved health and sense of well-being and a protected, enhanced and respected environment.	<p>A number of themes have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improving basic skills;</li> <li>Reducing the number of young people who are not in employment, education or training;</li> <li>Raising the high level skills base and retaining skilled workforce;</li> <li>Encouraging graduate retention;</li> <li>Maximising opportunities presented by Staffordshire Universities and associated networks;</li> <li>Increasing levels of enterprise and ensuring higher value added sector business start-ups;</li> <li>Raising aspirations of our children and young people;</li> <li>Reducing worklessness, increasing the employment rate and improving access to employment opportunities;</li> <li>Embracing and investing in new environmental technologies;</li> <li>Attracting sustainable, quality public and private investment in the County; and</li> <li>Developing housing which is decent, affordable and sustainable.</li> </ul>	Allocations SA will need to take account of this strategy.
<b>Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan (SBAP)</b>		
The SBAP identifies priority habitats and species, sets targets for their conservation and outlines the mechanisms for achieving these targets.	<p>14 Ecosystem Action Plans and 1 River Action Plan are identified.</p> <p>The following of which are relevant to Lichfield District.</p> <p>Cannock Heath Central Farmlands River Gravels</p>	Inclusion in SA Framework to ensure targets are supported resulting in compliance with identified UK and European target requirements.
<b>Staffordshire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2015)</b>		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
The Local Flood Risk Management Strategy sets out roles and responsibilities for flood risk management, assesses the risk of flooding in the County, where funding can be found to manage flood risk, Lead Local Flood Authority policies, objectives and actions will be taken by the Staffordshire County Council to manage flood risk.	<p>Objectives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a strategic understanding of flood risk from all sources,</li> <li>• Promote effective management of drainage and flood defence systems,</li> <li>• Support communities to understand flood risk and become more resilient to flooding,</li> <li>• Manage local flood risk and new development in a sustainable manner,</li> <li>• Achieve results through partnership and collaboration,</li> <li>• Be better prepared for flood events,</li> <li>• Secure and manage funding for flood risk management in a challenging financial climate.</li> </ul>	Allocations SA will need to take account of this strategy.
<b>Shaping the Future of Staffordshire 2005-2020: The Sustainable Strategy for the County</b>		
<p>The Strategy focuses on six key priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhancing the voice and profile of Staffordshire within the West Midlands region as well as nationally, within Europe and internationally</li> <li>• Developing strong and sustainable rural communities by improving access to services, opportunities and the number and quality of jobs available, while also protecting and enhancing the environment</li> <li>• Integrating and sustaining transport</li> <li>• Improving health and social care</li> <li>• Supporting the growth of the local economy and encouraging prosperity (including learning and skills) for the benefit of individuals, employers and communities</li> <li>• Sharing data and information to underpin the strategic priorities of the Strategy</li> </ul>	Various targets set within this document however end date 2010.	<p>Allocations SA will need to take account of this strategy.</p> <p>The document spans fundamental aspects of sustainable development and therefore consideration of the strategic drivers of this document will need to be considered at the baseline stage, the development of SA indicators and also during the development of site specific questions.</p>
Staffordshire County Council, A Strategy for School Organisation 2012-2017		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
The strategy will offer increased opportunities for parental choice and promote fair access to schools for all children and support our duty to intervene when standards in schools are a cause for concern.	No specific targets	Allocations SA will need to take account of this strategy.
Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2014-19		
The Management Plan is the basis for the strategic direction of the conservation and enhancement of the AONB. Relates to a range of national and local documents.	<b>Relevant High level objectives:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop Cannock Chase AONB as a special, peaceful and tranquil place for everyone who lives in, works within or visits the area.</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the distinctive and nationally important landscape of Cannock Chase AONB and the locally, nationally and internationally important biodiversity and geodiversity it supports, ensuring links between habitats within the AONB and surrounding landscape.</li> <li>• Ensure a safe, clean and tranquil environment that can contribute to a high and sustainable quality of life.</li> <li>• Support a balance between a working landscape where prosperity and opportunity increase, biodiversity flourishes and pressure upon natural resources is diminished.</li> <li>• Create a place of enjoyment for everyone, providing opportunities for quiet recreation and maintaining ecosystems that contribute positively to physical and mental well-being.</li> </ul>	Allocations will need to take account of this strategy.
Cannock Chase SAC Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Measures (SAMMM)		
An action plan to mitigate for planned housing growth within 0-15 km of Cannock Chase SAC.	A list of priority project are identified to mitigate for a 15% increase in visitor numbers.	The SAMM mitigates for planned housing growth within the 0-15km zone of influence as identified in the Local Plan Strategy.
Greater Birmingham & Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan 2014		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<p>Strategic Economic Plan which draws on the the strategic pillars of Business, People and Place, through a series of programmes that have either a thematic or spatial focus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growing Business – supporting the provision of activity to enable the formation, growth, attraction and retention of businesses across Greater Birmingham.</li> <li>• Enhancing the Regional Economic Hub – strengthening Birmingham City Centre as the regional hub for economic activity</li> <li>• UK Central, the Enterprise Belt and the wider Birmingham area – unlocking long-term growth potential on a national scale and targeting early investment to create housing and jobs</li> <li>• Enhancing our Growth Sectors – supporting delivery of key sites , infrastructure, skills and innovation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An additional 50, 000 jobs (on top of the 100,000 to which we have already committed);</li> <li>• 14, 315 new homes;</li> <li>• 1.7sqm of commercial floorspace;</li> <li>• £2.3bn GVA over ten years; and</li> <li>• £1,100m private sector leverage</li> </ul>	<p>Allocations will need to take account of this strategy.</p> <p>NB Strategic Economic Plan 2016-2030 A greater Birmingham For a Greater Britain is currently out to consultation.</p>
Stoke-on-Trent & Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan Part 1 – Strategy 2014-2030 (2014)		
<p>Strategic Economic Plan with the ambition to sustainably drive:</p> <p>rapid growth in Stoke-on-Trent and its contribution to the county and national economy</p> <p>development of the peri-urban areas along the County's key transport corridors that provide a strong, agile and competitive offer locally and nationally</p>	<p>Measure progress and success over the next 20 years: The City of Stoke On Trent rapidly grows into a <b>Core UK City</b>.</p> <p>A <b>Connected County</b> the aim is “super connectivity”, maximising the benefit of existing road, rail and air connections and future strategic infrastructure investments, including HS2 and other strategic rail investment, to benefit the whole area and maximise opportunities across the County's key transport corridors.</p> <p><b>Powerhouse Central:</b> Stoke on Trent &amp; Staffordshire internationally recognised as an investment destination and centre of expertise for indigenous energy.</p>	<p>Allocations will need to take account of this strategy.</p>

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	An internationally renowned <b>Applied Materials Technology Centre</b> for advanced research and innovation building on the expertise of Lucide on (formerly Ceram) and its ties to University and industry.	
Staffordshire County Council, Lichfield Historic Character Assessment (2011)		
The aim of the HLC was to produce a broad assessment of the historic and archaeological dimensions of the county's landscape as it exists today.	No specific targets.	Allocations will need to take account of the finding of this assessment in particular when assessing significant effects through the SA process.
CAMS: Tame, Anker & Mease Abstraction Licensing Strategy, Environment Agency (2013)		
This catchment abstraction management strategy (CAMS) sets out how the Environment Agency will manage water resources in the Tame, Anker and Mease catchments. It provides information on how existing abstraction is regulated and whether water is available for further abstraction.	No specific targets.	Allocations will need to take account of this strategy.
CAMS: Staffordshire Trent Valley Abstraction Licensing Strategy, Environment Agency (2013)		
This catchment abstraction management strategy (CAMS) sets out how water resources will be managed in the Staffordshire Trent Valley catchment. It provides information on how existing abstraction is regulated and whether water is available for further abstraction.	No specific targets.	Allocations will need to take account of this strategy.
Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Staffordshire 2013-2018		
Sets out the Staffordshire Health and Wellbeing Boards vision, principles, values, priorities and enablers to improve health and wellbeing of the people of Staffordshire.	Twelve areas of action are identified under the following five themes. Starting well Growing well Living well Aging well Ending well The focus for 2013/14: Parenting, alcohol use and supporting the frail elderly.	Key for baseline information. In particular Supporting the frail elderly should be considered as part of the SA. The measuring success element of the document should inform the SA indicators.
Southern Staffordshire Outline Water Cycle Study (2010)		



Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<p>Assesses the constraints and requirements that will arise from the scale of the proposed growth on the water infrastructure of southern Staffordshire.</p>	<p><b>Recommendations Lichfield Water Supply Summary</b>            Consultation with SSW ahead of progression of any potential development site, 14 sites named. (Curborough Settlement named in individual bullet). SSW required notification in advance regarding details of development plans.            Council should inform SSW of any high water demand developments as early as possible.</p> <p><b>Recommendations Lichfield Water Resources Summary</b>            Consultation must be held with STWL ahead of the progression of any potential developments sites- particularly important for 19 site identified (Curborough Settlement named in individual bullet)</p> <p><b>Recommendations Lichfield Wastewater Treatment Summary</b>            Restrictions in the short term in 3 areas until capacity issues are resolved. Early warning requirement for Burntwood. Further consultation in regard to two identified sites.</p> <p><b>Recommendations Lichfield Water Quality and Environment Summary</b>            Requirement to improve water quality most of the watercourses in the District. Due to the vast number of environmentally significant sites within the District policies must be emplaced to ensure threat development does not have an adverse impact on any of them.</p>	<p>Allocations will have to take into account the findings from this study.</p>
South Staffordshire Water PLC Water Resources Plan 2015-40		
<p>The Water Resources Management Plan sets out the water resources and demand projections for the South Staffs region of supply for the next 25 years.</p>	<p>There is no supply demand deficit forecast within the next 25 years therefore major resource development</p>	<p>Allocations will have to take into account the findings from this Resource Plan.</p>

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	<p>or demand management measures are not required to meet a shortfall.</p> <p>The key policies are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimising the impact on the environment.</li> <li>• Contribute to biodiversity</li> <li>• Catchment scale management activities to provide a sustainable alternative using less chemicals and energy for treatment</li> <li>• Optimisation of existing operations.</li> <li>• Maintain its water supply levels of service</li> <li>• Continue with successful metering policies</li> <li>• Promotion of water efficiency</li> <li>• Continue with effective leakages policy to levels to achieve the sustainable economic level of leakage.</li> </ul>	
<b>Severn Trent Water PLC Water Resources Plan 2015-40</b>		
The Water Resources Management Plan sets out the water resources and demand projections for the Severn Trent region of supply for the next 25 years.	Seeks to reduce the overall demand for water and to make the best use of existing water resources through a more flexible and sustainable supply system. The Plan seeks to address environmentally unsustainable levels of water abstraction by reducing the amount of water taken from the environment, by providing alternative sources of water supply where necessary.	The Allocations Document should seek to improve water quality by ensuring that policies are included in the Plan to support the objectives of this and other water quality management plans
<b>Humber River Basin Management Plan 2015</b>		
<p>A River Basin District covers an entire river system, including river, lake, groundwater, estuarine and coastal water bodies. The River Basin District River Basin Management Plans are designed to protect and improve the quality of our water environment.</p> <p>The main purposes of this plan are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to prevent water bodies deteriorating,</li> </ul>	Aim to achieve at least good status for all water bodies 2021 or 2027;	The Allocations Document should seek to improve water quality by ensuring that policies are included in the Plan to support the objectives of this and other water quality management plans. Specifically the Plan should support the delivery of SUDS within new development and include appropriate climate change and flooding policies.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to highlight the areas of land and bodies of water that have specific uses that need special protection,</li> <li>to provide binding objectives regarding quality</li> <li>to provide a framework for action and future regulation.</li> </ul>		
<b>Strategy for the A5</b>		
The strategy looks at issues of capacity, economic activity and growth, access to leisure and tourism, priority improvements and reduction of the impact of traffic on communities along the A5 route.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure that the A5 is fit for purpose in terms of its capacity and safety, both now and in the future;</li> <li>To allow the A5 to play its full and proper role in supporting and facilitating economic activity and growth at a national and local level;</li> <li>To promote and encourage improvements to sustainable transport (walking, cycling, public transport and behavioural change measures) in order to help reduce congestion on the A5, improve air quality and deliver a lower carbon transport system; and</li> <li>To reduce, where possible, the impact of the A5 on communities along the route.</li> </ul>	Allocations should ensure that identified needs and key priorities have been considered.
<b>CAMS: Staffordshire Trent Valley Abstraction Licensing Strategy, Environment Agency (2013)</b>		
The strategy sets out how the EA will manage water resources in the Staffordshire Trent Valley catchment. It provides information on how existing abstraction is regulated and whether water is available for further abstraction. The strategy also details how it protects EA requirements under the Water Framework Directive, ensuring no ecological deterioration to EA rivers.	Overarching principles that EA follow when determining water abstraction licenses.	Allocations will need to take account of this strategy.
<b>Tame Valley Wetlands Landscape Partnership Scheme Landscape Conservation Action Plan</b>		
Landscape scale approach to restoring conserving and reconnecting the physical and cultural landscape of the Tame Valley.		Allocations within the identified wetland area should consider the key priorities of the vision.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<b>Staffordshire County Council Planning for Landscape Change SPD</b>		
<p>Guidance to inform policy and practice in terms of the conservation, enhancement and regeneration of the rural landscapes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides descriptions of the character of Staffordshire Landscapes.</li> <li>Sets Landscape Policy Zones in Staffordshire identifying distinct types of landscape.</li> <li>Identifies Regional Character Areas in and around Staffordshire</li> <li>Indicates the areas that area preferred for targeting resources for woodland initiatives</li> </ul>	No targets identified.	The document need to be considered in regard to the assessment of effect on both biodiversity and landscape character.
<b>Local Landscape Character Assessments</b>		

## Local:

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<b>Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029 (2015) and accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan</b>		
It is a Development Plan Document produced to help shape the way in which the physical, economic, social and environmental characteristics of Lichfield District will change between 2008 and 2029. It sets the strategic context, and will be complemented by the Local Plan Allocations Document, to be prepared in line with the timescales set in the Local Development Scheme.	10,030 dwellings over the plan period. Settlement hierarchy identified, Lichfield Burntwood and five key rural settlements Alrewas, Armitage with Handsacre, Fazeley, Shenstone and Whittington. 6 Strategic Development Allocations and 1 Board Development Location. 70% on previously development land until 2018 and then 50% thereafter. Affordable Housing based on qualifying sites, target of 40%, dynamic viability model in place. Minimum of 14 residential pitches and 5 transit pitches to meet the needs of Gypsies, Traveller and travelling show people to 2028.	Allocations document will need to be in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy (2015).

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	Between 7,310 - 9000 additional jobs to achieve a job balance ratio of 85%. 79.1 hectares of land to be allocated for employment use. Extra 10 hectares to be defined at Allocations stage. 30,000m2 gross of Office Floorspace advocated focused in Lichfield City to 2029. Development for retail, leisure, office and cultural facilities will be focused within the commercial centres of Burntwood and Lichfield City. Key Rural Centres will be protected and enhanced to provide shops, services, employment and community facilities to meet the need of local communities and as a focus for those living and working in nearby smaller outlying villages.	
<b>Biodiversity &amp; Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2016)</b>		
The document provides guidance to developers in terms of biodiversity protection and mitigation.	No specific targets.	Ensure that protection and mitigation of biodiversity is considered by the SA. The document will shape the detailed questions that will be considered during the SA process.
<b>Developer Contributions SPD (2016)</b>		
The SPD sets out the Council's approach to planning obligations.	No specific targets.	Inform general infrastructure requirements. In detail provides guidance on Air Quality and Affordable housing requirements which will shape the detailed questions that will be considered during the SA process.
<b>Historic Environment SPD (2015)</b>		
The document provides information on aspects which should be considered when undertaking works that may affect the historic environment.	No specific targets.	Ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment. Detailed guidance on achieving quality design, local distinctiveness will help shape the detailed questions that will be considered during the SA process. Also support the requirement for protection of historic assets as part of the SA.
<b>Rural Development SPD (2015)</b>		
The document provides further detail to the policies relating to development within the rural areas of the	No specific targets.	The guidance on assessment of the relationship between services/ facilities and sustainability will help

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
District and those areas which also lie within the Green Belt.		shape the detailed questions that will be considered during the SA process.
<b>Sustainable Design SPD (2015)</b>		
The SPD provides guidance on how sustainable development can be achieved through connectivity and integration, in terms of how places and sustainability connect by transport linkages and through patterns of development.	No specific targets.	Guidance will be used to ensure that detailed questions within the SA will ascertain the impact on design, and connectivity and promote good design.
<b>Trees, Landscaping &amp; Development SPD (2016)</b>		
The SPD provides guidance on the retention, protection, incorporation and introduction of trees, hedgerows and woodlands as a part of sustainable development.	No specific targets.	Guidance will be used to shape the detailed questions stage of the SA.
<b>Little Aston Neighbourhood Plan (2016)</b>		
Establishes a vision for the future of the neighbourhood area and to sets out how that vision will be realised through planning and controlling land use and development change over the plan period 2015 to 2029.	No specific targets.	Where relevant the Neighbourhood Plan will be considered at the detailed questions stage of the SA.
<b>Stonnall Neighbourhood Plan (2016)</b>		
The Stonnall Neighbourhood Plan will set out a vision for the future of the village and its hinterland, providing a strategy and land-use planning framework to guide development within the Neighbourhood Plan area for the next 15 years.	No specific targets.	Where relevant the Neighbourhood Plan will be considered at the detailed questions stage of the SA.
<b>Conservation Area Appraisals</b>		
Lichfield District has 21 Conservation Areas, one of which covers sections of the Trent and Mersey Canal, one covers the historic core of Lichfield City, and 19 further Conservation Areas within rural villages.	No specific targets.	The consideration of this evidence based will ensure that protection and enhancement of important historic assets.
<b>Lichfield District Strategic Partnership's Carbon Reduction Plan 2012/13 (2013)</b>		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<p>The main objective of this document is to work towards a District which, whilst it is prosperous, also works to reduce its reliance on fossil fuels and to reduce its carbon emissions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing CO2 emissions from buildings, vehicles, services and activities throughout the district, starting with our own.</li> <li>Ensure that all buildings and services are resilient to changing climate impacts over coming decades.</li> <li>Encouraging developers to design and build new developments to minimise carbon emissions and reliance on fossil fuels and take into account other aspects of changing climate such as extreme weather and flooding.</li> <li>Acting as a community lead to advise and support local residents, businesses and other partners in contributing to the above.</li> </ul>	<p>SA through the site specific questions will need to ensure the reduction of CO2 is encouraged.</p>
Lichfield District Integrated Transport Strategy 2013-2028 (2013)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staffordshire is a place where people can easily and safely access everyday facilities and activities through the highways and transport networks</li> <li>Staffordshire's economy prospers and grows, together with the jobs, skills, qualifications and aspirations to support it</li> <li>Staffordshire's communities proactively tackle climate change, gaining financial benefit and reducing carbon emissions</li> </ul>	<p>Short term targets include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lichfield City Centre Local Transport Package: new bus station closer to Lichfield City rail station, pedestrian facilities, car park management, traffic management on St John Street and further pedestrianisation of the City centre, urban traffic control and junction improvements on A5127</li> <li>Bus access improvements on route 765 Lichfield to Tamworth</li> <li>Lichfield Southern Bypass Phase 3 detailed design work for section across the railway line</li> <li>Route signage from Lichfield to Tamworth</li> <li>Electric charging points</li> <li>A5(T) Wall Island junction improvement</li> <li>Potential designated area for coach parking</li> <li>Engagement with local communities on HS2 and exploring opportunities to improve existing rail services</li> </ul>	<p>Allocations should ensure that identified needs and key priorities have been considered.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<b>Lichfield District Housing Strategy 2013-2017 (2013)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve housing choice and access to a wide range of affordable homes;</li> <li>• Prevent and reduce homelessness;</li> <li>• Ensure warm, healthy, well maintained homes, reduce fuel poverty and cut carbon emissions;</li> <li>• Support older and vulnerable people to live as independently and healthily as possible.</li> </ul>	<p>To achieve the four objectives, the following aims have been set:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the provision of new affordable housing</li> <li>• Ensure new housing developments include a mix of homes to meet identified housing needs</li> <li>• Ensure best use is made of the housing stock in the District</li> <li>• Improve the housing options for people in need</li> <li>• Continue with a proactive approach to preventing homelessness</li> <li>• Improve the housing options for people in need</li> <li>• Reduce the use of temporary accommodation</li> <li>• Increase the provision of new affordable housing</li> <li>• Ensure new housing developments include a mix of homes to meet identified housing needs</li> <li>• Reduce the percentage of the population living in fuel poverty</li> <li>• Increase the energy efficiency of the housing stock and cut carbon emissions</li> <li>• Understand the impact of poor housing on health and life expectancy inequalities across the District</li> <li>• Continue with a proactive approach to preventing homelessness</li> <li>• Improve the housing options for people in need</li> <li>• Reduce the use of temporary accommodation</li> <li>• Increase the provision of new affordable housing</li> <li>• Ensure new housing developments include a mix of homes to meet identified housing needs</li> </ul>	<p>Allocations should ensure that identified need and key priorities have been considered. At a detailed level site specific questions regarding housing need will be developed to support aims.</p>
<b>Lichfield District Council AQMA Updating &amp; Screening Assessment (2015)</b>		
Considers all new monitoring data and assesses the data against the Air Quality Strategy (AQS) objectives.	Assessment has identified one location outside the existing AQMA where concentrations of nitrogen dioxide exceeded the annual objective. The District	Allocations and the impact on the two established Air Quality Management Zones will need to be considered.



Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
It also considers any changes that may have an impact on air quality	<p>now has two AQMA, A5 Muckley Corner and A38 Wall Island to Alrewas.</p> <p>Proposed actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue NO2 diffusion tube monitoring in the district to identify future changes in pollutant concentrations;</li> <li>• Continue NO2 diffusion tube monitoring at site A38-2A/B at Fradley;</li> <li>• Proceed to a dispersion modelling based Detailed Assessment for the north section of the A38 from the District boundary to the A38/A5127 junction;</li> <li>• Finalise the Lichfield Air Quality Action Plan;</li> <li>• Proceed to a Progress Report in 2016.</li> </ul>	Consideration will need to be given in relation to CO2 figures.
<b>Lichfield District Council Economic Development Strategy 2016-2020 (2016)</b>		
<p><b>Key Strategic Objectives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a suitable range and mix of employment opportunities to boost jobs</li> <li>• Increase the number of new business start-ups and overall business survival rates</li> <li>• Provide an appropriate balance between jobs and housing</li> <li>• Encourage increased levels of investment and spending by the public, private and voluntary sectors in to the District</li> <li>• Deliver enhanced levels of prosperity to all communities</li> </ul>	<p><b>Place</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Friarsgate Lichfield</li> <li>• Lichfield City Centre Development Strategy</li> <li>• Burntwood Town Centre</li> <li>• Suitable Employment Land</li> <li>• Transport Infrastructure Investment</li> <li>• Sustainable Housing</li> <li>• Strategic Investment in the West Midlands Conurbation</li> <li>• Broadband and Mobile Phone Network provision</li> </ul> <p><b>Business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communications</li> <li>• Local programme delivery</li> <li>• Sector specific support</li> <li>• Optimizing the use of available economic assets for business</li> </ul> <p><b>People</b></p>	Allocations can contribute to a number of the key objectives, ambitions and targets through the delivery of development across the District. At a detailed level the strategy will help shape clear site specific questions that focus on the three pillars of Place, Business and People and also provide clear indicators to measure sustainable economic growth.

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Helping local residents access skills training and the jobs market</li> </ul>	
Lichfield District Council Community Infrastructure Levy, Regulation 123 List (2016)		
The list sets out those infrastructure projects that Lichfield District Council currently intends may be wholly or partly funded by CIL, together with clarification notes and S106 requirements.	Clear Identified Infrastructure need.	Influence the baseline in relation to infrastructure need.
Lichfield District Community Safety Delivery Plan 2015/18		
The aim of the 'Lichfield District Community Safety Assessment' is to provide the Community Safety Partnership and the OPCC with an understanding of current trends in community safety across Lichfield District and Staffordshire as a whole, identifying current priority areas of need and highlighting any emerging threats.	<b>Priorities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing feelings of safety</li> <li>Support vulnerable members of the community</li> <li>Target high crime areas including businesses</li> <li>Reduce the impact of the misuse of alcohol and other substances</li> <li>Maximise impact of 'building resilient families and communities'</li> <li>Reducing re – offending</li> </ul>	Consideration of the priorities identified within the document will need to be given. A relationship between SA indicators should be forged.
Lichfield City Centre Development Strategy & Action Plan 2016-2020 (2016)		
<b>Strategic Objectives:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create an attractive, multi-faceted yet coherent city centre, which encourages visitors to linger and explore</li> <li>Improve the quantity, quality and appeal of the city's attractions and facilities, to attract and cater for a year round increase in visitors and spending</li> <li>Improve access to and within the city and facilitate orientation and exploration</li> <li>Raise awareness of Lichfield and its individual assets and facilities as a leading heritage and events city in central England</li> </ul>	<p>The document contains a detailed timeline and project aims over the following timescales:</p> <p>Delivery Year 1 Delivery Year 2-3 Delivery Year 3-7</p> <p>A number of projects identified in the project directory will supported existing need identified through the baseline assessment.</p>	<p>Allocations can contribute to a number of the key objectives, ambitions and targets through the delivery of development within Lichfield City.</p> <p>A number of projects identified in the project directory will supported existing need identified through the baseline assessment and leading a positive effect on indicators.</p>
Lichfield District Council Strategic Plan 2016-2020 (2016)		

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
<p>By 2020:</p> <p>Vibrant &amp; prosperous economy:</p> <p>Healthy &amp; safe communities:</p> <p>Clean, green &amp; welcoming places to live:</p>	<p>By 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More local jobs and more people in employment.</li> <li>• More new businesses locate in our district.</li> <li>• More businesses succeed.</li> <li>• A regenerated Lichfield City centre and an improved retail offer in Burntwood.</li> <li>• More people will be active and healthy.</li> <li>• Fewer people and families will be homeless.</li> <li>• More people will feel safer and less worried about crime and anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>• More people will be living independently at home.</li> <li>• More affordable homes in the district.</li> <li>• Our heritage and open spaces will be well maintained or enhanced.</li> <li>• More people will use parks and open spaces</li> </ul> <p>New homes, office, retail and manufacturing spaces will be built or developed in line with our Local Plan and planning guidance.</p>	<p>The document spans fundamental aspects of sustainable development and therefore consideration of the strategic drivers of this document will need to be considered at the baseline stage, the development of SA indicators and also during the development of site specific questions.</p>
<b>River Mease Restoration Plan (2012)</b>		
<p>This document outlines the strategy to restore the River Mease to achieve SAC conservation and Water Framework directive targets.</p>	<p>In the short term, mitigation includes the construction of silt traps to remove phosphorus arising from development which would otherwise harm water quality in the SAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine the impact of physical modification.</li> <li>• Provide an outline restoration plan for the river on a reach-by-reach basis.</li> </ul> <p>Identify potential delivery mechanisms.</p>	<p>The document will shape the assessment of significant effect.</p>
<b>River Mease Water Quality (Phosphate) management Plan 2011</b>		
<p>The primary purpose of this Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) is to reduce the levels of phosphate within the River Mease SAC, to enable the Conservation Objectives for the SAC to be met, and an adverse effect upon the SAC avoided. The primary</p>	<p>Reduction in phosphate in the River Mease to no more than 0.06mg/l</p>	<p>Ensure that the Allocations Plan does not lead to an increase in phosphate within the River though point and diffuse source pollution.</p>

## Appendix C

Key objectives relevant to the plan and sustainability appraisal	Key messages, targets and indicators relevant to the LDF and sustainability appraisal	Implications for plan and sustainability appraisal
objective of this plan is that the combined actions will result in a reduction in phosphate in the River Mease to no more than 0.06mg/l, and this will be achieved by 2027.		
River Mease Diffuse Water Pollution Plan		
This plan identifies the pressures on the River Mease from diffuse pollution and measures required to address these issues.	Reduction in phosphate in the River Mease to no more than 0.06mg/l	Ensure that the Plan does not lead to an increase in phosphate within the River including through diffuse pollution sources associated with urban development and farming.



## **APPENDIX D – LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**



## Appendix D

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source															
Demographics																				
Population growth	100,900 (mid 2011) 102,706 (mid 2015)	<b>Staffordshire</b> 849,500 (mid 2011) 862,562 (mid 2015)  <b>West Midlands</b> 5,608,700 (mid 2011) 5,751,000 (mid 2015)  <b>England</b> 56,170,900 (mid 2011) 54,786,327 (mid 2015)	1.8% increase in population within the District.	Lichfield District’s population has increased by 1.8% compared to increases of 1.5 and 2.5% in Staffordshire and the West Midlands respectively. The population in Lichfield District is growing more than both Staffordshire and England which had a reduction in population.	Mid year population statistics ONS 2011 and 2015															
Population age structure	0-15: 16.9% 16-64: 60.1% 65+: 22.9%  <b>Lone Pensioner Households 2011</b> <table><tr><th></th><th>Number</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>Lichfield</td><td>5,032</td><td>12.2</td></tr><tr><td>Staffordshire</td><td>44,771</td><td>12.6</td></tr><tr><td>West Midlands</td><td>289,571</td><td>12.6</td></tr><tr><td>England</td><td>2,725,596</td><td>12.4</td></tr></table>		Number	%	Lichfield	5,032	12.2	Staffordshire	44,771	12.6	West Midlands	289,571	12.6	England	2,725,596	12.4	<b>Staffordshire</b> 0-15: 17.3% 16-64: 61.9% 65+: 20.8%  <b>West Midlands</b> 0-15: 19.5% 16-64: 62.3% 65+: 18.2%  <b>England</b> 0-15: 19% 16-64: 63.3%	Four wards in Lichfield have high proportions of households with lone pensioners – Boney Hay (15.1%), Chasetown (16.4%), Leomansley (15.9%) and Stowe (17.6%). Of these lone pensioners 59.5% (2,992) have a long term health problem or disability -	Compared to regional and national statistics, Lichfield District has a higher elderly population with almost one quarter of the population being over the age of 65, 5% higher than the national figure.	Mid year population statistics ONS 2015  Lone pensioner statistics Census 2011.
	Number	%																		
Lichfield	5,032	12.2																		
Staffordshire	44,771	12.6																		
West Midlands	289,571	12.6																		
England	2,725,596	12.4																		



Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
		65+: 17.7%	<p>this is similar to the national average of 59.6%. The percentage of lone pensioners with a long term health problem or disability is significantly higher than England in two wards; Burntwood Central (67.9%) and Chasetown (72.1%).</p> <p>Using 2014 mid-year population figures for Lichfield it has been estimated that around 500 residents aged 65+ are at risk of loneliness.</p>	<p>By comparison the District is similar to Staffordshire as a whole for the 0-15 year age group, however this is lower than the national average.</p> <p>The number of people living in Lichfield aged 65 and over has already exceeded the number of children under the age of 16; projections suggest Lichfield will continue to get older and bigger.</p>	
Components of population change	2011 - 2015 Change due to live births 4.85% Change due to deaths 4.94% Change due to net internal migration 1.46% Change due to net international migration 0.58% Change due to 'Other' factors 0.31%		The largest population influence is death.	The amount of deaths within the District outstrips the number of births. As such the changes to the population numbers is largely through internal and international migration.	Mid year population statistics 2014 to 2015

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
Population ethnicity	White British: 94.6% White Irish/Other: 2.1% Mixed: 1.0% Asian British: 1.6% Black British: 0.5% Arab: 0.0% Traveller: 0.0% Other: 0.1%	<b>Staffordshire</b> White British: 93.6% White Irish/Other: 2.0% Mixed: 1.1% Asian British: 2.4% Black British: 0.6% Arab: 0.1% Traveller: 0.1% Other: 0.1%  <b>West Midlands</b> White British: 79.2% White Irish/Other: 3.5% Mixed: 2.4% Asian British: 10.8% Black British: 3.3% Arab: 0.3% Traveller: 0.1% Other: 0.6%  <b>England</b> White British: 79.8% White Irish/Other: 5.6% Mixed: 2.3% Asian British: 7.8% Black British: 3.5% Arab: 0.4% Traveller: 0.1% Other: 0.6%		Lichfield and Staffordshire County are relatively similar with regard to ethnic mix, with a high proportion of white British with 94.6% white British compared to 79.2% and 79.8% respectively for the West Midlands and England	2011 census/ONS
Projections	The sub national Population Projections from 2014 to 2039 for Lichfield District show an increase in population of 8.5% with an additional 8,700 people predicted to reside within Lichfield District.		The net decrease of 7,800 through natural change reflects the death rate being	There is a net decrease (-7,800) in population through natural change i.e.	ONS population Projections Unit.

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
			markedly higher than the birth rate. This points to the ageing population within the District and as reflected in the age structure breakdown above.	births and deaths, with the increase in population attributable to net internal migration with an increase of around 16,300 people.	
<b>Housing</b>					
Dwelling stock by tenure	<b>2011 Total dwelling stock: 43,170</b> LA dwelling stock: 0% Registered Social Landlord: 13.1% Other public: 0.4% Owned & privately rented: 86.5%	<b>2011 England Total dwelling stock: 22,976,000</b> LA dwelling stock: 7.5% Registered Social Landlord: 10.1% Other public: 0.3% Owned & privately rented: 82.1%	Household projections published by the DCLG can be used as an estimate of overall housing need. Lichfield had 42,300 households in 2014 which is projected to rise to 48,700 by 2035.	Compared to the national average for England, Lichfield District has a 3% higher proportion of Registered Social Landlords than nationally.	ONS and DCLG
Household types	Detached: 41.1% Semi detached: 36.2% Terraced: 14.5% Flats - Purpose built: 6.8% Flat - converted or shared house: 0.6% Flat – commercial building: 0.4% Caravan or other temporary structure: 0.4%	<b>Staffordshire</b> Detached: 36.1% Semi detached: 39.6% Terraced: 17.2% Flats - Purpose built: 5.6% Flat - converted or shared house: 0.6% Flat – commercial building: 0.5% Caravan or other temporary structure: 0.4%  <b>West Midlands</b> Detached: 25.7%		Lichfield District has significantly higher proportion of detached dwellings than Staffordshire and over 15% more than either the West Midlands or England.  In comparison, the District has a much lower percentage of terraced properties	Census 2011

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
		Semi detached: 39.6% Terraced: 24.1% Flats - Purpose built: 8.5% Flat - converted or shared house: 1.1% Flat – commercial building: 0.7% Caravan or other temporary structure: 0.3%  <b>England</b> Detached: 24.3% Semi detached: 33.6% Terraced: 25.7% Flats - Purpose built: 12.1% Flat - converted or shared house: 2.9% Flat – commercial building: 0.8% Caravan or other temporary structure: 0.3%		and flats than the regional or national average.	
House prices	Average property price Lichfield District December 2015: £250,675	Average property price December 2015: East Staffordshire District: £190,214 Stafford District: £204,361 Cannock Chase District: £156,613 Tamworth Borough: £164,916.	Staffordshire and the West Midlands' average house prices are almost identical with Lichfield District's average house prices largely mirroring the shape of the graph but being significantly higher.	Property values in Lichfield District are higher than most of the neighbouring authorities, and are significantly higher than the West Midlands average. Lichfield District is seen as an attractive	ONS and Land Registry

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source																																																																																								
		Staffordshire: £191,260 West Midlands: £196,406		commuter area for Birmingham and the larger salaries associated with these jobs. The house prices in the District are particularly high due to the historic character of the city and attractive nature of its villages and countryside.																																																																																									
	<div><h3>1995 - 2015 Average House Prices</h3><p>Average House Price</p><p>Year</p><p>Legend: Lichfield (purple), Staffordshire (orange), West Midlands (green)</p><table><caption>Estimated Average House Prices (1995-2015)</caption><thead><tr><th>Year</th><th>Lichfield</th><th>Staffordshire</th><th>West Midlands</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Q4-1995</td><td>75,000</td><td>60,000</td><td>60,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-1996</td><td>80,000</td><td>65,000</td><td>65,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-1997</td><td>85,000</td><td>70,000</td><td>70,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-1998</td><td>90,000</td><td>75,000</td><td>75,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-1999</td><td>100,000</td><td>80,000</td><td>80,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2000</td><td>110,000</td><td>85,000</td><td>85,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2001</td><td>120,000</td><td>90,000</td><td>90,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2002</td><td>130,000</td><td>100,000</td><td>100,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2003</td><td>150,000</td><td>110,000</td><td>110,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2004</td><td>170,000</td><td>120,000</td><td>120,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2005</td><td>180,000</td><td>130,000</td><td>130,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2006</td><td>190,000</td><td>140,000</td><td>140,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2007</td><td>220,000</td><td>150,000</td><td>150,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2008</td><td>210,000</td><td>145,000</td><td>145,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2009</td><td>190,000</td><td>140,000</td><td>140,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2010</td><td>220,000</td><td>150,000</td><td>150,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2011</td><td>200,000</td><td>145,000</td><td>145,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2012</td><td>200,000</td><td>150,000</td><td>150,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2013</td><td>200,000</td><td>160,000</td><td>160,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2014</td><td>220,000</td><td>170,000</td><td>170,000</td></tr><tr><td>Q4-2015</td><td>230,000</td><td>180,000</td><td>180,000</td></tr></tbody></table></div>					Year	Lichfield	Staffordshire	West Midlands	Q4-1995	75,000	60,000	60,000	Q4-1996	80,000	65,000	65,000	Q4-1997	85,000	70,000	70,000	Q4-1998	90,000	75,000	75,000	Q4-1999	100,000	80,000	80,000	Q4-2000	110,000	85,000	85,000	Q4-2001	120,000	90,000	90,000	Q4-2002	130,000	100,000	100,000	Q4-2003	150,000	110,000	110,000	Q4-2004	170,000	120,000	120,000	Q4-2005	180,000	130,000	130,000	Q4-2006	190,000	140,000	140,000	Q4-2007	220,000	150,000	150,000	Q4-2008	210,000	145,000	145,000	Q4-2009	190,000	140,000	140,000	Q4-2010	220,000	150,000	150,000	Q4-2011	200,000	145,000	145,000	Q4-2012	200,000	150,000	150,000	Q4-2013	200,000	160,000	160,000	Q4-2014	220,000	170,000	170,000	Q4-2015	230,000	180,000	180,000
Year	Lichfield	Staffordshire	West Midlands																																																																																										
Q4-1995	75,000	60,000	60,000																																																																																										
Q4-1996	80,000	65,000	65,000																																																																																										
Q4-1997	85,000	70,000	70,000																																																																																										
Q4-1998	90,000	75,000	75,000																																																																																										
Q4-1999	100,000	80,000	80,000																																																																																										
Q4-2000	110,000	85,000	85,000																																																																																										
Q4-2001	120,000	90,000	90,000																																																																																										
Q4-2002	130,000	100,000	100,000																																																																																										
Q4-2003	150,000	110,000	110,000																																																																																										
Q4-2004	170,000	120,000	120,000																																																																																										
Q4-2005	180,000	130,000	130,000																																																																																										
Q4-2006	190,000	140,000	140,000																																																																																										
Q4-2007	220,000	150,000	150,000																																																																																										
Q4-2008	210,000	145,000	145,000																																																																																										
Q4-2009	190,000	140,000	140,000																																																																																										
Q4-2010	220,000	150,000	150,000																																																																																										
Q4-2011	200,000	145,000	145,000																																																																																										
Q4-2012	200,000	150,000	150,000																																																																																										
Q4-2013	200,000	160,000	160,000																																																																																										
Q4-2014	220,000	170,000	170,000																																																																																										
Q4-2015	230,000	180,000	180,000																																																																																										

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
Housing affordability	The lowest quartile house price was 7.1 times the lowest quartile income		The lowest quartile house price was 7.1 times the lowest quartile income which is higher than the averages for Staffordshire (6.1), West Midlands (5.4) and England (6.5). These rates highlight possible affordability issues in Lichfield.		ONS
Net Housing completions since 2006	2008/9: 273 2009/10: 102 2010/11: 306 2011/12: 201 2012/13: 239 2013/14: 324 2014/15: 226 2015/16: 200	N/A	The level of house building reached its peak in 2005/6 with 647 being delivered and the supply of housing sites was not constrained. However since the recession the rate of house building has declined.	It is unlikely that until development starts on site for the remaining Strategic Development Allocations that this delivery rate will increase.  To date only 2 of the 8 Strategic Development Allocations are on site with only 1 having been partially completed and the other only recently starting with figures expected to be	

Indicator	Lichfield District			Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
						included in the 2015/16 monitoring.	
Household projections					Between 2014 and 2039 there is a projected fall in household size within Lichfield District from 2.37 to 2.24 persons per household.  The Local Plan Strategy seeks to provide a minimum of 10,030 new dwellings between 2008 and 2029 of which 1000 are to accommodate the growth of neighbouring authorities.	Household projections are trend-based and indicate the number of additional households that would form if recent demographic trends continue.  The projected fall in household size reflects the general ageing of the population evidenced by the projected household growth by age which shows that between 2014 and 2039 there is a large growth in the number of households within the 75+ age category. The age groups for the remaining categories remain largely similar	ONS Household Projections – Published Tables (2014 base)
	Year	Average household size	Projected number of households				
	2014	2.37	42,000				
	2019	2.33	44,000				
	2024	2.30	45,000				
	2029	2.27	46,000				
	2034	2.25	47,000				
	2039	2.24	48,000				
	Number of projected households by Age						
	Age	2014	2039				
	Under 25	750	740				
	25-34	3,700	2,830				
	35-44	6,810	6,320				
	45-54	8,760	8,780				
	55-64	7,350	7,180				
	65-74	8,160	8,100				
	75-84	5,010	8,730				
85+	1,730	5,480					

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
				between 2014 and 2039.	
<b>Deprivation</b>					
Deprivation	IMD Average Rank – 252 Employment – 202 Education Skills & Training – 243 Health Deprivation & Disability - 206 Crime – 287 Barriers – 160 Living Environment – 248 Income deprivation affecting children – 229 Income deprivation affecting older people - 240	<b>Local authority districts</b> include lower-tier non-metropolitan districts, London boroughs, unitary authorities and metropolitan districts. At the time of publication, there were 326 local authority districts in England with the local authority district with a rank of 1 being the most deprived, and the area ranked 326 the least deprived.	Since 2010 there has been an increase from 1 to 2 LSOAs falling within the bottom 20% of most deprived areas. The average IDM rank for Lichfield District in 2004 was 259 followed by 237 in 2010 and 247 in 2015, showing a dip during and immediately post the recession with recovery now underway.	The Indices of Deprivation 2015 is the relative measure of deprivation published by the government. The data is published for small areas (Lower-layer Super Output Areas, or LSOAs) across England. At a District Level with regard to the IMD average rank, Lichfield is within the top 30% nationally.  However there are pockets of deprivation within Lichfield District. Two lower super output areas fall within IMD's 20% of most deprived areas nationally. These are found within the	DCLG English Indices of Deprivation 2015



Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
				wards of Chadsmead and Chasetown.	
Crime	Lichfield	36.0 crimes per 1,000 residents, 20.3% lower than the Staffordshire rate (45.2 per 1000).	<p>The number of crimes recorded in the district increased slightly by 1.4% in 2014/15 compared to the previous year but has decreased from 4308 crimes in 2010-11 to 3677 in 2014-15.</p> <p>Anti-social behaviour has increased by 6.2% over the last year but overall there has been a reduction over the past 5 years from 2262 incidents in 2010-11 to 2015 in 2014-15.</p> <p>In 2014/15, there were 46 hate crimes reported to the police in the Lichfield district. Despite this being a low number, it represents an increase</p>	<p>Both recorded crime, and the rate of anti-social behaviour across the district per 1,000 Residents' remains below the county average.</p> <p>Theft offences have declined by 8.2% since 2013/14 and the reduction is largely down to a reduction in the number of 'burglary' offences. In contrast to overall crime trends, there has been an increase in 'violence against the person' offences in the district.</p> <p>However compared to Staffordshire the</p>	Lichfield District Community Safety Delivery Plan 2016-2019

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
			<p>of 48% from the previous year of 15 crimes. The vast majority (91%) were violence and public order offences with 83% of all offences motivated by race. North Lichfield and Fazeley are in the top five areas for hate crime in the Trent Valley division (Lichfield, Tamworth and East Staffs).</p> <p>Road safety was highlighted, in particular speeding vehicles and Parking were cited as a big issues in their area. However, in terms of road traffic casualties, the proportion of casualties killed or seriously injured in 2014 was the lowest rate for 5 years, and lower than the Staffordshire rate. Staffordshire County</p>	rate of violence offences per 1000 residents was 8.8% in Lichfield compared to 12.2%.	

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source																																																
			recorded the 8 <sup>th</sup> lowest casualty severity ratio of the 153 local authorities across England and it can be inferred that the District's roads are some of the safest in the country.																																																		
Economic																																																					
Unemployment Job seekers allowance claimants	<div>DWP benefits claimants % is a proportion of resident population of area aged 16-64</div> <table><caption>DWP benefits claimants % (Estimated Data)</caption><thead><tr><th>Year</th><th>Lichfield (%)</th><th>West Midlands (%)</th><th>Great Britain (%)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Nov-15</td><td>0.5</td><td>1.8</td><td>1.5</td></tr><tr><td>Nov-14</td><td>0.6</td><td>2.2</td><td>1.8</td></tr><tr><td>Nov-13</td><td>1.2</td><td>3.5</td><td>3.0</td></tr><tr><td>Nov-12</td><td>2.0</td><td>4.5</td><td>3.5</td></tr><tr><td>Nov-11</td><td>2.3</td><td>4.6</td><td>3.7</td></tr><tr><td>Nov-10</td><td>2.3</td><td>4.2</td><td>3.4</td></tr><tr><td>Nov-09</td><td>2.8</td><td>4.8</td><td>3.7</td></tr><tr><td>Nov-08</td><td>2.0</td><td>3.5</td><td>2.5</td></tr><tr><td>Nov-07</td><td>1.1</td><td>2.5</td><td>1.8</td></tr><tr><td>Nov-06</td><td>1.2</td><td>3.0</td><td>2.2</td></tr><tr><td>Nov-05</td><td>1.3</td><td>2.8</td><td>2.2</td></tr></tbody></table>		Year	Lichfield (%)	West Midlands (%)	Great Britain (%)	Nov-15	0.5	1.8	1.5	Nov-14	0.6	2.2	1.8	Nov-13	1.2	3.5	3.0	Nov-12	2.0	4.5	3.5	Nov-11	2.3	4.6	3.7	Nov-10	2.3	4.2	3.4	Nov-09	2.8	4.8	3.7	Nov-08	2.0	3.5	2.5	Nov-07	1.1	2.5	1.8	Nov-06	1.2	3.0	2.2	Nov-05	1.3	2.8	2.2	Benefit claimants for Lichfield remains below the national and regional averages.	Benefit claimants has been variable in Lichfield over the last ten years, however this trend has broadly followed national and regional averages.	Department of Work and Pensions. Benefit claimants - working age client group
Year	Lichfield (%)	West Midlands (%)	Great Britain (%)																																																		
Nov-15	0.5	1.8	1.5																																																		
Nov-14	0.6	2.2	1.8																																																		
Nov-13	1.2	3.5	3.0																																																		
Nov-12	2.0	4.5	3.5																																																		
Nov-11	2.3	4.6	3.7																																																		
Nov-10	2.3	4.2	3.4																																																		
Nov-09	2.8	4.8	3.7																																																		
Nov-08	2.0	3.5	2.5																																																		
Nov-07	1.1	2.5	1.8																																																		
Nov-06	1.2	3.0	2.2																																																		
Nov-05	1.3	2.8	2.2																																																		
Economic activity rate	<div>Economic Inactivity 16-64 year olds</div> <table><thead><tr><th></th><th>Lichfield (%)</th><th>West Midlands (%)</th><th>Great Britain (%)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table>			Lichfield (%)	West Midlands (%)	Great Britain (%)						Economic inactivity in Lichfield is significantly lower than both the national and	ONS annual population survey																																								
	Lichfield (%)	West Midlands (%)	Great Britain (%)																																																		

Indicator	Lichfield District				Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	Apr 10-Mar 11	20.3	25.8	23.9			regional indicator and consistently so.	
	Apr 11-Mar 12	22.1	25.7	23.7				
	Apr 12-Mar 13	15.8	24.9	23.1				
	Apr 13-Mar 14	22.1	24.5	22.8				
	Apr 14-Mar 15	15.8	24.8	22.6				
	Apr 15-Mar 16	19.1	25.2	22.2				
Net additional floorspace provided	Use Class Order		Amount of Floorspace (m²)				In 2016 4,520m² of employment developments have been completed with the District providing an increase in employment floorspace.  The Council continues to achieve in locating new employment land on previously developed land, with all the completed employment development being on brownfield sites.	Authority Monitoring report 2016 Lichfield District Council
	B1a		455					
	B1b		830					
	B1c		600					
	B2		367					
	B8		175					
	B8/A1 combined		340					
	B2/B8		1,753					
	Total		4,520					


Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
Employment land available	Lichfield District has 64.42 ha of employment land available for employment development. This is available across a range of sites which can provide for all types of employment development.	N/A	The total area of employment land available for this monitoring period is some 30.18 hectares less than in December 2015.	<p>Lichfield District maintains a large portfolio of sites which are available for employment development, 64.42 ha of land is under construction and/or has secured planning permission for employment.</p> <p>The District Council produced its first Employment Land Availability Assessment (ELAA) in 2016</p>	Authority Monitoring Report 2016 Lichfield District Council
Retail performance	<p>Lichfield District has a City Centre, Lichfield and a Town Centre, Burntwood.</p> <p>Since January 2009 vacancy rates for Lichfield City Centre have fluxed between a high of 10.5% in August 2009 to a low of 7.0% in July 2014. In December 2015 vacancy rates stood at 9.15% representing 28 of the available 306 retail premises available in the City Centre.</p> <p>In terms of Burntwood vacancy rates were recorded at 9.85 in July 2014 and fall to 4.55% in December 2015, representing 3 vacancy premises of the total 66 available.</p>	N/A		Very little employment development has occurred with the District's Centres between December 2015 and 2016 AMR totalling 7.5% of this year's employment completions were located in the town centres.	Authority Monitoring Report 2016 Lichfield District Council

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source																																										
	Only two developments were completed within the Centres between December 2015 and the 2016 AMR, leading to a net new floorspace of 340m <sup>2</sup>																																														
Education																																															
Qualification of residents	<p><b>Level 1:</b> 1-4 O Levels/CSE/GCSEs (any grades), Entry Level, Foundation Diploma, NVQ Level 1, Foundation GNVQ, Basic/Essential Skills;</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> 5+ O Level (Passes)/CSEs (Grade 1)/GCSEs (Grades A*-C), School Certificate, 1 A Level/ 2-3 AS Levels/VCEs, Intermediate/Higher Diploma, Welsh Baccalaureate Intermediate Diploma, NVQ level 2, Intermediate GNVQ, City and Guilds Craft, BTEC First/General Diploma, RSA Diploma;</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> 2+ A Levels/VCEs, 4+ AS Levels, Higher School Certificate, Progression/Advanced Diploma, Welsh Baccalaureate Advanced Diploma, NVQ Level 3; Advanced GNVQ, City and Guilds Advanced Craft, ONC, OND, BTEC National, RSA Advanced Diploma;</p> <p><b>Level 4 and above:</b> Degree (for example BA, BSc), Higher Degree (for example MA, PhD, PGCE), NVQ Level 4-5, HNC, HND, RSA Higher Diploma, BTEC Higher level,</p> <p><b>Adult Qualification Levels – Proportion of the working age population (16-64), Jan-Dec 2014</b></p> <table><thead><tr><th></th><th>% with NVQ4+</th><th>% with NVQ3+</th><th>% with NVQ2+</th><th>% with NVQ1+</th><th>% with other qualifications</th><th>% with no qualifications</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Lichfield</td><td>31.0</td><td>57.9</td><td>74.3</td><td>87.2</td><td>3.5</td><td>9.3</td></tr><tr><td>Staffordshire</td><td>28.4</td><td>53.3</td><td>73.3</td><td>83.5</td><td>5.0</td><td>11.5</td></tr><tr><td>Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent LEP</td><td>26.7</td><td>50.9</td><td>70.3</td><td>80.9</td><td>5.9</td><td>13.3</td></tr><tr><td>West Midlands</td><td>29.4</td><td>50.1</td><td>67.4</td><td>79.9</td><td>7.0</td><td>13.2</td></tr><tr><td>England</td><td>35.7</td><td>56.5</td><td>73.2</td><td>85.1</td><td>6.2</td><td>8.6</td></tr></tbody></table> <p><b>Apprenticeship success rates in Lichfield 2012/13 and 2013/14</b></p>		% with NVQ4+	% with NVQ3+	% with NVQ2+	% with NVQ1+	% with other qualifications	% with no qualifications	Lichfield	31.0	57.9	74.3	87.2	3.5	9.3	Staffordshire	28.4	53.3	73.3	83.5	5.0	11.5	Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent LEP	26.7	50.9	70.3	80.9	5.9	13.3	West Midlands	29.4	50.1	67.4	79.9	7.0	13.2	England	35.7	56.5	73.2	85.1	6.2	8.6			Overall the proportion of the working age population (16-64) in Lichfield qualified to NVQ Level 3 compares favourably to the County, LEP, Regional and National averages. However, higher level adult skills are an issue across the SSLEP, including Lichfield, with the proportion of the working age population qualified to ‘NVQ Level 4 and above’ below the national average.  Apprenticeship success rates in Lichfield are higher than the SSLEP area,	ONS Annual Population Survey and Apprenticeship Success Rates www.gov.uk
	% with NVQ4+	% with NVQ3+	% with NVQ2+	% with NVQ1+	% with other qualifications	% with no qualifications																																									
Lichfield	31.0	57.9	74.3	87.2	3.5	9.3																																									
Staffordshire	28.4	53.3	73.3	83.5	5.0	11.5																																									
Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent LEP	26.7	50.9	70.3	80.9	5.9	13.3																																									
West Midlands	29.4	50.1	67.4	79.9	7.0	13.2																																									
England	35.7	56.5	73.2	85.1	6.2	8.6																																									

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators		Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source																													
	<table><tr><th rowspan="2">Area</th><th colspan="2">2012/13</th><th colspan="2">2013/14</th></tr><tr><th>Starts</th><th>Success Rate</th><th>Starts</th><th>Success Rate</th></tr><tr><td>Lichfield</td><td>930</td><td>76.7%</td><td>1,030</td><td>70.8%</td></tr><tr><td>Staffordshire &amp; Stoke-on-Trent LEP</td><td>13,360</td><td>71.7%</td><td>11,330</td><td>67.7%</td></tr><tr><td>West Midlands</td><td>62,430</td><td>72.3%</td><td>52,410</td><td>69.7%</td></tr><tr><td>England</td><td>504,200</td><td>72.3%</td><td>434,600</td><td>68.9%</td></tr></table>	Area	2012/13		2013/14		Starts	Success Rate	Starts	Success Rate	Lichfield	930	76.7%	1,030	70.8%	Staffordshire & Stoke-on-Trent LEP	13,360	71.7%	11,330	67.7%	West Midlands	62,430	72.3%	52,410	69.7%	England	504,200	72.3%	434,600	68.9%				regional and national averages although the district does demonstrate the same decrease in success rates in 2013/14 when compared to the previous year	
	Area		2012/13		2013/14																														
		Starts	Success Rate	Starts	Success Rate																														
	Lichfield	930	76.7%	1,030	70.8%																														
	Staffordshire & Stoke-on-Trent LEP	13,360	71.7%	11,330	67.7%																														
	West Midlands	62,430	72.3%	52,410	69.7%																														
England	504,200	72.3%	434,600	68.9%																															
GCSE Results	2014-15 Staffordshire: % pupils achieving 5+ GCSE grades A*-C: 64.9% Average A' Level Scores per candidate: 698.4	2014-15: England % pupils achieving 5+ GCSE grades A*-C: 64.2% Average A' Level Scores per candidate: 700.3	Staffordshire's results has decreased with regard to GCSEs from 2009 when 70.4% achieved grades A*-C. This level of achievement was in line with the national figure of 70%. There has also been a slight reduction in the average A Level scores per candidate achieving 707.6 in 2009 with the average for England being 739.1 substantially higher than Staffordshire's results.	Staffordshire's results are similar to the national picture.	Department for Education																														
Health																																			
Life expectancy	Males: 80 years Females: 84 years	West Midlands Males: 78.9 years	Latest ONS population projections are trend-	Overall life expectancy at birth	ONS: Healthy life																														

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
		<p>Females: 82.9 years</p> <p><b>England</b></p> <p>Males 79.5 years</p> <p>Females: 83.2 years</p>	<p>based and use the 2014 mid-year population estimates as the base year. They provide an indication of expected levels of population growth over a 25 year period. The population is projected to see a significant growth in people aged 65 and over and in particular those aged 85 and over.</p> <p>The rate of increase in the number of older people in Lichfield is faster than both the West Midlands and England and by 2029 equates to a 60% increase in 75-84 year olds and a 115% increase in the amount of residents aged 85.</p>	<p>continues to increase both nationally and locally. Overall life expectancy at birth in Lichfield is 80 years for men and 84 years for women, both similar to the national average. However men and women living in the most deprived areas of Lichfield live five and 10 years less than those living in less deprived areas.</p> <p>For men the difference in life expectancy between the ward with the lowest life expectancy and the ward with the highest life expectancy in the district is over six years (varying between 76 years in Chadsmead and 83 years in Burntwood</p>	<p>expectancy at birth and age 65 by upper tier local authority and area deprivation: England, 2012 to 2014</p>



Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
				Central).  For women the difference in life expectancy between the ward with the lowest life expectancy and the ward with the highest life expectancy in the district is over 12 years (varying between 79 years in Chasetown and 91 years in St John's).	
Ageing population	<p>Population Projections for Lichfield District 2014 - 2039</p>  <p>Number of People (,000)</p> <p>Year</p> <p>0-15 16-24 25-49 50-64 65-74 75-84 85+</p>			Most wards (22 out of 26) have higher proportions of older people aged 65+ than England. Armitage with Handsacre, Boley Park, Chasetown, Fazeley, King's Bromley, Leomansley, Little Aston, Shenstone and Stowe also have higher proportions of people aged 85 or over. Only three	ONS Population Estimates 2014 - 2039

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source																																
	<div><p>Projected population change between 2014 and 2029</p><table border="1"><caption>Projected population change between 2014 and 2029</caption><thead><tr><th>Age Group</th><th>Lichfield</th><th>West Midlands</th><th>England</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>0-15</td><td>-5.00</td><td>8.00</td><td>10.00</td></tr><tr><td>16-24</td><td>-10.00</td><td>5.00</td><td>8.00</td></tr><tr><td>25-49</td><td>-5.00</td><td>2.00</td><td>2.00</td></tr><tr><td>50-64</td><td>5.00</td><td>8.00</td><td>10.00</td></tr><tr><td>65-74</td><td>22.00</td><td>15.00</td><td>22.00</td></tr><tr><td>75-84</td><td>60.00</td><td>42.00</td><td>48.00</td></tr><tr><td>85+</td><td>115.00</td><td>65.00</td><td>60.00</td></tr></tbody></table></div> <p>The dependency ratio for older people in Lichfield (measures the number of people aged over 65 who depend on people of working age (16-64)) is 38 older people for every 100 people of working age. This is higher than the England average.</p>			Age Group	Lichfield	West Midlands	England	0-15	-5.00	8.00	10.00	16-24	-10.00	5.00	8.00	25-49	-5.00	2.00	2.00	50-64	5.00	8.00	10.00	65-74	22.00	15.00	22.00	75-84	60.00	42.00	48.00	85+	115.00	65.00	60.00	wards, Alrewas and Fradley, Chadsmead and Summerfield have high proportions of children under 16.	
Age Group	Lichfield	West Midlands	England																																		
0-15	-5.00	8.00	10.00																																		
16-24	-10.00	5.00	8.00																																		
25-49	-5.00	2.00	2.00																																		
50-64	5.00	8.00	10.00																																		
65-74	22.00	15.00	22.00																																		
75-84	60.00	42.00	48.00																																		
85+	115.00	65.00	60.00																																		
Benefit claimants	<table><tr><td></td><td>June 2013</td><td>June 2014</td><td>June 2015</td><td>June 2016</td></tr><tr><td>Lichfield</td><td>2.3%</td><td>1.3%</td><td>0.6%</td><td>0.7%</td></tr><tr><td>West Midlands</td><td>5.5%</td><td>4.0%</td><td>2.9%</td><td>2.9%</td></tr><tr><td>Great Britain</td><td>4.4%</td><td>3.1%</td><td>2.6%</td><td>2.2%</td></tr></table>		June 2013	June 2014	June 2015	June 2016	Lichfield	2.3%	1.3%	0.6%	0.7%	West Midlands	5.5%	4.0%	2.9%	2.9%	Great Britain	4.4%	3.1%	2.6%	2.2%		As the District has recovered from the recession, the amount of benefit claimants has reduced.	These figures show the number of claimants as a percentage of economically active residents 16-64. The figures for Lichfield District shows that	NOMIS (June 2016)												
	June 2013	June 2014	June 2015	June 2016																																	
Lichfield	2.3%	1.3%	0.6%	0.7%																																	
West Midlands	5.5%	4.0%	2.9%	2.9%																																	
Great Britain	4.4%	3.1%	2.6%	2.2%																																	

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
				its claimants' rate is substantially lower than the West Midlands and Great Britain.	
Health deprivation and disability	<p>Lichfield District is ranked as 206 out of 326 local authorities (i.e. in top 40%) where 1 is the most deprived.</p> <p>The Health Deprivation and Disability Domain measures the risk of premature death and the impairment of quality of life through poor physical or mental health. The domain measures morbidity, disability and premature mortality but not aspects of behaviour or environment that may be predictive of future health deprivation.</p>	Staffordshire is ranked 91 <sup>st</sup> out of 152 i.e. in the top 40%.		<p>The 2011 Census found that 18.1% (18,300 people) had a limiting long-term illness (LLTI) in Lichfield. This is higher than the England average of 17.6%. The proportion of people who have a LLTI also increases with age: around 48% (9,400) of people with 65 and over and 67% (5,100) of people aged 75 and over have a LLTI.</p> <p>In Lichfield 12 of 26 wards also have higher proportions of people with LLTI than the England average.</p>	DCLG English Indices of Deprivation 2015


Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source																																																						
Health inequality	<p>The charts provide a comparison of the changes in early death rates (in people under 75) between this area and all of England. Early deaths from all causes also show the differences between the most and least deprived quintile in this area. (Data points are the midpoints of 3 year averages of annual rates, for example 2005 represents the period 2004 to 2006).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Early deaths from all causes: MEN</b></p> <table><caption>Estimated data for Early deaths from all causes: MEN</caption><thead><tr><th>Year</th><th>Lichfield District</th><th>England</th><th>Most Deprived Quintile</th><th>Least Deprived Quintile</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2003</td><td>550</td><td>500</td><td>650</td><td>450</td></tr><tr><td>2004</td><td>530</td><td>480</td><td>620</td><td>420</td></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td>510</td><td>460</td><td>580</td><td>400</td></tr><tr><td>2006</td><td>500</td><td>450</td><td>550</td><td>350</td></tr><tr><td>2007</td><td>490</td><td>440</td><td>530</td><td>300</td></tr><tr><td>2008</td><td>480</td><td>430</td><td>510</td><td>300</td></tr><tr><td>2009</td><td>470</td><td>420</td><td>500</td><td>280</td></tr><tr><td>2010</td><td>460</td><td>410</td><td>480</td><td>280</td></tr><tr><td>2011</td><td>450</td><td>400</td><td>470</td><td>280</td></tr><tr><td>2012</td><td>440</td><td>390</td><td>460</td><td>280</td></tr></tbody></table>	Year	Lichfield District	England	Most Deprived Quintile	Least Deprived Quintile	2003	550	500	650	450	2004	530	480	620	420	2005	510	460	580	400	2006	500	450	550	350	2007	490	440	530	300	2008	480	430	510	300	2009	470	420	500	280	2010	460	410	480	280	2011	450	400	470	280	2012	440	390	460	280		<p>Priorities in Lichfield include addressing inequalities in health, addressing the impact of alcohol, and supporting the ageing population.</p> <p>In 2012, 23.5% of adults are classified as obese.</p> <p>The rate of smoking related deaths was 229, better than the average for England. This represents 143 deaths per year. Rates of sexually transmitted infections, people killed and seriously injured on roads and TB are better than average. Rates of statutory homelessness, violent crime, long term unemployment,</p>	Public Health England
Year	Lichfield District	England	Most Deprived Quintile	Least Deprived Quintile																																																							
2003	550	500	650	450																																																							
2004	530	480	620	420																																																							
2005	510	460	580	400																																																							
2006	500	450	550	350																																																							
2007	490	440	530	300																																																							
2008	480	430	510	300																																																							
2009	470	420	500	280																																																							
2010	460	410	480	280																																																							
2011	450	400	470	280																																																							
2012	440	390	460	280																																																							

Indicator	Lichfield District		Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source	
	<div><div>▲ England average</div><div>● Local average</div><div>■ Local least deprived</div><div>◆ Local most deprived</div><div>Local inequality</div></div> <div><p>Early deaths from all causes: WOMEN</p><p>Age-standardised rate per 100,000 population</p><p>Years</p></div>					drug misuse, early deaths from cardiovascular diseases and early deaths from cancer are better than average.	
Infant mortality	2010 – 2012 3.4 deaths per 1000 live births 2011-2013 3.1 deaths per 1000 live births		Staffordshire 2011-2013: 4.7 deaths per 1000 live births	A drop in the IMR for Lichfield accords with a national reduction.	Infant mortality rates dropped nationally from 11.1 per 1000 live births in 1981 to 4.0 per 1000 live births in 2011.	LGA	

E07000194

## Health summary for Lichfield

The chart below shows how the health of people in this area compares with the rest of England. This area's result for each indicator is shown as a circle. The average rate for England is shown by the black line, which is always at the centre of the chart. The range of results for all local areas in England is shown as a grey bar. A red circle means that this area is significantly worse than England for that indicator; however, a green circle may still indicate an important public health problem.




### Indicator notes

1 % people in this area living in 20% most deprived areas in England, 2013 2 % children (under 16) in families receiving means-tested benefits & low income, 2012  
 3 Crude rate per 1,000 households, 2013/14 4 % key stage 4, 2013/14 5 Recorded violence against the person crimes, crude rate per 1,000 population, 2013/14  
 6 Crude rate per 1,000 population aged 16-64, 2014 7 % of women who smoke at time of delivery, 2013/14 8 % of all mothers who breastfeed their babies in the first 48hrs after delivery, 2013/14 9 % school children in Year 6 (age 10-11), 2013/14 10 Persons under 18 admitted to hospital due to alcohol-specific conditions, crude rate per 100,000 population, 2011/12 to 2013/14 (pooled) 11 Under-18 conception rate per 1,000 females aged 15-17 (crude rate) 2013 12 % adults aged 18 and over who smoke, 2013  
 13 % adults achieving at least 150 mins physical activity per week, 2013 14 % adults classified as obese, Active People Survey 2012 15 % adults classified as overweight or obese, Active People Survey 2012 16 Directly age standardised rate per 100,000 population, aged under 75, 2010-12 17 Directly age sex standardised rate per 100,000 population, 2013/14 18 The number of admissions involving an alcohol-related primary diagnosis or an alcohol-related external cause, directly age standardised rate per 100,000 population, 2013/14 19 Estimated users of opiate and/or crack cocaine aged 15-64, crude rate per 1,000 population, 2011/12 20 % people on GP registers with a recorded diagnosis of diabetes 2013/14 21 Crude rate per 100,000 population, 2011-13, local number per year figure is the average count 22 All new STI diagnoses (excluding Chlamydia under age 25), crude rate per 100,000 population, 2013 23 Directly age and sex standardised rate of emergency admissions, per 100,000 population aged 65 and over, 2013/14 24 Ratio of excess winter deaths (observed winter deaths minus expected deaths based on non-winter deaths) to average non-winter deaths 01.08-31.07.13 25, 26 At birth, 2011-13 27 Rate per 1,000 live births, 2011-13 28 Directly age standardised rate per 100,000 population aged 35 and over, 2011-13 29 Directly age standardised mortality rate from suicide and injury of undetermined intent per 100,000 population, 2011-13 30 Directly age standardised rate per 100,000 population aged under 75, 2011-13 31 Directly age standardised rate per 100,000 population aged under 75, 2011-13 32 Rate per 100,000 population, 2011-13  
 † Indicator has had methodological changes so is not directly comparable with previously released values.

\* "Regional" refers to the former government regions.

More information is available at [www.healthprofiles.info](http://www.healthprofiles.info) and <http://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/health-profiles> Please send any enquiries to [healthprofiles@phe.gov.uk](mailto:healthprofiles@phe.gov.uk)  
 You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/)


Indicator	Lichfield District				Comparators			Local Trend			Commentary	Data Source	
Environmental Issues													
Energy Consumption	Average Domestic Electricity Usage 2005-2014 per consumer											The average amount of electricity and gas usage per capita has decreased in line with the British average, however it remains at a higher rate.  The rate of gas usage in Lichfield District per consumer has reduced by 33%, with the reduction in electricity usage by around 20%.	Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy <a href="http://tools.dcc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/local_auth/interactive/domestic/ge/index.html">http://tools.dcc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/local_auth/interactive/domestic/ge/index.html</a>
		2005 (KWh)	2006 (KWh)	2007 (KWh)	2008 (KWh)	2009 (KWh)	2010 (KWh)	2011 (KWh)	2012 (KWh)	2013 (KWh)	2014 (KWh)		
	Lichfield	5,320	4,910	4,850	4,630	4,520	4,510	4,410	4,360	4,290	4,310		
	GB Mean	4,600	4,460	4,390	4,200	4,150	4,150	4,080	4,020	3,940	3,950		
	<div><p>Average Domestic Electricity Usage 2005-2014</p></div>												
	Average Domestic Gas Usage 2005-2014 per consumer												
		2005 (kWh)	2006 (kWh)	2007 (kWh)	2008 (kWh)	2009 (kWh)	2010 (kWh)	2011 (kWh)	2012 (kWh)	2013 (kWh)	2014 (kWh)		
	Lichfield	21090	20200	19400	18720	16950	16730	15850	15740	15200	14890		
	GB Mean	19020	18240	17610	16910	15380	15160	14210	14080	13680	13250		

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source																																																								
	<div><p>Average Domestic Gas Usage 2005-2014</p><table><caption>Average Domestic Gas Usage 2005-2014 (KWH)</caption><thead><tr><th>Year</th><th>Lichfield</th><th>GB Mean</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2005</td><td>21000</td><td>19000</td></tr><tr><td>2006</td><td>20000</td><td>18500</td></tr><tr><td>2007</td><td>19500</td><td>18000</td></tr><tr><td>2008</td><td>18500</td><td>17500</td></tr><tr><td>2009</td><td>17000</td><td>16000</td></tr><tr><td>2010</td><td>17000</td><td>15500</td></tr><tr><td>2011</td><td>16000</td><td>15000</td></tr><tr><td>2012</td><td>16000</td><td>14500</td></tr><tr><td>2013</td><td>15500</td><td>14000</td></tr><tr><td>2014</td><td>15000</td><td>13500</td></tr></tbody></table></div>			Year	Lichfield	GB Mean	2005	21000	19000	2006	20000	18500	2007	19500	18000	2008	18500	17500	2009	17000	16000	2010	17000	15500	2011	16000	15000	2012	16000	14500	2013	15500	14000	2014	15000	13500																									
Year	Lichfield	GB Mean																																																											
2005	21000	19000																																																											
2006	20000	18500																																																											
2007	19500	18000																																																											
2008	18500	17500																																																											
2009	17000	16000																																																											
2010	17000	15500																																																											
2011	16000	15000																																																											
2012	16000	14500																																																											
2013	15500	14000																																																											
2014	15000	13500																																																											
Homes built on previously developed land	<div><p><b>New and Converted Dwellings – On Previously Developed Land</b></p><table><thead><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">Brownfield</th><th colspan="2">Greenfield</th><th colspan="2">Garden Land (Greenfield)</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>Number of Dwellings</th><th>%</th><th>Number of Dwellings</th><th>%</th><th>Number of Dwellings</th><th>%</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2010/11</td><td>249</td><td>76%</td><td>80</td><td>24%</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>2011/12</td><td>161</td><td>77%</td><td>47</td><td>23%</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>2012/13</td><td>207</td><td>82%</td><td>45</td><td>18%</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>2013/14</td><td>215</td><td>65%</td><td>21</td><td>6%</td><td>93</td><td>28%</td></tr><tr><td>2014/15</td><td>330</td><td>84%</td><td>25</td><td>6%</td><td>36</td><td>9%</td></tr><tr><td>2015/16</td><td>180</td><td>88%</td><td>10</td><td>5%</td><td>14</td><td>7%</td></tr></tbody></table></div>				Brownfield		Greenfield		Garden Land (Greenfield)			Number of Dwellings	%	Number of Dwellings	%	Number of Dwellings	%	2010/11	249	76%	80	24%	-	-	2011/12	161	77%	47	23%	-	-	2012/13	207	82%	45	18%	-	-	2013/14	215	65%	21	6%	93	28%	2014/15	330	84%	25	6%	36	9%	2015/16	180	88%	10	5%	14	7%	<div><p>2013-14 28% Garden Land. Due to Laurel House, Fazeley development which is considered to be garden land</p><p>The percentage profile of homes</p></div>	Authority Monitoring Report 2016 Lichfield District Council
	Brownfield		Greenfield		Garden Land (Greenfield)																																																								
	Number of Dwellings	%	Number of Dwellings	%	Number of Dwellings	%																																																							
2010/11	249	76%	80	24%	-	-																																																							
2011/12	161	77%	47	23%	-	-																																																							
2012/13	207	82%	45	18%	-	-																																																							
2013/14	215	65%	21	6%	93	28%																																																							
2014/15	330	84%	25	6%	36	9%																																																							
2015/16	180	88%	10	5%	14	7%																																																							



Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	There has been an increase in the proportion of completions on brownfield sites to that recorded during 2014/15, the majority of development still occurs on brownfield land.			built on previously developed land will change in future years as greenfield releases will be required to deliver the housing requirements over the Local Plan Strategy Plan Period.	
EU Habitats sites	Within 20km of LDC: River Mease SAC – 23.03 ha Cannock Chase SAC – 1244.2 ha Cannock Extension Canal SAC – 5 ha Pasturefields Salt Marsh – 7.8 ha West Midlands Mosses – 184.62 ha Fens Pool – 20 ha Ensor's Pool – 3.86 ha	N/A		It has been determined by the HRA of the Local Plan that the only 2 European Sites on which the Local Plan could cause significant harm are the Cannock Chase SAC and the River Mease SAC.	HRA, Lichfield District and Tamworth Borough
Nature conservation sites	Cannock Chase SSSI - 1279.1 ha Chasewater and Southern Staffordshire Coalfields Heath SSSI - 530.23 ha Gentleshaw Common SSSI - 80.47 ha Stowe Pool and Walkmill Claypit SSSI - 8.38 ha River Mease SSSI - 21.86 ha  78 SBIs (Sites of Biological Importance) within Lichfield District	N/A			

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	Local Nature Reserves: Christian Fields, Lichfield				
Biodiversity	<p>The Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan identifies habitats of importance for the county and includes plans for their conservation and management.</p> <p>There are 78 Sites of Biological Interest within Lichfield District: However the total number of sites changes periodically. Up to date information on these sites and their boundaries is provided by Staffordshire Ecological Record.</p> <p>Lichfield District contains a wide variety of species which are defined by and received protection under domestic or European Legislation. Particular protected species that have been encountered within Lichfield District include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bats</li> <li>• Birds</li> <li>• Great crested newts</li> <li>• White clawed crayfish</li> <li>• Water voles</li> <li>• Otters</li> <li>• Badgers</li> <li>• Invertebrates</li> <li>• Reptiles</li> <li>• Plant species</li> </ul>	N/A			
Landscape Character	<p>Cannock Chase AONB</p> <p>Cannock Chase AONB – 68 sq km (a small proportion falls within the west of the District.</p>	N/A			

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
Fluvial Flood Risk	<div><div><p><b>Lichfield district Council</b> www.lichfielddc.gov.uk District Council House Frog Lane Lichfield Staffs WS13 6YY Telephone: 01543 358000 enquiries@lichfielddc.gov.uk</p><p><b>Legend</b></p><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>District Boundary</li><li>Flood Zone 3</li><li>Flood Zone 2</li></ul><p>© Environment Agency copyright and/or database right 2016. All rights reserved.</p><p><b>Drawing Details:</b> Scale 1:33,396 Date: 01/08/2016 Drawing No: Drawing Prepared by: Roberts Whittaker - GIS Officer Coordinate System: British National Grid Projection: Transverse Mercator Datum: OSGB 1936 False Easting: 490,000.0000 False Northing: -190,000.0000 Central Meridian: -2.0000 Scale Factor: 0.9996 Latitude Of Origin: 49.0000 Units: Meter</p><p><b>Compass Rose:</b> N W E S</p><p>© Crown Copyright, Database Rights 2016 Lichfield District Council Licence No: 100017765.</p></div></div>	<p>The main rivers located in the Lichfield District are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• River Tame.</li><li>• River Trent.</li><li>• River Mease.</li><li>• Moreton Brook.</li><li>• River Blithe</li></ul> <p>The River Tame and River Trent are the main rivers that flow through the Lichfield District Council area. These rivers carry large volumes of water and have wide floodplains. The EA Flood Zone maps for the River Trent and River Tame indicate fluvial risk occurs predominantly into rural agricultural land where there is currently little proposed development.</p>	Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)		

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
Other Flood Risk	<p><b>Pluvial Risk</b> - Pluvial flooding poses a risk to the District, due to the lack of drainage capacity during high flows. Blockages of drains and watercourses in urban areas have been attributed to the pluvial flooding incidents in Lichfield District. Throughout Lichfield District there have been a large number of pluvial flooding occurrences which have been identified as highways flooding. Fazeley is the area most at risk of pluvial flooding as detailed in the SWMP Phase 2. Historic records indicate that Fazeley suffers from recurring fluvial and pluvial flood events.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk from Sewers</b> - Records provided by Severn Trent Water indicate within Lichfield Council area there are 15 postcode areas identified as at risk of flooding from artificial drainage systems and surface water runoff. The number of properties at risk of flooding from sewer flooding. Further detail is contained within the SFRA.</p> <p><b>Groundwater Flooding</b> - Existing studies (WCS Report, 2010) indicate that there are no known problems with groundwater flooding within the Lichfield District Council area.</p> <p><b>Other Sources of Flood Risk</b> - Little Aston Pool, Chasewater, Stowe Pool, Shustoke Lower, Blithfield and Chasewater reservoirs pose a risk of flooding. Inundation maps indicating the areas that would be inundated should the reservoir fail are contained within the SFRA 2014. Although the consequence of</p>	N/A	N/A	Should development take place in these areas, further work should be carried out to investigate the nature and scale of the risk posed, so that mitigation can be put in place and the areas can be targeted through appropriate policies for reducing flood risk.	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (June 2014)

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	<p>reservoir breach and or failure is high, the probability of breach is considered very low.</p> <p>There are a number of canals located within Lichfield Council area: the Trent and Mersey Canal, Coventry Canal and the Birmingham and Fazeley Canal and part of the Wyrley and Essington Canal Anglesey Branch to the south of Chasewater. Liaison with the Canal and Rivers Trust indicated that there are no recorded incidents of breaches or any other flood risk instances associated with these canals.</p>				
Water Demand and Supply	<p>The Southern Staffordshire Outline Water Cycle Study (WCS) (July 2010) was undertaken in light of the proposed growth requirements relating to the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (WMRSS) Phase 2 revision i.e. 8,000 homes, 99 hectares of general employment land and 30,000m<sup>2</sup> of office for Lichfield District. Whilst the WMRSS has since been abolished, the message from the WCS is that, in principle, and subject to careful phasing of development, there are no 'show stoppers' for the level of growth identified.</p> <p>In response to previous consultation stages of the Local Plan Strategy, South Staffordshire Water (SSW) has advised that there are no problems with supply. However the WCS indicates a need for infrastructure investment and the action which South Staffordshire Water needs to take, working directly with developers, is as follows.</p>				Lichfield District Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan August 2015


Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source												
	<p><b>Water Resource Infrastructure Needs (defined by the Water Cycle Study)</b></p> <p><b>Water supply</b> SSW can supply water to all developments, but some may require additional investment, which is achieved by the developer working directly with the supplier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Major upgrades will be required for all sites in Burntwood, and sites which link to the Brownhills network, including supply mains.</li><li>Minor infrastructure upgrades will be needed for:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fradley Airfield;</li><li>North Streethay;</li><li>Fazeley; and</li><li>South Lichfield.</li></ul></li></ul> <p><b>Water abstraction</b> Any developments requiring the abstraction of water should consider the information contained within the Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS).</p>																
Air Quality	<p><b>Mortality attributable to air pollution (adults aged 30 and over)</b></p> <table><tr><th>Area</th><th>2011 (%)</th><th>2012 (%)</th><th>2013 (%)</th></tr><tr><td>Lichfield</td><td>5.1</td><td>5.0</td><td>5.1</td></tr><tr><td>Staffordshire</td><td>4.9</td><td>4.7</td><td>5.0</td></tr></table>	Area	2011 (%)	2012 (%)	2013 (%)	Lichfield	5.1	5.0	5.1	Staffordshire	4.9	4.7	5.0		The table displays the fraction of annual all-cause adult mortality attributable to anthropogenic (human-made) particulate air	Poor air quality is a significant public health issue. The burden of particulate air pollution in the UK in 2008 was	Public Health Outcomes Framework
Area	2011 (%)	2012 (%)	2013 (%)														
Lichfield	5.1	5.0	5.1														
Staffordshire	4.9	4.7	5.0														

Indicator	Lichfield District				Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	West Midlands	5.3	5.1	5.4		pollution (measured as fine particulate matter, PM2.5). This suggests that around 5% of Lichfield's mortality is attributable to air pollution which is similar to the regional and national picture.	estimated to be equivalent to nearly 29,000 deaths at typical ages and an associated loss of population life of 340,000 life years lost.  Inclusion of this indicator in the Public Health Outcomes Framework (PHOF) will enable local health and wellbeing groups to prioritise action on air quality in their area to help reduce the health burden from air pollution.	
	England	5.4	5.1	5.3				
Per capita emissions in LA Area		Lichfield	Staffordshire	England		13.6% reduction per capita in Lichfield District since 2005.	Lichfield has a lower per capita emissions than its county comparators. However despite an overall reduction it still remains higher than national figures.	Department of Energy and Climate Change
	2005	8.8	9.8	8.5				
	2006	8.9	9.8	8.5				
	2007	8.9	9.6	8.2				
	2008	8.3	9.1	7.9				
	2009	7.5	8.3	7.1				
	2010	7.8	8.7	7.3				
	2011	7.3	8.2	6.7				
	2012	7.6	8.3	7.0				

35



Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
National Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative	<p>There are a number of regional initiatives affecting parts of the District that aim to achieve enhancements to existing landscapes and create valuable new habitats that can play a part in increasing biodiversity value within the District. In particular these include the National Forest, the Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative,</p> <p>The <b>National Forest</b> for the Midlands was originally a Countryside Commission initiative. The Forest area is located principally within Derbyshire, Leicestershire and East Staffordshire District. A small area to the north of the District which includes the National Memorial Arboretum and Alrewas fall within the National Forest. The District Council currently supports the principle of establishment for the National Forest through saved policy EA.16 Lichfield District Local Plan June 1998.</p> <p>The <b>Forest of Mercia</b>, originally sponsored by the Countryside Commission and Forestry Authority, includes part of South Staffordshire, Cannock Chase, Lichfield District and Walsall Metropolitan Borough which are partners in the project. In Lichfield District the Forest areas encircles Burntwood, with its eastern fringes reaching the northern and western edge of Lichfield.</p> <p>The <b>Central Rivers Initiative (CRI)</b> is a broadly based partnership which the District council is part working together to shape and guide the progressive</p>	N/A	N/A	<p>The Forest of Mercia and the National Forest are both landscape ordained initiatives that seek to fundamentally change the character of parts of the District to redress the major loss of woodland the area has suffered whilst enhancing the District's biodiversity and playing an important role in providing for recreation and tourism.</p> <p>The National Forest, Forest of Mercia and Central Rivers Initiative are supported through Core Policy 1 &amp; 13 of the Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029.</p> <p>In addition the principle of the National Forest and Forest of Mercia</p>	Lichfield District Local Plan June 1996

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	restoration and revitalisation of the river valley between Burton, Lichfield and Tamworth - an area of central England that covers over 50 square km. The initiative area within the district is focused on a belt that runs from Alrewas southwards to the border with Tamworth.			features as saved policies from the Lichfield District Local Plan June 1998 and will be subject of a review through the development of the Allocations Document.	
Archaeology					
Landscape character	<p>There are three main historic landscapes character areas in the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Burntwood and the South West</li><li>• Lichfield and its surroundings</li><li>• River Valleys</li></ul> <p>The Historic Landscape Character Assessment identifies 13 sub Historic Environmental Character Areas which fall wholly or partly within Lichfield District which were identified by their earliest discoverable landscapes.</p> 	N/A	The location and scale of development will need to take into account the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment assets within the District.	Historic Environment Character Assessment Final report for Lichfield District Council Feb 2009 Lichfield District Council Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document	

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	The areas to the west of Lichfield City and to the north and west of Alrewas scored highly and any developments in these zones would require consideration of this historic environment.				
Historic Farmsteads	High rates of survival with 78.8% of historic farmstead sites retaining some working buildings (36.1% with all or over 50% of their historic footprint).	Between 1980's and 1999 the 2006 study of aerial photographs (University of Gloucestershire study for EH 2009) shows listed working farms buildings with evidence for residential reuse: Lichfield: 33.3% West Midlands: 27% England: 30%	A higher proportion of farmsteads are in residential use than is typical of the region as a whole.	However in 2013 the Government extended permitted development rights and within certain parameters, redundant agricultural buildings can be converted to residential units without having to apply for planning permission if the plans meet the approval of the local authority. This may have increased the rate at which conversions have been brought forwards although no corroborating data is available	Historic Farmsteads & Landscape Character in Staffordshire (SCC and EH) 2012
Historic Environment	The Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document which was adopted in 2015 captures the range of elements to the Historic Environment via a SWOT, which is summarised below.  <b>Historic Environment SWOT Analysis Strategy Elements</b>				Historic Environment Supplementar

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Threats</b>	y Planning Document
	Historic City with medieval street pattern intact and well preserved historic core	Consolidate local character	Loss of industrial heritage	HS2	
	Historic Villages	Channel development pressure positively to regenerate	Some characterless suburbs	Wind Turbine Proposals	
	Varied attractive landscapes	Raise designs of Design	Lack of high quality contemporary architecture: tendency towards a default position of pastiche or “safe” design	Growth pressures favours fast growing urban extensions, making organic growth difficult	
	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Retain character of historic cores whilst regenerating underused sites to attract new investment		Gentrification of villages resulting in a change of character	
	Five spires skyline provides strong city identity	Environmental improvements to key spaces		Out of town retail undermining historic core	
	Strong local distinctiveness	Promote visitor attraction		Recreation and visitor Pressure	
	Trent and Mersey and Coventry Canals and their environs	Heritage base tourism			
	River Trent, Mease and Tame valleys	Continued expansion of the canal network through the Lichfield			

Indicator	Lichfield District		Comparators	Local Trend		Commentary	Data Source
		Canal and the Lichfield and Hatherton Canal Restoration Trust					
	Rural Areas in demand.						
Conservation Areas  Listed Buildings	The historic environment of the District is significant.  Scheduled ancient monuments: 5 <b>Listings</b> Grade I 12 Listings Grade II* 63 Listings Grade II 686 Listings Scheduled Monuments: 16 Registered Historic Parks and Garden: 1 Conservation Areas: 21 Over 430 buildings or structures which are recorded on the List of Locally Important Buildings.  <b>At Risk Register:</b> Conservation Areas at Risk: 1 Grade II Listed Buildings at Risk: 18 Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings at Risk: 2		N/A	N/A	Much of Lichfield District's Character and tourism draw is due to its wealth of historic buildings and conservation areas. The preservation of historic sites remains of paramount importance.	Annual Monitoring Review 2016.  <a href="https://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list">https://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list</a>	
Minerals							
Sand and Gravel Resources	The New Minerals Local Plan for Staffordshire (2015-2030). Our Vision and Strategic Objectives 1, recognise the importance of aggregate minerals to support sustainable economic development taking into account the need to achieve an acceptable balance		N/A	N/A	The New Minerals Local Plan for Staffordshire (2015-2030) is currently out for consultation for main modifications.	The New Minerals Local Plan for Staffordshire (2015-2030)	


Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	<p>with the impact of mineral operations on local communities and the environment.</p> <p>Policy 1: Provision for Sand and Gravel Provision will be made to maintain permitted reserves with production capacity of up to 5.0 million tonnes of sand and gravel per annum. This will be achieved initially from existing permitted reserves and by granting planning permission to extend a number of sites.</p> <p>The following falls within Lichfield District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alrewas</li> </ul> <p>In addition Policy 1 Provision of Sand and Gravel goes on to identify proposals for new sand and gravel sites with the area of search and these include to the west of the A38 shown on the Policies and Proposals Map where they accord with Plan policies including Policy 4.</p>			Consideration will need to be given to growth in identified and potential areas as identified with the New Minerals Local Plan for Staffordshire (2015-2030).	
<b>Waste</b>					
<b>Waste and Recycling</b>	Household Waste – 2014/15, 54.5% recycled, composted or reused.	2014/15 England recycling rate 42.9% West Midlands recycling rate: 41.3%		Lichfield District is above and in advance of the EU target of 50% of waster being recycled by 2020.	Data.gov.uk
<b>Transport Issues</b>					
Commuter Trips	In terms of travel to work, 3% of employed residents commute by rail which is the highest level in Staffordshire, but at the same time, Lichfield has one	N/A	N/A	The District sees a considerable proportion of its	Lichfield District Integrated

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	<p>of the highest levels of car drivers, at 75%. Lichfield District has four rail stations Lichfield City, Lichfield Trent Valley, Rugeley Trent Valley and Shenstone. There are also a number of community transport services operating within the District.</p> <p>49.1% of employees which live within the District commute out of the District to work.</p> <p>In Lichfield City 83% of households are within 350 metres of a half-hourly or better weekday bus service, achieved through the commercial network.</p>			higher skilled workers commute to jobs elsewhere in the West Midlands conurbation on a daily basis.	Transport Strategy 2015-2029
Traffic congestion	<p>The District is well served by local routes such the A51, A515 and A5127 and has excellent connections to the national transport network including the M6 Toll, A38 (T), A5148 (T) and A5 (T). However enhanced connectivity in the District will need to focus on these routes to ensure traffic levels are managed.</p> <p>The improvements listed include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to safety and capacity are required at a number of junctions within Lichfield City Centre to accommodate proposed growth (para 5.15 Lichfield District Integrated Transport Strategy).</li> <li>• Bus/ rail integration will be provided as part of the Friarsgate Development.</li> <li>• Bus access improvements and frequency in Burntwood to support an enhanced town centre and new housing.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	Phase 3 of the Lichfield southern Bypass will reduce traffic in the City Centre on A5127 and A51, protecting the historic core.	Lichfield District Integrated Transport Strategy 2015-2029

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connectivity improvements between the Strategic Development Allocations (SDA) in south Lichfield and the City Centre.</li> <li>Completion of final stage (London Road to Birmingham Road) of Lichfield Southern bypass to link A5206 London Road to A461 Walsall Road.</li> <li>Improvements to mitigate development to the east of Lichfield SDA.</li> <li>Substandard junction layouts at Hillards Cross and Fradley South located along the A38.</li> <li>Lichfield Trent Valley rail station disabled access improvements to allow access to London bound platform.</li> <li>New bus services from Fradley SDA to Lichfield city.</li> <li>Manage routing of Heavy Commercial Vehicles and consider provision of lorry park at Fradley.</li> </ul>				
Bus and Rail	<p><b>Bus</b> In Lichfield City 83% of households are within 350 metres of a half-hourly or better weekday bus service, achieved through the commercial network.</p> <p>For the rural north west of the District which have either a less regular or non existent bus service the County Council provide the 'Needwood Forest Connect' bookable bus service where the route is plotted on a daily basis from telephone bookings enabling it to only run where there are passengers which require its services. This service is provided between 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday.</p>		60% of the District's households are within Lichfield and Burntwood with a further 20% within the key rural settlements. Therefore it intimates that current bus services predominantly serve the main centres and key rural settlements.	The level of demand for rail travel is expected to increase significantly. Network Rail's Market Study for Regional Urban Centres, published in October 2013, suggests growth of between 8% and 49% for travel into both Birmingham	<p>Lichfield District Integrated Transport Strategy 2015-2029</p> <p>Staffordshire Rail Strategy May 2015.</p>



Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	<p><b>Rail</b></p> <p>Lichfield District has four rail stations Lichfield City, Lichfield Trent Valley, Rugeley Trent Valley and Shenstone. 3% of employed residents commute by rail which is the highest level in Staffordshire. Lichfield Trent Valley, Lichfield City, Shenstone, Blake Street and Four Oaks stations are served by the Cross City North line which forms part of the busiest local rail corridors in the West Midlands.</p> <p>In recent years a regular service on the West Coast Mainline between Crewe and London calling at Lichfield Trent Valley and Rugeley Trent Valley has been introduced which has significantly improved connectivity between key locations on this line.</p> <p>Possible rail enhancements which would benefit the District include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lichfield Trent Valley rail station disabled access improvements are required to allow access to London bound platform.</li> <li>• Reopening the Lichfield Walsall line</li> <li>• Electrification of the Rugeley to Walsall line and Lichfield Trent Valley to Wychnor to improve line speed and allow more frequent services and reduce environmental impacts.</li> <li>• Provision of passenger service from Lichfield to Derby with a new station at Alrewas to serve the village and National Memorial Arboretum.</li> </ul>			<p>and Manchester by 2023, rising to between 24% and 114% by 2043. This confirms the increasingly important role the rail network will play in the future and demonstrates the need for continued investment in rail services and the associated network.</p>	

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source															
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Development of a Strategic Freight Corridor from Stourbridge to Lichfield via Walsall to offer capacity relief.</li></ul> <p><b>HS2</b> HS2 passes through the District and will impact on communities, however there are no stations proposed.</p>																			
	<p><b>Access to private transport: proportion of residents who have no car or van by age (2011)</b></p>  <table><caption>Proportion of residents with no cars by age group (2011)</caption><thead><tr><th>Age group</th><th>Proportion with no cars (%)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Under 65</td><td>~7%</td></tr><tr><td>65-69</td><td>~7%</td></tr><tr><td>70-74</td><td>~12%</td></tr><tr><td>75-79</td><td>~19%</td></tr><tr><td>80-84</td><td>~33%</td></tr><tr><td>85+</td><td>55%</td></tr></tbody></table>			Age group	Proportion with no cars (%)	Under 65	~7%	65-69	~7%	70-74	~12%	75-79	~19%	80-84	~33%	85+	55%		<p>In Lichfield around 18% of people aged 65 and over have no private transport (i.e. access to a car). This increases to 55% of people aged 85 and over. Using 2014 mid-year population figures for Lichfield it has been estimated that around 500 residents aged 65+ are at risk of loneliness and a lack of transport increases the sense of isolation and loneliness.</p>	Census 2011
Age group	Proportion with no cars (%)																			
Under 65	~7%																			
65-69	~7%																			
70-74	~12%																			
75-79	~19%																			
80-84	~33%																			
85+	55%																			

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
<b>High Quality Design and Sustainability Issues</b>					
Trees, Landscape and Development	<p>The NNPF places great importance to the design of the built environment. Lichfield District Council is committed to good design standards in all development.</p> <p>The final section of the SPD deals with the provision of new trees, hedgerows, woodlands and shrub planting as part of the design of a development and its landscaping scheme.</p>			Lichfield District Council recently adopted a raft of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) that support the delivery of the Local Plan Strategy. Each SPD focus on the concept of design in relation to their particular features specialism.	Lichfield District Council Trees, Landscape and Development Supplementary Planning Document
Biodiversity & Development	<p>The NNPF places great importance to the design of the built environment. Lichfield District Council is committed to good design standards in all development.</p> <p>The findings of ecological surveys should be taken into careful consideration at the earliest design stage of a development. Possible conflicts can be addressed by having the information available at the right stage and by taking an imaginative approach to site design to avoid harm.</p>			Lichfield District Council recently adopted a raft of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) that support the delivery of the Local Plan Strategy. Each SPD focus on the concept of design in relation to their particular features specialism.	Lichfield District Council Biodiversity & Development Supplementary Planning Document

Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
Rural Development	<p>The NNPF places great importance to the design of the built environment. Lichfield District Council is committed to good design standards in all development.</p> <p>Recognises the rural housing residential developments will be expected to incorporate high quality design. Appendix B of the document is dedicated to providing design standards for the reuse of Rural Building.</p>			Lichfield District Council recently adopted a raft of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) that support the delivery of the Local Plan Strategy. Each SPD focus on the concept of design in relation to their particular features specialism.	Lichfield District Council Rural Development Supplementary Planning Document
Historic Environment	<p>The NNPF places great importance to the design of the built environment. Lichfield District Council is committed to good design standards in all development.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Design should be informed by an understanding of the overall character of an area, particularly the elements that contribute to local distinctiveness, and also an understanding of the significance of heritage assets of all types and the importance of their setting in order to secure good quality , well designed and sustainable places.</p>			Lichfield District Council recently adopted a raft of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) that support the delivery of the Local Plan Strategy. Each SPD focus on the concept of design in relation to their particular features specialism.	Lichfield District Council Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document
Sustainable Design	The NNPF places great importance to the design of the built environment. Lichfield District Council is committed to good design standards in all development.			Lichfield District Council recently adopted a raft of Supplementary Planning Documents	Lichfield District Council Sustainable Design


Indicator	Lichfield District	Comparators	Local Trend	Commentary	Data Source
	<p>The Sustainable Design Supplementary Planning Document seeks to give guidance on how sustainable development can be achieved through connectivity and integration, in terms of how places are sustainably connected by transport linkages and through patterns of development. It then considers how the layout and density can assist in creating sustainable development, through green infrastructure, standards for parking and spaces around dwellings, utilising sustainable drainage systems, creating walkable communities and energy efficient layouts.</p> <p>Appendix C – of the document is dedicated to providing and explain the objectives of good design.</p>			(SPD) that support the delivery of the Local Plan Strategy. Each SPD focus on the concept of design in relation to their particular features specialism.	Supplementary Planning Document



## **APPENDIX F – LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**





**Alrewas****Site A2****Planning Permission Secured****Likely Significant Effect**

- The site records a significant negative effect against three of the Site Specific Questions relating to Sustainability Objective 1. Surveys confirm that there is significant use of the site by protected and priority species and this effect is mirrored against the protected and priority habitats focused Site Specific Question.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.
- The site falls within a mineral consultation area relating to sand and gravel drift, this location results in a significant negative effect being recorded against Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 4.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The development of the site will result in the loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site falls within the National Forest and the Central River Initiative, the potential for the site to produce a positive effect has been recorded through a minor positive with uncertainty against Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 5.
- The site is adjacent to a rural settlement which has a number of existing services resulting in significant positive effects being identified against Sustainability Objective 12 and 15 and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objectives 4, 6 and 12.

## Alrewas

### Site A3



## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site falls within the National Forest and the Central River Initiative the potential for the site to produce a positive effect has been recorded through a minor positive with uncertainty against Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 5.
- The site is adjacent to a rural settlement which has a number of existing services resulting in significant positive effects being identified against Sustainability Objective 12 and 15 and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objectives 4, 6 and 12.

## Alrewas

### Site A4



### Planning Permission Secured

#### Likely Significant Effect

- The site has been previously developed and as such records a significant positive effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The previously developed nature of the site enables minor positive effects against Sustainability Objective 5, 8 and 9 to be recorded.
- The site falls within the National Forest and the Central River Initiative the potential for the site to produce a positive effect has been recorded through a minor positive with uncertainty against Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 5.
- The site is adjacent to a rural settlement which has a number of existing services resulting in significant positive effects being identified against Sustainability Objective 12 and 15 and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objectives 4, 6 and 12.
- The site is located within a conservation area and has a locally listed building within its curtilage, resulting in minor negative effects being recorded against Sustainability Objective 3.

## Alrewas

### Site A5



### Planning Permission Secured

#### Likely Significant Effect

- The site falls within the National Forest and the Central River Initiative the potential for the site to produce a positive effect has been recorded through a minor positive with uncertainty against Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 5.
- The site is adjacent to a rural settlement which has a number of existing services resulting in significant positive effects being identified against Sustainability Objective 12 and 15 and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objectives 4, 6 and 12.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.

## Armitage

### Site AH1



## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The landscape character record against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question “does it respect and protect existing landscape character” Sustainability Objective 2.
- The site falls within a mineral consultation area relating to sand and gravel drift, this results in a significant negative effect being recorded against Sustainability Objective 2.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site is adjacent to a rural settlement which has a number of existing services resulting in significant positive effects being identified against Sustainability Objective 12 and 15 and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objectives 4, 6 and 12.

## East of Rugeley

### Site R1




### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is located a distance away from both Armitage with Handsacre and Rugeley and therefore significant negative effects in relation to Sustainability Objective 4 has been recorded.
- The site, due to its previously developed nature returns a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site records a significant positive effect in relation to encouraging the use of existing sustainable modes of travel.
- The effect of the potential change of use of this site from employment to housing is recorded as a significant negative against Sustainability Objective 14.

## Fazeley

### Site FZ2




### Likely Significant Effect

- The site records a significant negative effect in regard to Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 1. The significant negative effect is recorded in response to survey evidence identifying protected and priority species.
- The site records significant positive and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objective 3, these effects reflect the potential to bring back into full use a Grade II Listed building, currently deemed at risk.
- The site is within a rural settlement which has a number of existing services resulting in significant positive effects being identified against Sustainability Objective 12 and 15 and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objectives 4, 6 and 12.
- The site due to its previously developed nature records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.

## Fazeley

### Site FZ3



### Likely Significant Effect

- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site records significant minor effect against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 2, relating to the sites ability to value and protect locally distinctive settlement and townscape character.
- The site is adjacent to a rural settlement which has a number of existing services resulting in significant positive effects being identified against Sustainability Objective 12 and 15 and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objectives 4, 6 and 12.



## Fradley

### Site F1




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site is located within Source Protection Zone 1, and as such a significant negative effect has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 9.
- The site is within a rural settlement which has a number of existing services resulting in significant positive effects being identified against Sustainability Objective 12 and 15 and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objectives 4 and 12.

## North of Tamworth

### Site NT1




### Likely Significant Effect

- Surveys have identified protected and priority species on site, as such a significant negative effect has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 1.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- Potential impact on a Grade II Listed building accounts for the significant negative effect recorded as against Sustainability Objective 3.
- The site records a significant negative effect in relation to effect on traffic sensitive areas.
- The opportunity for improving transport accessibility has been captured as a significant positive effect in relation to Sustainability Objective 6.
- A significant positive effect against three of the Site Specific Questions, Sustainability Objective 11 relating to meeting local housing need.

## North of Tamworth

### Site NT2




## Under Construction

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site records against Sustainability Objective 6 a significant positive effect in relation to encouraging use of existing sustainable modes of travel and a minor positive effect traffic sensitive areas.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.
- A significant positive effect against three of the Site Specific Questions, Sustainability Objective 11 relating to meeting local housing need.

## Other Rural

### Site HR1 (255)




## Under Construction

### Likely Significant Effect

- The development has the potential to have an impact on the River Mease Special Area of Conservation, as such a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 9, Site Specific Question 2 has been recorded.
- The sites records significant and minor positive effects in relation to Sustainability Objective 12.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.

## Other Rural

### Site HR1 (135)




## Under Construction

### Likely Significant Effect

- The sites records significant and minor positive effects in relation to Sustainability Objective 12.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.
- In Sustainability Objective 11 significant positive effects are scored against 3 of the site specific questions in relation to housing provision.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.

## Other Rural

### Site OR1



## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site records a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 1, survey data indicates the presence of a bat roost.
- The site records a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 6. Packington Hall Landscape Park is included within the site boundary.
- The site is isolated, this is recorded through significant negative effects against indicators included as part of Sustainability Objective 4 and 6.
- The majority of the site has been previously developed and as such a significant positive effects against Sustainability Indicator 5.
- The sites records a significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 3, which reflects the potential to bring back into full use a Grade II building currently at risk.

## Other Rural

### Site OR3



## Planning Permission Secured


### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is isolated, this is recorded as a significant negative against indicators within Sustainability Objective 4.
- The site falls within a mineral consultation area relating to sand and gravel drift this results in a significant negative effect being recorded against Sustainability Objective 2.
- The site includes a Historic Environment Area feature, and as such a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 7 has been recorded.
- Due to the majority of the site being previously developed a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.

The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.

## Other Rural

### Site OR4



## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site falls within a mineral consultation area relating to sand and gravel drift this results in a significant negative effect being recorded against Sustainability Objective 2.
- The site is isolated this is recorded as significant negative effects against indicator in Sustainability Objective 4.
- Due to the majority of the site being previously developed significant positive effects in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 has been recorded.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.



## Other Rural

### Site OR5




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to the majority of the site being previously developed significant positive effects in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site falls within a mineral consultation area relating to sand and gravel drift this results in a significant negative effect being recorded against Sustainability Objective 2.
- The site is isolated as such a significant negative effect is recorded against indicators included as part of Sustainability Objective 4.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.

## Other Rural

### Site HR2




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such a significant negative effect has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 9 Site Specific Question 4.
- The site records a significant negative effect in relation to encouraging the use of existing sustainable modes of travel.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site records a significant positive effect against three of the Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 11.

## Other Rural

### Site OR7




### Planning Permission Secured

#### Likely Significant Effect

- The site records a significant negative effect against three of the Site Specific Questions associated with Sustainability Objective 1. Surveys confirm that there is significant use of the site by protected and priority species and this is mirrored against the protected and priority habitats focused Site Specific Question.
- Separated from any settlement the site records a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 4.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site records significant and minor positive effects in relation to Sustainability Objective 12.
- A significant positive effect has been recorded against three of the Site Specific Indicators included as part of measuring effect on Sustainability Objective 11, relating to meeting local housing need.
- The site is separated from the settlement of Lichfield however it has been assumed that future residents would use facilities within Lichfield Town Centre, this results in significant positive effects being recorded against Sustainability Objective 15.

## Other Rural

### Site OR8



## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site records a significant negative effect against three of the Site Specific Questions associated with Sustainability Objective 1. Surveys confirm that there is significant use of the site by protected and priority species.
- The site is isolated and located a significant distance away from services as such significant negative effects has been recorded against Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Indicator 4.
- The site has been previously developed and as such returns a significant positive effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site records a significant positive effect in relation to traffic sensitive areas.

## Harlaston

### Site H1



### Likely Significant Effect

- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.
- The site records a significant negative effect against one of the Site Specific Questions associated with Sustainability Objective 1. Surveys confirm that there is significant use of the site by protected and priority species.
- The site records two significant negative effects against Sustainability Objective 6 which relates to sustainable transport.
- The site records a positive significant effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 4.
- The site is located within 480 metres of one or more areas of accessible open space and therefore records a significant positive effect against Sustainability Objective 12.

Site is located within 480m of one or more areas of accessible open space.

-

## Shenstone

### Site S1




### Likely Significant Effect

- A significant negative effect is recorded reflecting of the flood risk zones associated with the site.
- The effect of the potential change of use of this site from employment to housing is recorded as a significant negative against Sustainability Objective 14.
- The site is adjacent to a rural settlement which has a number of existing services resulting in significant positive effects being identified against Sustainability Objective 12 and 15, and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objectives 4, 6 and 12.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.

## Whittington

### Site W2



### Likely Significant Effect

- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is adjacent to a rural settlement which has a number of existing services resulting in significant positive effects being identified against Sustainability Objective 12 and 15 and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objectives 4, 6 and 12.

## Whittington

### Site W3




### Likely Significant Effect

- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is located within the conservation area and as such a significant negative effect in regard to Sustainability Objective 3, Site Specific Question 3 has been recorded.
- The site is within a rural settlement which has a number of existing services resulting in significant positive effects being identified against Sustainability Objective 12 and 15 and minor positive effects against Sustainability Objectives 4, 6 and 12.



## Employment

### Site EMP 1 (ELAA 97)




### Likely Significant Effect

- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- In regard to Sustainability Objective 5 which focuses on transport, the site records a significant negative effect in regard to Site Specific Question 1 “encouraging the use of existing sustainable modes of transport”. In contrast the site records a significant positive effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 5, which relates to potential opportunities for the development of sustainable transport modes.
- The site is directly connected to AQMA resulting in a significant negative effect being returned for Sustainable Objective 9, Site Specific Question 3.
- Due to the nature of the allocation, employment, the site records significant positive effects against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.

## Employment

### Site EMP 1 (ELAA 105)



### Likely Significant Effect

- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is directly connected to AQMA resulting in a significant negative effect being returned for Sustainable Objective 9, Site Specific Question 3.
- A minor negative effect is recorded against Sustainability 2, Site Specific Question 7 due to the close proximity to a Historic Environment Area.
- Due to the nature of the allocation, employment, the site records significant positive effects against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.

## Employment

### Site EMP 1 (ELAA 113)




### Likely Significant Effect

- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5 Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is directly connected to AQMA resulting in a significant negative effect being returned for Sustainable Objective 9, Site Specific Question 3.
- A minor negative effect is recorded against Sustainability 2, Site Specific Question 7 due to the close proximity to a Historic Environment Areas.
- Due to the nature of the allocation, employment, the site records significant positive effects against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.

## Employment

### Site EMP 2




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is directly connected to AQMA resulting in a significant negative effect being returned for Sustainable Objective 9, Site Specific Question 3.
- Due to the nature of the allocation, employment, the site records a significant positive effect against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.

## Employment

### Site EMP 3




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is directly connected to AQMA resulting in a significant negative effect being returned for Sustainable Objective 9, Site Specific Question 3.
- Due to the nature of the allocation, employment, the site records a significant positive effect against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.

## Gypsy and Traveller

### Site GT21




### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to the nature of the allocation, gypsy and traveller site, of the site records a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 11, Site Specific Question 2, “increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups”. In contrast the site records significant positive effect against Sustainability Objective 11, Site Specific Question 4, “meet the needs of the travelling community and show people”.
- The site is previously developed and therefore a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 has been recorded.

## Burntwood

### Site B1




### Planning Permission Secured

#### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to loss of potential employment use the site records significant negative effects against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- Due to the previously developed nature of the site a significant positive effect is recorded in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood and as such records a significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records a minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.

## Burntwood

### Site B2



## Planning Permission Secured


### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to loss of potential employment use the site records a significant negative effect against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- Due to the sites previously developed nature records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood and as such records a significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records a minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.



## Burntwood

### Site B3



### Likely Significant Effect


- Due to loss of potential employment use the site records a significant negative effect against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- Due to the sites previously developed nature records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood and as such records a significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records a minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.

**Burntwood****Site B4****Likely Significant Effect**

- Due to loss of potential employment use the site records a significant negative effect against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- A minor negative effect has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Questions 1 and 2, there is a potential for protected and priority species.
- The potential loss of open space has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 12.
- Due to the sites previously developed nature a significant positive effect is recorded respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood and as such records a significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records a minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.

## Burntwood

### Site B5




### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to the sites previously developed nature it records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site recorded a minor negative effect in relation to Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 2. An element of the site includes protected and priority habitat.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood and as such records a significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records a minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.

## Burntwood

### Site B7




### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to the sites previously developed nature it records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site recorded a significant negative effect in relation to Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 2. The vacant site is currently semi improved/acid grassland which is a priority habitat.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4 Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records minor positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.

## Burntwood

### Site B8



### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to loss of potential employment use the site records a significant against effects against all 4 Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- The site recorded a minor negative effect in relation to Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 1. There is potential for the site to support protected and priority species.
- Due to the sites previously developed nature it records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4 Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.

## Burntwood

### Site B10




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site recorded a minor negative effect in relation to Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 2. The vacant site is in part currently semi improved /acid grassland which is a priority habitat.
- Due to the sites previously developed nature it records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood records significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4 Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15 Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.

## Burntwood

### Site B13




## Under Construction

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood records significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4 Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15 Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records minor positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.
- Due to loss of potential employment use the site records a significant against effect against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- The site records a minor negative effect against Sustainability Objective 6, Site Specific Question 3, as there is potentially insufficient space to accommodate cycle facilities within the site.
- Due to the sites previously developed nature it records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.

## Burntwood

### Site B16



## Planning Permission Secured


### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to loss of potential employment use the site records a significant negative effect against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- The site recorded a significant negative effect in relation to Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 1, survey data indicated protected species.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood and records significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4 Site Specific Question 4 and Sustainability Objective 15 Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records a minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.
- Due to the sites previously developed nature a significant positive effect is recorded in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.



## Burntwood

### Site B17




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to the sites previously developed nature a significant positive effect is recorded in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood records significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4 Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15 Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records a minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.

## Burntwood

### Site B20




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood a significant positive effect is recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records a minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.
- Due to the sites previously developed nature a significant positive effect is recorded in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- Due to the site currently being vacant and demolition of the previous structure taking place some years ago the site records a significant positive effect against Site Specific Question four, Sustainability Objective 5.

## Burntwood

### Site B21



## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is located within the main settlement of Burntwood a significant positive effect is recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records a minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.
- Due to the sites previously developed nature a significant positive effect is recorded in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.

## Lichfield

### Site L1



### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is located within a conservation area, adjacent to listed buildings and also has the potential to effect views towards Lichfield Cathedral, as such minor negative effects has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 3 and Sustainability Objective 4.
- The site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument and within an area of significant archaeological potential this results in a minor negative effect being recorded against Sustainable Objective 2, Site Specific Question 7.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3. Due to the sites previously developed nature a significant positive effect is recorded in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.

## Lichfield

### Site L2



### Likely Significant Effect

- The Mare Brook runs along the boundary of the site resulting in a minor negative effect being recorded against encouragement of ecological connectivity, Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 4.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is located significant positive against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 4 which relates to the creation of places and Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3 which relates to contributing positively to existing settlements.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.

## Lichfield

### Site L3



## Under Construction

### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to loss of potential employment use the site records significant negative effects against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 12.
- Due to the previously developed nature of the site a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 is recorded.
- A significant negative effect has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Questions 2, the site comprises of semi – improved grassland.
- The site adjoins a conservation area and therefore a minor negative effect has been recorded against Sustainable Objective 3, Site Specific Question 3.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.

## Lichfield

### Site L4



### Planning Permission Secured

#### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.
- The site is in close proximity to a scheduled ancient monument and a Historic Environment point: Lichfield Town Defences, therefore a minor negative effect being recorded against Sustainable Objective 2, Site Specific Question 7.
- The site is adjacent to listed buildings and a conservation area and as such a minor negative effect has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 3.
- Due to the previously developed nature of the site a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 has been recorded.

## Lichfield

### Site L5 (19)



### Planning Permission Secured


#### Likely Significant Effect

- The site records a significant negative effect against three of the Site Specific Questions attached to Sustainability Objective 1, the site includes semi improved grassland and is connected to an established network of other priority habitats.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 4 and Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3. Due to the previously developed nature of the site a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 is recorded.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.



## Lichfield

### Site L5 (89-90)




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site recorded a significant negative effects against three of the Site Specific Questions attached to Sustainability Objective 1, the site includes semi improved grassland and is connected to an established network of other priority habitats.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 4 and Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.

## Lichfield

### Site L5 (1065)




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site recorded significant negative effect against three of the Site Specific Questions attached to Sustainability Objective 1, the site includes semi improved grassland and is connected to an established network of other priority habitats.
- The site would result in a loss of quality agricultural land which is recorded as a significant negative effect.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 4 and Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.

## Lichfield

### Site L6



### Planning Permission Secured

#### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to loss of potential employment use the site records significant negative effects against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- Due to the previously developed nature of the site a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 has been recorded.
- The site records a minor negative effect in relation to Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 1, following the potential for the site to support protected and priority species.
- The site recorded minor negative effects against Site Specific Question 6 and 7, Sustainability Objective 2. The site is adjacent to a Grade II Registered Park and Garden and in close proximity to an Ancient Monument.
- The site recorded a minor negative effects against Site Specific Question 1 and 3 Sustainability Objective 3. The site lies within a conservation area and adjacent to a number of listed buildings.
- The site recorded minor negative effects against Site Specific Question 2 and 3, Sustainability Objective 4 there is potential for development to impact on the views of Lichfield City.

## Lichfield

### Site L7




### Likely Significant Effect

- The site recorded a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 1 in relation to conservation of protection and priority species.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.
- Due to the previously developed nature of the site a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 has been recorded.

## Lichfield

### Site L8



### Likely Significant Effect

- The site recorded a minor negative effect against safeguarding sites of archaeological importance, Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 7.
- A significant negative effect was recorded against Sustainability Objective 3, Site Specific Question 1 “Will it preserve and enhance buildings and structures and their setting and contribute to the Districts heritage”.
- A minor negative effect has been recorded against the sites potential effect on the historic views and skylines, Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 3.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 4 and Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.


## Lichfield

### Site L9



### Likely Significant Effect


- A minor negative effect has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 1 and 2, as the site has the potential to support protected and priority species and habitats.
- Due to the previously developed nature of the site a significant negative effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The development of the site will result in the loss of quality agricultural land.
- The site recorded a minor negative effect against safeguarding sites of archaeological importance, Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 7.
- The site is near to Grade II Listed buildings and therefore recorded a minor negative effect against Sustainability Objective 3, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 4 and Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.

**Lichfield****Site L10****Likely Significant Effect**

- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield a significant positive effects has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 4 Site Specific Question 4 and Sustainability Objective 15 Site Specific Question 1 and 3. The site also records minor and significant positive effects against all Site Specific Questions identified against Sustainability Objective 12.
- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5 Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is located within Source Protection Zone 1, a significant negative effect has been recorded against Sustainable Objective 9, Site Specific Question 1.
- Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 1 recorded a minor negative effect and Question 2 a significant negative effect. The site consists of semi improved grass land and has the potential to support protected and priority species.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.

## Lichfield

### Site L12



## Under Construction


### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is within a conservation area which is recorded as a minor negative effect against Sustainable Objective 3, Site Specific Question 3.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 4 and Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.



## Lichfield

### Site L13



## Under Construction

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site due to its previously developed nature records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site recorded a minor negative effect against Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 7, due to the site being located within the historic city core.
- The site is located within the conservation area and has a number of Grade II listed structures within it, therefore the site records minor negative effects against Sustainability Objective 3 Site Specific Question 1 and 3.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 4 and Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.

## Lichfield

### Site L14



## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site due to its previously developed nature records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- Due to loss of potential employment use the nature of the allocation the site records a significant against effect against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 4 and Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.

## Lichfield

### Site L16




## Under Construction

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site due to its previously developed nature records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 4 and Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.

## Lichfield

### Site L17




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site due to its previously developed nature effect significant positive in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- Due to loss of potential employment use the nature of the allocation the site records a significant against effect against all four of the Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.

## Lichfield

### Site L18




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site due to its previously developed nature records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- Minor negative and significant negative effects was recorded against Sustainability Objective 1, the site has the potential to support protected and priority species and consists of semi improved grassland.
- The site records a minor negative effect against Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 7 the site is within the historic core Lichfield City and in close proximity to past Anglo-Saxon finds.
- The site records a minor negative in relation to Sustainability Objective 3, Site Specific Question 1, there are a number of listed buildings close to the site.
- In regard to Sustainability Objective 4, place creation, there are a number of minor negative effects recorded relating to historic views and skylines and the need for sensitive design.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.

## Lichfield

### Site L19




### Planning Permission Secured

#### Likely Significant Effect

- The site due to its previously developed nature a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 has been recorded.
- The historic context of the sites location has led to a significant negative effects being recorded against Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 7. A minor negative effect is also recorded against Site Specific Question 6 of the same Sustainability Objective.
- The site includes an at risk Grade II listed building, there is the potential opportunity to bring this heritage asset back into active use, as such the site recorded a significant positive effect against Sustainability Objective 3, Site Specific Question 4.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.

## Lichfield

### Site L20




### Likely Significant Effect

- The site has not been previously developed and as such returns a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is adjacent to listed buildings therefore a minor negative effect has been recorded against Suitability Objective 3, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.

## Lichfield

### Site L21



## Planning Permission Secured


### Likely Significant Effect

- The site due to its previously developed nature records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- There is an element of semi improved grassland within the site and as such a minor negative effect has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 2.
- The site is adjacent to a number of list buildings and a listed monument as such a minor negative effect has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 3, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.



## Lichfield

### Site L22




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site due to its previously developed nature records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site is located within the historic core and as such records a minor negative effects against Sustainability Objective 2, Site Specific Question 6 and 7.
- The site includes a locally listed building and is in close proximity to listed buildings as such minor negative effects has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 3 which relates to protecting and enhancing buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting.
- Minor positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 3. These positive effects relate to the potential opportunity surrounding the local listed building being brought back into use.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.

## Lichfield

### Site L23




### Likely Significant Effect

- The site due to its previously developed nature records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- Due to loss of potential employment use the nature of the allocation the site records a significant against effect against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- The site is adjacent to a Listed building and as such a minor negative effect has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 3, Site Specific Question 1.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects are recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.

## Lichfield

### Site L24




### Likely Significant Effect

- Due to loss of potential employment use the nature of the allocation the site records a significant negative effect against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield a significant positive effect is recorded against Sustainability Objective 4 Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15 Site Specific Question 1 and 3.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.

## Lichfield

### Site L25




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield and effect significant positive against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.
- The site due to its previously developed nature records a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site in located within Source Protection Zone 3 and as such records a minor negative effect against Sustainability Objective 9, Site Specific Question 1.

## Lichfield

### Site L26




### Planning Permission Secured

#### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield and a significant positive effect against Sustainability Objective 4 Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15 Site Specific Question 1 and 3.
- The site due to its previously developed nature effect significant positive in respect to Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site records a minor negative against Sustainability Objective 3, Site Specific Question 7, two Historic Landscape features are within the site.
- The site is adjacent to Grade I and Grade II listed buildings and as such records a minor negative effect against Site Specific Question 1, Sustainability Objective 1. The site is within a conservation areas but development may improve the area hence a minor negative effect recorded against Site Specific Question 3.
- A significant negative effect is recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 3 “Does it safeguard historic views and valuable skylines of settlements”.


## Lichfield

### Site L27




### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield and records significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.
- The site due to its previously developed nature a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 has been recorded.
- Due to loss of potential employment use the nature of the allocation the site records a significant against effect against all four Site Specific Questions related to Sustainability Objective 14.

**Lichfield****Site L28****Under Construction****Likely Significant Effect**

- A minor negative effect has been recorded against Site Specific Question 1 Sustainability Objective 1 the site has potential for protected and priority species.
- There are a number of Historic Environment Areas within the site therefore a minor negative effect has been recorded against Site Specific Question 7, Sustainability Objective 2.
- The site includes a number of listed buildings and as such a minor negative effect has been recorded against Sustainability Objective 3, Site Specific Question 1.
- A minor negative effect is recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 3 "Does it safeguard historic views and valuable skylines of settlements."
- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield and records significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3.
- The site due to its previously developed nature a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 has been recorded.


**Lichfield****Site L29****Likely Significant Effect**

- The site is located within the main settlement of Lichfield significant positive effects against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Questions 4 and 5, Sustainability Objective 15, Site Specific Question 1 and 3 have been recorded.
- A significant negative effect is recorded against Sustainability Objective 4, Site Specific Question 3 “Does it safeguard historic views and valuable skylines of settlements”.
- The site is adjacent to a Grade II listed park and garden as such a minor negative effect has been recorded against Site Specific Question 6, Sustainability Objective 2. This effect is mirrored in Site Specific Question 7, the site is within the historic centre of the city and is within close proximity to ancient monument.
- The site includes Grade II listed buildings and is also in close proximity to the other Grade II listed buildings, in addition there is potential to affect the setting of the Cathedral, as such, the site has recorded a significant negative effect against Site Specific Question 1, Sustainability Objective 3.
- The site is located with a conservation area and as such a minor negative effect against Site Specific Question 3, Sustainability Objective 3.
- In regard to Sustainability Objective 3 the site records a significant positive effect against Site Specific Question 4 and minor positive against Site Specific Question 2, this reflects the potential opportunity to bring back into use a vacant listed building.
- Due to its previously developed nature the site a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 has been recorded.



## Lichfield (Employment)

### Site L30




## Planning Permission Secured

### Likely Significant Effect

- The site comprises of semi improved grassland and as such records a significant negative effect against Sustainability Objective 1, Site Specific Question 2.
- The landscape character recorded against the site results in a significant negative effect being returned in relation to Site Specific Question 1, “does it respect and protect existing landscape character”, Sustainability Objective 2.
- Due to its previously developed nature the site a significant positive effect in respect to Sustainability Objective 5 has been recorded.
- The site records a significantly positive effect against sustainability Objective 5, Site Specific Question 4 relating to the reducing derelict, degraded and underused land.
- Due to the nature of the allocation, the site score significantly positive in relation to all four Site Specific Indicators, Sustainability Objective 14.

## Lichfield

### Site L31



### Likely Significant Effect

- The site is been previously developed and as such records a significant positive effect against Sustainability Objective 5.
- The site scores significantly positive against two of the Site Specific Questions attached to Sustainability Objective 6 which focuses on sustainable transport.
- The site is located with Lichfield and as such record a significantly positive effects against Sustainability Objective 15.
- The site is currently used for employment and as such the site records a significant negative effect against four of the Site Specific Questions attached to Sustainability Objective 14.

# **APPENDIX G – LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

**Table 6 – Reasons for Preferred Alternatives  
Housing**

				Development Considerations				
Settlement	SA Ref	Allocations	Complete (since AMR 2016)	Under Construction	Planning Permission	Urban Capacity	Local Plan Strategy	Green Belt
Alrewas	974	A4						
	751	A3						
	36	A5						
	842							
	28	A2						
Armitage with Handsacre	91	AH1						
	651							
	379							
	120							
	1030							
	1024							
	1021							
	650							
	92							
	747							
	583							
Burntwood	907, 1123							
	964							
	42							
	404							
	958							
	957							
	102							
	71							
	483							
	653							
	477							
	93							
	494							
	632							
	490							
	482							
	69							
	70							
	654							
	655							

## APPENDIX G

Table 6 – Reasons for Preferred Alternatives  
Housing

				Development Considerations				
Settlement	SA Ref	Allocations	Complete (since AMR 2016)	Under Construction	Planning Permission	Urban Capacity	Local Plan Strategy	Green Belt
	659							
	660							
	701							
	1005	B1						
	763							
	478	B13						
	496	B7						
	4	B5						
	119	B4						
	7	B3						
	156	B2						
	429	B8						
	1037	B16						
	1054	B17						
	ELAA 47	B10						
	926	B19						
East of Rugeley	1028							
	833							
	832							
	1031	R1						
	27							
Fazeley	472							
	495							
	94							
	140							
	95							
	440	FZ3						
	115	FZ2						
	97							
	1118							
Fradley	87							
	138	F1						
	369							
	376							
	377							
	437							

## APPENDIX G

Table 6 – Reasons for Preferred Alternatives  
Housing

				Development Considerations				
Settlement	SA Ref	Allocations	Complete (since AMR 2016)	Under Construction	Planning Permission	Urban Capacity	Local Plan Strategy	Green Belt
	130							
	838							
	83							
	436							
	132							
	666							
	412							
	131							
	438							
	1119							
	1120							
Lichfield	6							
	434							
	435							
	16							
	22							
	18							
	956							
	17							
	20							
	416							
	704							
	955							
	126							
	127							
	633							
	856	L27						
	1							
	835							
	1032	L2						
	837	OR7						
	646							
	671							
	1070	L28						
	105							
	21							
	905							

## APPENDIX G

Table 6 – Reasons for Preferred Alternatives  
Housing

				Development Considerations				
Settlement	SA Ref	Allocations	Complete (since AMR 2016)	Under Construction	Planning Permission	Urban Capacity	Local Plan Strategy	Green Belt
	44	L6						
	813	L20						
	103	L10						
	836	L18						
	19	L5						
	31	L12		Part	Part			
	703							
	89-90	L5						
	39	L14						
	61	L16						
	63	L17						
	64	L25						
	415	L24						
	422							
	648	L8						
	52	L29						
	425	L21						
	54	L22						
	418	L1						
	428	L7						
	ELAA 58	L3						
	1040	L13						
	1065	L5						
	1057	L4						
	60	L19						
	1104	L9						
	144	L26						
	681							
	164	L23						
	1114							
	1121							
North of Tamworth	104	NT1						
	43	NT2						
Other Rural	255	HR1						
	135	HR1						
	85	H1						
	1022	OR5						

## APPENDIX G

**Table 6 – Reasons for Preferred Alternatives  
Housing**

				Development Considerations				
Settlement	SA Ref	Allocations	Complete (since AMR 2016)	Under Construction	Planning Permission	Urban Capacity	Local Plan Strategy	Green Belt
	51	OR1						
	935	OR3						
	1046	OR4						
	107							
	895							
	74							
	543							
	960							
	817							
	826							
	1115							
	727							
	65							
	37							
	50							
	49							
	133							
	489							
	86							
	35							
	899							
	25							
	66							
	954							
	834							
	863							
	373							
	86							
	641							
	488							
	1034							
	380							
	1069							
	574							
	909							
	642							
	14							



## APPENDIX G

Table 6 – Reasons for Preferred Alternatives  
Housing

				Development Considerations				
Settlement	SA Ref	Allocations	Complete (since AMR 2016)	Under Construction	Planning Permission	Urban Capacity	Local Plan Strategy	Green Belt
	137							
	665							
	716							
	896							
	898							
	670							
	375							
	481							
	473							
	423							
	475							
	474							
	476							
	370							
	134							
	106							
	45							
	544							
	68							
	374							
	1033							
Shenstone	785							
	480							
	30	S1						
	67							
	684							
	1071							
	500							
	545							
	953							
	241							
	738							
Whittington	154							
	940							
	721							
	431							
	748							

## APPENDIX G

**Table 6 – Reasons for Preferred Alternatives  
Housing**

				Development Considerations				
Settlement	SA Ref	Allocations	Complete (since AMR 2016)	Under Construction	Planning Permission	Urban Capacity	Local Plan Strategy	Green Belt
	754	W3						
	8	W2						
	1035							
Additions	B20 167	B20						
	B21 146	B21						
no SHLAA ref	L31 ADD 1	L31						
no SHLAA ref	HR2 ADD 2	HR2						
	1109	OR8						
	1109	OR8						

Table 6 Key: Housing

	Urban Capacity, has Planning Permission, is Urban Capacity (as assessed in Urban Capacity Assessment), is in line with Local Plan Strategy, or is outside Green Belt
	Local Plan Strategy: Outside existing settlement boundary, however is adjacent to Key Rural Settlement and Local Plan Strategy recognises some growth beyond boundaries will be required. To be yellow site needs to be in line with quantum of development required for settlement having regard to Urban Capacity Assessment
	Not Urban Capacity, Not in line with Local Plan Strategy, in Green Belt
	Not applicable - site Urban Capacity

**Table 6: Reasons for Preferred Alternatives Employment**

Employment sites								
				Development Considerations				
	SA Ref	Allocations	Complete (since AMR 2016)	Under Construction	Planning Permission	Employment Capacity	Local Plan Strategy	Green Belt
Employment	ELAA 97	F2						
	ELAA 111	F2						
	ELAA 113							
	ELAA 1							
	ELAA 2							
	ELAA3							
	ELAA5							
	ELAA 6							
	ELAA 8							
	ELAA 9							
	ELAA 10							
	ELAA 11							
	ELAA 72							
	ELAA 112							
	ELAA 12							
	ELAA 13							
	ELAA 14							
	ELAA 15							
	ELAA 16							
	ELAA 17							
	ELAA 18							
	ELAA 19							
	ELAA 20							
	ELAA 23							
	ELAA 26							
	ELAA 30							
	ELAA 32							
	ELAA 37							
	ELAA 41							
	ELAA 46							
	ELAA 47							
	ELAA 58							
	ELAA 67							
	ELAA 77	A6						
	ELAA 80							
	ELAA 81							

Employment sites								
				Development Considerations				
	SA Ref	Allocations	Complete (since AMR 2016)	Under Construction	Planning Permission	Employment Capacity	Local Plan Strategy	Green Belt
	ELAA 82							
	ELAA 83							
	ELAA 84							
	ELAA 85							
	ELAA 86							
	ELAA 87							
	ELAA 88							
	ELAA 89							
	ELAA 90							
	ELAA 91							
	ELAA 92							
	ELAA 93							
	ELAA 94							
	ELAA 95							
	ELAA 96	OR6						
	ELAA 98							
	ELAA 99							
	ELAA 100							
	ELAA101							
	ELAA 102							
	ELAA 103							
	ELAA 104							
	ELAA 105	F2						
	ELAA 106							
	ELAA 107							
	ELAA 108							
	ELAA 109							
	ELAA 110							

Table 6 Key: Employment

	Urban Capacity, has Planning Permission, is Employment Capacity (as assessed in Employment Land Capacity Assessment), is in line with Local Plan Strategy, or is outside Green Belt
	Employment Land Capacity Assessment assess site as uncertain. Local Plan Strategy, outside existing employment area boundary, however is adjacent to sustainable settlement and/or employment area. Yellow indicates that the site is in line with quantum of development required for settlement having regard to Urban Capacity Assessment
	Site is not deemed as employment land capacity, is not in line with Local Plan Strategy and is in the Green Belt
	Not applicable - site Urban Capacity

Table 7: Reasons for Preferred Alternatives Gypsy &amp; Travellers

	SA Ref	Allocations	Complete (since AMR 2016)	Under Construction	Planning Permission	Green Belt	Local Plan Strategy	SA Significant Effect	Suitable	Available	Allocate
GT1	SHLAA 376	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N/A	N
GT2	SHLAA 377	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N/A	N
GT3	SHLAA 27	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N
GT4	SHLAA 641	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N
GT5	SLAA 667	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N
GT6	SHLAA 686	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N
GT7	SHLAA 842	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N
GT8	SHLAA 884	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N
GT9	other rural	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N/A	N
GT10	other rural	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N/A	N
GT11	other rural	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N
GT12	other rural	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N
GT13	other rural	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
GT14	other rural	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
GT15	other rural	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N/A	N
GT16	other rural	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N/A	N
GT17	other rural	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N
GT18	other rural	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N
GT19	other rural	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N
GT20	other rural	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N
GT21	other rural	GT21	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

# **APPENDIX H – LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**







## Policy IP2: Lichfield Canal

	1 To promote biodiversity protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats				2 To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/ geological assets, and landscape character of the district							3 To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting				4 Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrated effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas, and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character					5 Maximise the use of previously developed land/ buildings and the efficient use of land				6 Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of transport and increased opportunities for non-car travel				7 To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change				8 To minimise waste and increase the reuse and recycling of waste materials				9 Seek and improve air, soil and water quality				10 To reduce and manage flood risk				11 To provide affordable affordable homes that meet local need				12 Improve services and access to services to produce good he				13 To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime				14 Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth				15 To enhance the vitality and viability of existing, city, town and village centres within the District				16 Increase participation and improve access to education, skills-based training, knowledge and information, and lifelong learning			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4																
Policy Absent	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N															
Existing Policy Emp 11	N	++	N	++	-	N	+	?	N	++	N	N	+	N	++	+	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N															
Alternative if suggested	N	++	N	++	-	N	+	?	N	++	N	N	+	N	++	+	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N															
Proposed Policy IP2	N	++	N	++	-	N	+	?	N	++	N	N	+	N	++	+	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N															
Amended Proposed Policy IP2	+	++	N	++	-?	N	+	?	N	++	N	N	+	N	++	+	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N															

## Likely Significant Effects

- The Existing, Proposed and Alternative Policy options all deliver Significant Positive impacts on SA Objective 1, 3 and 12.
- The Existing, Proposed and Alternative Policy options all deliver Significant Negative impacts in terms of loss of agricultural land, this negative effect is also recognised as a key negative cumulative effect for the LPA. Mitigation to address loss at a detailed design stage will be required.
- In regard to the Significantly Negative effect on SA5 Question 1 loss of land not previously developed. This may be more difficult to mitigate against due to the route of the Canal being in large part historic.





## Policy EMP1: Employment Areas &amp; Allocations

	1 To promote biodiversity protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats				2 To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/ geological assets, and landscape character of the district							3 To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting				4 Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrated effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas, and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character					5 Maximise the use of previously developed land/ buildings and the efficient use of land				6 Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of transport and increased opportunities for non-car travel			7 To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change			8 To minimise waste and increase the reuse and recycling of waste materials			9 Seek and improve air, soil and water quality				10 To reduce and manage flood risk		11 To provide affordable affordable homes that meet local need				12 Improve services and access to services to produce good he			13 To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime		14 Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth				15 To enhance the vitality and viability of existing, city, town and village centres within the District			16 Increase participation and improve access to education, skills-based training, knowledge and information, and lifelong learning	
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2											
Policy Absent	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N								
Existing Policy EMP2, L9, L10, B2	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N								
Alternative if suggested	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N								
Proposed Policy EMP1	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N								
Main Modification Policy EMP1	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N								

## Likely significant effects

- Significant positive effects will be generated relating to economic benefits. There is like difference between existing and proposed policy options, the amended options enables the scope of the policy to reflect the fact that previously identified sites have been implemented. The Major Modified Policy does not change this position.
- The Major Modified Policy records two single positive scores against Sustainability Objective 5, which recognises the flexibility in the policy to now support a broader use class range which in turn has be potential to ensure that land is in currently use, reducing the risk of land becoming derelict, degraded or underused.
- The Major Modified Policy also records single positives scores against Sustainability Objective 11 which relates to the provision of homes. The last paragraph of the policy enables flexible land use which could led to the provision of homes.
- The policy records an uncertain score against Sustainability Objective 6 all three Site Specific Questions, this is due the allocated employment sites scoring significantly different within the site assessment matrix which can be viewed in Appendix E. Further information on the impact of the allocated sites is within Appendix F Allocated Sites Summary Impact. To clarify the policy text on its own would not generate an effect.











## Policy BE2: Heritage Assets Policy Lichfield

	1 To promote biodiversity protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats				2 To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/ geological assets, and landscape character of the district							3 To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting				4 Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrated effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas, and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character					5 Maximise the use of previously developed land/ buildings and the efficient use of land				6 Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of transport and increased opportunities for non-car travel				7 To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change				8 To minimise waste and increase the reuse and recycling of waste materials				9 Seek and improve air, soil and water quality				10 To reduce and manage flood risk				11 To provide affordable affordable homes that meet local need				12 Improve services and access to services to produce good he				13 To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime				14 Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth				15 To enhance the vitality and viability of existing, city, town and village centres within the District				16 Increase participation and improve access to education, skills-based training, knowledge and information, and lifelong learning			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2																		
Policy Absent	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N																	
Existing Policy C2	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N																	
Alternative if suggested	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N																	
Proposed Policy BE2	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N																	
Amended Proposed Policy BE2	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N																	

## Likely Significant Effects:

- The Proposed Policy in terms of SA Objective 2 Site Question 7 and SA Objective 3 Site Specific Question 1 scores a Significant Positive effect compared to Significant Negative effect score against the Existing Policy. This can be seen as a positive mitigating impact.
- In terms of SA Objective 3 site specific question 3 a backward shift in effect has been recorded. The Existing policy scores Significantly Positive and the Proposed Policy a Minor Negative. This backward shift will be mitigated for through wider policy context offered within the Local Plan Strategy and adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

## Policy Lichfield 3: Lichfield Economy

	1 To promote biodiversity protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats				2 To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/ geological assets, and landscape character of the district							3 To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting				4 Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrated effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas, and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character					5 Maximise the use of previously developed land/ buildings and the efficient use of land				6 Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of transport and increased opportunities for non-car travel				7 To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change				8 To minimise waste and increase the reuse and recycling of waste materials				9 Seek and improve air, soil and water quality				10 To reduce and manage flood risk				11 To provide affordable affordable homes that meet local need				12 Improve services and access to services to produce good he				13 To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime				14 Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth				15 To enhance the vitality and viability of existing, city, town and village centres within the District				16 Increase participation and improve access to education, skills-based training, knowledge and information, and lifelong learning			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2																				
Policy Absent	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N																		
Existing Policy Lichfield 3	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N																		
Alternative if suggested	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N																		
Proposed Policy Lichfield 3	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N																		

## Likely Significant Effects:

- The Existing and Proposed policy has the ability to delivery positive effects.
- The Proposed Policy has the ability to delivery Minor positive effects in relation to prosperity and economic growth.

## Policy Burntwood 3: Burntwood Economy

	1 To promote biodiversity protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats				2 To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/ geological assets, and landscape character of the district							3 To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting				4 Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrated effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas, and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character					5 Maximise the use of previously developed land/ buildings and the efficient use of land				6 Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of transport and increased opportunities for non-car travel				7 To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change			8 To minimise waste and increase the reuse and recycling of waste materials			9 Seek and improve air, soil and water quality				10 To reduce and manage flood risk		11 To provide affordable affordable homes that meet local need				12 Improve services and access to services to produce good he			13 To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime		14 Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth				15 To enhance the vitality and viability of existing, city, town and village centres within the District			16 Increase participation and improve access to education, skills-based training, knowledge and information, and lifelong learning	
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	1	2													
Policy Absent	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N										
Existing Policy Burntwood 3	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	++	N	N	+				N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N										
Alternative if suggested	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N									
Proposed Policy Burntwood 3	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	++	N	N	+				N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N									

## Likely Significant Effects:

- The Existing and Proposed policy has the ability to deliver positive effects.
- The Proposed Policy has the ability to delivery Minor positive effects in relation to prosperity and economic growth.

[illegible]

- The Local Plan Review policy has the ability to lead to an impact on all of the identified Sustainability Objectives and to a lesser degree the Site Specific Questions. This impact is more likely when the Sustainability Objective correlates directly to the bullet pointed requirements of the policy, most notably housing and employment need. However clearly uncertainty is very much evident hence “?” score recorded for all Objectives.
- What impact whether that be negative or positive that the review requirement of the policy will create is currently unknown and will only become apparent once a Sustainability Impact Assessment has been undertaken on the content of policies within the Review document.
- It is therefore appropriate to also conclude that this policy will equally have no impact on the mitigation measures proposed within this SA as these too will fall within any future SA.
- The impact of this policy of the Duration Section of the SA has been noted and this detail is contained within the Duration Section of the SA report.



# **APPENDIX I – LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

## Introduction

Sustainability Appraisal is a statutory requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It is designed to ensure that the plan preparation process maximises the contribution that a plan makes to sustainable development and minimises any potential adverse impacts. The SA process involves appraising the likely social, environmental and economic effects of the policies and proposals within a plan from the outset of its development.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is also a statutory assessment process, required under the SEA Directive, transposed in the UK by the SEA Regulations (Statutory Instrument 2004, No 1633). The SEA Regulations require the formal assessment of plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment and which set the framework for future consent of projects requiring Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The purpose of SEA, as defined in Article 1 of the SEA Directive is *‘to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans....with a view to promoting sustainable development’*.

SEA and SA are separate processes but have similar aims and objectives. Simply put, SEA focuses on the likely environmental effects of a plan whilst SA includes a wider range of considerations, extending to social and economic impacts. National Planning Practice Guidance shows how it is possible to satisfy both requirements by undertaking a joint SA/SEA process, and to present an SA report that incorporates the requirements of the SEA Regulations. The SA/SEA of Lichfield District Council’s Local Plan Allocation has been developed using this integrated approach and throughout this report the abbreviation ‘SA’ should therefore be taken to refer to ‘SA incorporating the requirements of SEA’.

## Assumptions and Assessment

Every Local Plan Allocation proposed site along with reasonable alternatives have been assessed as part of the SA. In addition every revised policy has been assessed through the SA process. **For the purposes of Cabinet the SA will contain a detailed report and a matrix of site and policy assessments. At this point this stands at over a 1000 pages. As the SA assessment is a technical process, for the purposes of Leadership the relevant objectives and assumptions have been provided.** There are a number of SA indicators which assumptions have been attached before the SA assessment process was completed. These assumptions have been catalogued.

SA Objectives	Assumptions
<p>1. To promote biodiversity protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats.</p>	<p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p>Individual site assessment were completed by Lichfield District Council's Ecology Officer (BSc (hon) and MBIol (hon), retains EPS licences and has over 10 years of practical experience).</p> <p>Sites were assessed using all available ecological data, this was provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Lichfield District Local Development Framework Ecological Study</li> <li>• The Staffordshire Ecological Record</li> <li>• Any and all recent Ecological Assessments relevant to the site which had previously been submitted to the LPA as part of a prior planning application.</li> <li>• 2017 Arial photographs.</li> <li>• The Ecology Officers previous knowledge of the site (if a site visit had previously been conducted as part of a prior planning application).</li> </ul> <p>If, after scrutinising all available information, a reasonable assessment of the sites ecological value could not be determined with any assurance then a site visit/re-visit was conducted by the Ecology Officer using existing highways and public rights of way.</p> <p>For reference follow text offers a summary of requirements during the Decision –taking phase of delivering sustainable development in regard to biodiversity protected species and their habitats.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where a protected/priority species is found to be present the developer would adhere to the mitigation hierarchy (as per para 118 of NPPF 2012).</li> <li>• All developments, prior to approval of application, would need to demonstrate to the LPA that the proposed works are unlikely to negatively impact upon protected or priority species (i.e. those defined under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended 2010), The Conservation of Natural Habitats Regulations (Habitat Regs.) 1994 (as amended 2010), The Protection of Badgers Act 1992 or listed under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006).</li> <li>• All development would conform to the requirements of para 118 of NPPF 2012 (no net-loss)</li> </ul>



SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All developments would demonstrate compliance with policy NR3 of LDC Local plan, achieving a net gain for protected/priority species.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where priority habitat or local conservation site (SBI, BAS) were found to be negatively affected by the development proposed (direct or indirect; during either construction or operation) the developer would adhere to the mitigation hierarchy (as per para 118 of NPPF 2012).</li> <li>• All developments, prior to approval of application, would need to demonstrate to the LPA that the proposed works are unlikely to negatively impact upon protected or priority habitats (i.e. those defined under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended 2010), The Conservation of Natural Habitats Regulations (Habitat Regs.) 1994 (as amended 2010), listed under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006), or noted within the LDC Biodiversity and Development SPD.</li> <li>• All development would conform to the requirements of para 118 of NPPF 2012 (no net-loss)</li> <li>• All developments would demonstrate compliance with policy NR3 of LDC Local plan, and para 6.33 of Biodiversity and Development SPD achieving a measurable net gain of no less than 20% above the biodiversity unit value of habitats to be lost.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All development within agreed zones of impact (CC SAC 15km, and RM SAC water catchment zone) will adhere to either CC SAC mitigation guidance or RM SAC Developer contribution scheme, as appropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased ecological will be sought to be incorporated in all developments in line with the Lawton Principle (Biodiversity 2020) &amp; LDC local plan policy's NR3 and NR6</li> </ul>
2. To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural	<p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1</b></p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
<p>archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of the District.</p>	<p>Landscapes that have been characterised as Active Landscape Conservation, Landscape Maintenance, and Landscape Enhancement are seen to have potentially high sensitivity to development. Landscapes that have been characterised as Landscape Restoration and Innovative Landscape Regeneration are seen to have a potentially moderate sensitivity to development. Landscapes that are classed as urban or have no recognised landscape character are seen to have a potentially low sensitivity to development as defined by the Staffordshire County Council Landscape Character Types (2001). In addition where development is within or close to designated landscapes negative effects could result.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions have been made in relation to Site Specific Question 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are entirely or mainly in Active Landscape Conservation, Landscape Maintenance and Landscape Enhancement are likely to have a significant negative effect (--)</li> <li>• Sites that are entirely or mainly in Landscape Restoration and Innovation Landscape Regeneration are likely to have a minor negative effect (-)</li> <li>• Site that are entirely or mainly in and urban or non-classified Landscape Character Area are likely to have a neutral (N) effect.</li> </ul> <p>In addition where development is within or close to designated landscapes negative effects could result.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are within or in close proximity to Cannock Chase AONB are likely to have a significant negative effect (--)</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2</b></p> <p>Development sites that are in or within close proximity to sites of geological importance could potential have an impact on those features, however uncertainly existing, as appropriate mitigation may avoid adverse effects and could have potential benefits.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions have been made in relation to Site Specific Question 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are entirely or mainly in within or in close proximity to a regionally important geological site are likely to have a significant negative effect (--?)</li> <li>• All other sites will be score neutral (N).</li> </ul>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p><b>Site Specific Question 3</b></p> <p>The effect of new development on improving and promoting landscape connectivity will depend largely on the sites detailed design, which is not yet known.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions have been made in relation to Site Specific Question 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sites will be scored neutral effect (N).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 4</b></p> <p>The location of development sites can influence the efficient use of minerals as development in Mineral Safeguarding Areas as identified in the adopted Staffordshire Minerals Local Plan may sterilise mineral resources and restrict the availability of resources in the District.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in related to Site Specific Question 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where sites fall entirely or mainly in within a Mineral Safeguarding area will be scored as having a significant negative effect (--)</li> <li>• Sites outside a Mineral Safeguarding area will be scored as having a neutral effect (N).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 5</b></p> <p>Potential exists for developed within the designated areas through contributions and/or design features to have a positive effect in identified objectives of the National Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in related to Site Specific Question 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where sites fall entirely or partial within the National Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative a potential minor positive effect with uncertainty (+?).</li> <li>• Sites outside the National Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative will be scored as have a neutral effect (N).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 6</b></p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>Development sites that are in or within close proximity to a historic landscape feature could potential have an impact on those features, however uncertainly exists, as appropriate mitigation may avoid adverse effects and could have potential benefits.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in related to Site Specific Question 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are entirely or mainly in within a historic landscape feature have the potential to result in a significant negative effect (--).</li> <li>• Sites that are adjacent to or in close proximity to a historic landscape feature have the potential to result in a minor negative effect (-).</li> <li>• All other sites will be score neutral (N).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 7</b></p> <p>Development sites that are in or within close proximity to sites of archaeological importance could potential have an impact on those features, as appropriate mitigation may avoid adverse effects and could have potential benefits.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions have been made in relation to Site Specific Question 7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are entirely or mainly within sites of archaeological importance are likely to a have a significant negative effect (--) in addition sites in close proximity to a site of archaeological importance are likely to have a negative effect with uncertainty (-). It may be possible that a site in close proximity is view to have a significant effect (--) due to the nature of the archaeological site in question.</li> <li>• All other sites will be score neutral (N).</li> </ul>
<p>3. To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting.</p>	<p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p>The NPPF para 132 states that the ‘significance of a heritage asset can be harmed or lots through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting’. Development could also enable the enhancement of an asset preserving or revealing importance elements.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1</b></p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 1.</p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where sites have the potential to significantly enhance a listed building or its setting for example by repairing it, removing inappropriate development within its setting they will be scored as having a significant positive effect (++).</li> <li>Where sites have the potential to enhance a locally listed building or its setting or they have the potential to make a modest improvement to a listed building or its setting they will be scored as having a minor positive effect (+).</li> <li>Where sites are not considered to be within the setting of a listed or locally listed building they will be scored as having a Neutral (N).</li> <li>Where a site has the potential to harm a locally listed building or its setting or would cause modest harm to a Grade II listed building or its setting but this would be minor harm and/or could be mitigated this will be scored as having a minor negative (-).</li> <li>Where a site, however developed, would cause any harm to a Grade I or II* listed building or its setting or harm to a Grade II listed building or its setting that could not be mitigated it will be scored as having a significant negative effect (--).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2</b></p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where sites have the potential to significantly improve and broaden access to, and understanding of, local heritage, historic sites, areas and buildings they will be scored as having a significant positive effect (++)</li> <li>Where sites have the potential to improve and broaden access to, and understanding of, local heritage, historic sites, areas and buildings they will be scored as having a minor positive effect (+).</li> <li>Where sites are not considered to be near to any heritage assets they will be scored as having a neutral (N).</li> <li>Where a site has the potential to harm access to, and understanding of, local heritage, historic sites, areas and buildings or their settings but this would be minor harm and/or could be mitigated this will be scored as having a minor negative effect (-).</li> <li>Where a site, however development would harm access to, and understanding of, local heritage, historic sites, areas and buildings or their settings and no mitigation is likely to be possible this will be scored as having a significant negative effect (--).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 3</b></p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where sites have the potential to enhance a conservation area, for example where the area is highlighted as an area for improvement in the adopted conservation area appraisal, they will be scored as having a significant positive effect (++).</li> <li>Where sites have the potential to preserve the conservation area they will be scored as having a minor positive effect (+).</li> <li>Where sites are not considered to be within the setting of a conservation area they will be scored as having a significant positive effect (N).</li> <li>Where a site has the potential to harm the conservation area or its setting but this would be minor harm and/or could be mitigated this will be scored as having a minor negative effect (-).</li> <li>Sites which however development would cause harm to a conservation area or its setting will be scored as having a significant negative effect (--).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 4</b></p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where sites have the potential to bring a listed building back into active use they will be scored as having a significant positive effect (++).</li> <li>Where sites have the potential to bring a locally listed building or other non-designated heritage asset back into active use they will be scored as having a minor positive effect (+).</li> <li>Where sites do not contain any designated or non-designated heritage assets they will be scored as having a neutral (N).</li> <li>Where a site has the potential to harm a non-designated heritage asset so that it is less likely to be able to be brought back into use this will be scored as having a minor negative effect (-).</li> <li>Where a site, has the potential to harm a designated heritage asset so that it is less likely to be able to be brought back into use this will be scored as having a significant negative effect (--).</li> </ul>
4. Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrated effectively with one another, respect	<p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1</b></p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
<p>significant views and vistas, and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character.</p>	<p>The effects of new development on Site Specific Question 1 will depend largely on its design, which is not yet known, therefore all effects will be to some extent uncertain at this stage. Therefore the assumption will be made that all sites have the potential to achieve a high quality and sustainable design sensitive to the locality but this depends wholly on the specific attribute of a particular scheme.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions have been made in relation to Site Specific Question 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sites will be scored neutral effect (N).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2</b></p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where sites have the potential to significantly improve locally distinctive settlement and townscape character they will be scored as having a significantly positive effect (++)</li> <li>• Where sites have the potential to improve locally distinctive settlement and townscape character setting they will be scored as having a minor positive effect (+).</li> <li>• Where sites have the potential to preserve locally distinctive settlement and townscape character they will be scored as having a neutral effect (N).</li> <li>• Where a site has the potential to harm locally distinctive settlement and townscape character but this harm would be minimal and/or could be mitigated this will be scored as having a minor negative effect (-).</li> <li>• Where a site, however developed, harm locally distinctive settlement and townscape character that could not be mitigated it will be scored as having a significantly minor effect (--).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 3</b></p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where sites have the potential to significantly improve historic views and valuable skylines of settlements they will be scored as having a significant positive effect (++)</li> <li>• Where sites have the potential to improve historic views and valuable skylines of settlements setting they will be scored as having a minor positive effect (+).</li> <li>• Where sites will have no impact on historic views and valuable skylines of settlements they will be scored as having a neutral effect (N).</li> </ul>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where a site has the potential to harm historic views and valuable skylines of settlements but this harm would be minimal and/or could be mitigated this will be scored as having a minor negative effect (-).</li> <li>Where a site, however developed, harm historic views and valuable skylines of settlements that could not be mitigated it will be scored as having a significant negative effect (--).</li> </ul> <p><b>Residential and Gypsy and Traveller Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 4</b></p> <p>Connections and the access to integrated infrastructure (physical, green and social/community) is seen as important to the formation of sustainable communities.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that are within or have a boundary with a Lichfield or Burntwood will be scored as having a significant positive effect (++).</li> <li>Sites that are within or have a boundary with Alrewas, Armitage with Handscare, Fazeley, Fradley, Shenstone and Whittington (Key Rural Settlements) will be scored as having a minor positive effect (+).</li> <li>Sites that are have a boundary with Rugeley and Tamworth (Neighbouring Town) will be scored as having a minor positive effect (+).</li> <li>Sites that are within or have a boundary with those settlements identified as Other Rural (Clifton Campville, Colton, Drayton Bassett, Edingale, Elford, Hamstall Ridware, Harlaston, Hill Ridware, Hopwas, Kings Bromley, Little Aston, Longdon, Stonnall, Upper Longdon, Wigginton) will be scored as having a minor negative effect (-).</li> <li>Sites that are isolated and are located away from any settlement boundary will be scored as having a significant negative effect (--).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 5</b></p> <p>Site Specific Question 5 relates directly to Site Specific Question 5 (above) assumptions and scoring has been linked to enable an informed response. It should also be noted that assess to a number of clearly identified services features within Sustainability Objective 6 Site Specific Question 3.</p>



SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those sites identified as being within or having a boundary with an identified settlement identified within Site Specific Question 4 with score has having a minor positive effect (+).</li> <li>All other sites will have a significant negative effect (--).</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 4</b></p> <p>The settlement hierarchy articulated through site specific Question 4 is not relevant to employment sites.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A neutral (N) score will be recorded.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 5</b></p> <p>Whilst it is possible that employees may choose to access services close to their place of employment during the working day a direct relationship between the two is considered at this point the SA to be neutral. It should be noted that accessibility is considered directly as part of SA Objective 6 and furthermore SA Objective 15 measures potential economic benefits.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A neutral (N) score will be recorded.</li> </ul>
<p>5. Maximise the use of previously developed land/buildings and the efficient use of land.</p>	<p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1</b></p> <p>Development on brownfield land represents more efficient use of land in comparison to the development of greenfield sites.</p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are mainly or entirely on brownfield land will be scored as having a significant positive effect (++)</li> <li>• Sites that are partly greenfield but include an element of previously developed land will be scored as having a minor negative effect (-)</li> <li>• Sites that are mainly or entirely on greenfield land will be scored as having a significant negative effect (--).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2</b></p> <p>Higher density development with a number of integrated uses provides an efficient use of existing land resource. Whilst the great majority of sites have the natural ability to deliver high density development this can be restricted at detailed design stage when the surrounding context and other individual site specific elements are established.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sites will be scored as having a neutral (N) effect.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 3</b></p> <p>The reuse of existing buildings is an efficient use of existing resources however the extent that new development is able to incorporate existing site infrastructure will only become apparent at detailed design stage.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that have existing buildings included within them will be scored as having a minor positive effect with uncertainty (+?)</li> <li>• Site that do not have buildings included within them will be scored as having a neutral effect (N).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 4</b></p> <p>Development on derelict, degraded and underused land represents an efficient use of land.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 4.</p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that have an element of derelict, degraded and underused land within them will be scored as having a significant positive effect (++).</li> <li>All other sites will be scored as having a neutral effect (N).</li> </ul>
<p>6. Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of transport and increased opportunities for non-car travel.</p>	<p><b>All types of site options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1</b></p> <p>The potential for new residents/ employees/ visitors to use sustainable modes of travel (walking, cycling, bus and rail) when travelling to and from the site has been assessed using TRACC accessibility planning software. Access to the following services has been calculated for Lichfield District and overlaid with the site boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to an hourly or better bus service within a 350m walk</li> <li>Access to a rail station within a 30 minute walk</li> <li>Access to a primary school within a 30 minute walk</li> <li>Access to a GP surgery within a 30 minute walk</li> <li>Access to employment within a 20 minute cycle ride</li> </ul> <p>For walking and cycling to be safe and attractive options the provision of footpaths for pedestrians and safe cycle facilities are required between the site and local services and facilities or residential areas. Safe cycle facilities include designated cycle routes, advisory cycle routes as defined in the Borough cycle map and local residential streets where traffic levels are low.</p> <p>Accessibility assessments include any commitments made through planning obligations or Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029. These include the provision of Lichfield Southern Bypass and associated walk and cycle infrastructure and provision of three primary schools within SDLs (see Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029 Policies Maps, Lichfield Inset 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To have a significant positive (++) effect a site would have access by rail, bus, walk and cycle within the above parameters.</li> <li>To have a minor positive (+) effect a site would have access by walk and bus within the above parameters.</li> </ul>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To have a mixed and uncertain (+?) or (-?) effect a site would have access by either walk or bus within the above parameters.</li> <li>• To have a minor negative (-) effect a site would have access by neither walk nor bus within the above parameters.</li> <li>• To have a significant negative (-) effect a site would not have access by any of the four sustainable modes within the above parameters.</li> </ul> <p><b>Residential and Employment Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2</b></p> <p>Areas with potential sensitivities to increases in traffic flow include 11 key junctions in Lichfield, of which 7 have improvements planned, (see Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029 Policies Maps, Lichfield Inset 1), Lichfield's historic core, 5 Way Island and the Gungate Corridor and Ventura Park in Tamworth. The likely impact on traffic sensitive areas has been considered in terms of the expected AM peak (0800-0900) and PM peak (1700-1800) traffic generations for each site and the likelihood that the distribution of trips will impact on traffic sensitive areas.</p> <p>The traffic impact of sites with planning consent have been considered through the planning process and any impacts on traffic sensitive areas are able to be mitigated through the discharge of associated planning obligations. These sites have been assessed as a minor positive (+) effect.</p> <p>It has been assumed that sites of less than 25 dwellings are likely to have no impact on traffic sensitive areas due to the small number of vehicle trips the generate within the peak periods. This is the best outcome in traffic terms for a site and is considered a significant positive (++) effect.</p> <p>In the absence of transport evidence there is uncertainty as to the effect on traffic sensitive of sites larger than 25 dwellings, retail sites or employment sites. To acknowledge this uncertainty the assessment includes an unknown (?) effect element. For very large sites such as site 1031 to the East of Rugeley an assessment of the likely impact of traffic cannot be made in the absence of transport evidence and the site has been assessed as unknown (?) effect.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 3</b></p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>The potential for sites to provide additional or extended bus services is in part related to the size of site. Public transport contributions would usually be sought from sites in excess of 50 dwellings where the site does not currently benefit from satisfactory bus service provision. Sites that have access to an hourly or better bus service within 350m using a safe walking route may not be required to develop bus networks.</p> <p>The potential for sites to provide additional walk and cycle infrastructure has been considered in relation to the site boundary. It is not possible through a strategic assessment to determine the likely delivery of walk and cycle infrastructure on land outside of the site boundary. Where this would be required to join the site to existing walk and cycle networks then the assessment score includes an unknown (?) effect.</p> <p>This assessment considers that sites meeting the aforementioned criteria would not need to further develop local bus networks and have therefore been scored as Neutral response in relation to criterion (N).</p> <p>Where a site does not meet the bus access criteria and is below 50 dwellings in size it has been considered an unlikely to be able to develop local bus networks and has a minor negative (-) effect.</p> <p>To provide clarity to rail services are viewed in terms of new services, amended services frequencies and or the provision of additional rail stations.</p> <p><b>Gypsy and Traveller Site Options</b></p> <p>There are a number of difference in relation to Gypsy and Traveller Site Options</p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2</b></p> <p>In the absence to site yields and in view that Gypsy and Travellers do not generally produce the same trip rates as 'bricks and mortar' residential areas the impact on traffic sensitive areas is uncertain.</p> <p>Therefore in relation to Site Specific Question 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sites will be scored as having an uncertain effect (?).</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 3</b></p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>In the absence of yields and in view of the end use of the site an assessment would take place at detailed design stage all sites will be scored as having a neutral effect.</p> <p>Therefore in relation to Site Specific Question 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All sites will be scored as having a Neutral effect (N).</li> </ul>
<p>7. To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change.</p>	<p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1, 2, and 3</b></p> <p>The effect on new development on the Sustainability Objective will depend to a large extent on options taken at detailed design.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Questions 1, 2 and 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All sites that are considered to have a Neutral (N) effect.</li> </ul>
<p>8. To minimise waste and increase the reuse and recycling of waste materials.</p>	<p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1</b></p> <p>This will depend largely on behaviour patterns combined with the detailed design of the development.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All sites that are considered to have a Neutral (N) effect.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2 and 3</b></p> <p>It is possible that previously developed land may offer opportunities for the reuse of materials and buildings as part of the development.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 2 and 3.</p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sites that are mainly or entirely on brownfield land will have a minor positive effect (+)</li> <li>• All other sites will record a Neutral (N) effect.</li> </ul>
<p>9. Seek to improve air, soil and water quality.</p>	<p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1</b></p> <p>The effects of development on water quality will depend on the capacity of the relevant sewage treatment works to accommodate the impact of the new development, the level/extent of the effect cannot be assessed at this point. However, which water Source Protection Zone the site falls within can be established and a level of effect assumed.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Specific Question 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are within Source Protection Zone 1 could have a significant negative (--) effect on water quality.</li> <li>• Sites that are within Source Protection Zone 2 or 3 could have a minor negative (-) effect on water quality.</li> <li>• Sites that are not within a Source Protection Zone are likely to have a neutral (N) effect on water quality.</li> </ul> <p>The River Mease is designated as a Special Area of Conservation under the Habitats Regulations part of which falls within Lichfield District.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2</b></p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those sites that are located partly or wholly within the catchment of the River Mease SAC could have a significant negative (--) effect in water quality.</li> <li>• All other sites will record a Neutral (N) effect.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 3</b></p> <p>Within Lichfield District there are two Air Quality Management Zone designated (A5 Muckley Corner and A38 Wall Island to Alrewas). Site that are within one of the Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) in the District could increase levels of air pollution in those areas as a result of increase vehicle traffic.</p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation Site Specific Question 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are partly or wholly in an Air Quality Management Area are likely to have a significant negative (--) effect on air quality.</li> <li>• Sites that are not in an Air Quality Management Area are likely to have a neutral (N) effect on air quality.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 4</b></p> <p>The effect of development on soil will depend on two elements, the first the quality of agricultural land and the second if the site is located on land that has been previously developed.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are wholly or partly on greenfield land which is classed as being Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3 agricultural quality land could have a significant negative (--) effect on soils.</li> <li>• Sites that are wholly or partly on greenfield land which are classed as being Grade 4, Grade 5 or urban land would have a minor negative (-) effect on soils.</li> <li>• Sites that are mainly or entirely on brownfield land would have a minor positive (+) effect.</li> </ul>
10. To reduce and manage flood risk.	<p>National Planning Guidance identifies which types of land uses are considered to appropriate in Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b. Where site options are located in areas of high flood risk, it could increase the risk of flooding in those areas particularly if the site has not previously been developed. No assumptions have been made that relate to existing mitigation that may or may not exist on sites that are brownfield.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1.</b></p> <p><b>Residential Site Options</b></p> <p>National Planning Practice guidance identifies residential properties as a 'more vulnerable use', which is suitable in areas of flood zone 1 and 2, but would require an exception test in flood zone 3a, and is unsuitable in flood zone 3b.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are entirely or mainly on greenfield land that are within flood zones 3 are likely to have a significant negative (--) effect.</li> </ul>



SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are entirely or mainly on greenfield outside of flood zone 3 are likely to have a minor negative (-) effect.</li> <li>• Sites that are entirely or mainly on brownfield within flood zones 3 are likely to have a minor negative (--) effect.</li> <li>• Sites that are on brownfield land outside of flood zones 3 are likely to have a Neutral (N) effect.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gypsy and Traveller Site Options</b></p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance identifies caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use as a 'highly vulnerable use', which is suitable in areas of flood zone 1 but require an exception test in flood zone 2 and is unsuitable in flood zones 3a and 3b.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are entirely or mainly with flood zones 2 or 3 are likely to have a significant negative (--) effect.</li> <li>• Sites that are on greenfield land outside of flood zones 2 and 3 are likely to have a minor negative (-) effect</li> <li>• Sites that are on brownfield land within flood zones 2 and 3 are likely to have a minor negative (-) effect.</li> <li>• Sites that are on brownfield land outside flood zones 2 and 3 area likely to have a Neutral (N).</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment and Retail Site Options</b></p> <p>National Planning Guidance identifies buildings used for shops, as well as offices and general industry, as 'less vulnerable uses', which are suitable in areas of flood zone 1, 2 and 3a but are unsuitable in flood zone 3b.</p> <p>Lichfield Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, states that all areas within Flood Zone 3 should be considered as Flood Zone 3b unless, or until, appropriate assessment shows to the satisfactions of the EA that the area falls within Flood Zone 3a. Therefore in areas where the functional floodplain has not been defined and no suitable surrogate data is available the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) has been defined as the extent of Flood Zone 3a.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions have been made in relation to Site Specific Question 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are entirely or mainly on greenfield land that is within flood zone 3 are likely to have a significant negative (--) effect.</li> <li>• Sites that are either entirely or mainly in greenfield outside of flood zone 3, or that are entirely or mainly in brownfield within flood zone 3 are likely to have a minor negative (-) effect.</li> <li>• Sites that are on brownfield land outside of flood zone 3b are likely to have a Neutral (N) effect.</li> </ul>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2.</b></p> <p>The effect of new development on flood management will depend on the extent to which SuDs or other flood elevation methods are incorporated within the development. It is however difficult to assume the level of effect such design elements (if incorporated) will have at this stage.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An uncertain effect (?) score will be recorded on all types of site options</li> </ul>
<p>11. To provide affordable homes that meet local need.</p>	<p><b>Employment Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1, 2,3</b></p> <p>In relation to Site Specific Questions 1, 2, and 3 the location of employment sites are not considered likely to have an effect on this objective.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 1,2 and 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A neutral effect (N) score will be recorded.</li> </ul> <p><b>Residential Site Options and Gypsy and Traveller Site options</b></p> <p>All sites of this development type will to some extent have a positive effect on this objective.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1</b></p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A significant positive (++) effect will be recorded against Site Specific Question 1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2 and 3</b></p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>In relation to Site Specific Questions 2 and 3 housing development consisting of 11 homes or more are required to make provision for affordable housing.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 2 and 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites with capacity for more than 11 homes will have a significant positive (++) effect</li> <li>• Sites with capacity for less than 11 homes will have a positive (N) effect.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gypsy and Traveller Site options Site Specific Question 4</b></p> <p>All sites of this type will address identified local need and are therefore expected to have a positive effect on Site Specific Question 4 of this objective.</p> <p>The following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sites are considered to have a significant positive (++) effect.</li> </ul> <p><b>Residential Site Options and Employment Site Options Site Specific Question 4</b></p> <p>Site Specific Question 4 relates directly to the provision of Gypsy and Traveller need therefore development of any other type would not have an effect on Site Specific Question 4.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A neutral effect (N) score will be recorded against Site Specific Question 4.</li> </ul>
<p>12. To improve services and access to services to produce good health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.</p>	<p><b>Residential Site Options and Employment Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1.</b></p> <p>In terms of Site Specific Question 1, whilst it is possible that employees may choose to access health care facilities close to their place of work it is assumed that any generated need and required response will focus on residential growth points.</p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>The District Council's Community Infrastructure (CIL) Levy Regulation 123 listed states that funds may be used where evidence is provided that there is no local capacity and expansion of services is required to support growth across the district. Therefore development that falls within and identified use on the adopted Schedule of Rates will result in a possible positive effect, however the extent is uncertain.</p> <p>Therefore in relation to Site Specific Question 1 the following assumptions will be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minor positive effect (+?) score will be recorded against Site Specific Questions 1.</li> </ul> <p>We are aware that there exists a number of locations within the District where Health Care need has been identified in advance of the Site Allocations document and partnership work is currently underway to develop and implement responses in line with the NHS Transformation Programme. If residential Site Allocations fall within these locations a note will be added to the comments section of the Sustainability Assessment.</p> <p><b>Gypsy and Traveller site options</b></p> <p>Development associated with the development of sites to accommodate Gypsy and Traveller need would not fall within an identified use on the adopted Schedule of Rates. As such CIL would not apply and a possible positive effect would not result.</p> <p>Therefore in relation to Site Specific Question 1 the following assumptions will be made</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A neutral effect (N) score will be recorded.</li> </ul> <p><b>Residential Site Options and Gypsy and Traveller site options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2</b></p> <p>Sites that are within walking distance (480m, Policy HSC1 Lichfield District Council Local Plan Strategy) of existing open spaces (including play, amenity green space) may provide opportunities for people to improve their health and wellbeing.</p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>Therefore in relation to Site Specific Question 2 the following assumptions will be made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are within 480m of more than one area of open space will have a significant positive (++) affect.</li> <li>• Sites that are within 480m of one area of open space will have a minor positive (+) affect.</li> <li>• Sites that are not within 480m of an area of open spaces will have a Neutral (N) affect.</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment Site options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2</b></p> <p>Whilst it is possible that employees may choose to access green space close to their place of employment during the working day the location of employment sites and retail sites options are not considered likely to have an effect on Site Specific Questions 2 of this objective which relates directly to accessibility of greenspace.</p> <p>The following assumption will be made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A neutral effect (N) score will be recorded against Site Specific Questions</li> </ul> <p><b>Residential and Employment Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 3.</b></p> <p>Improvements to open space provision, including play provision for key sites, in line with the Open Space Assessment are identified as infrastructure to be funded in whole or in part by CIL. Therefore development that falls within and identified use on the adopted Schedule of Rates will result in a possible positive effect, however the extent is uncertain.</p> <p>Development of a site that includes an existing area of open space could result in the loss of that asset depending on whether its retention is incorporated within the detailed design. Large-scale new housing site allocations could offer the opportunity for the creation of accessible open space provision within the development site. It is uncertain as it cannot be known until detailed design stage whether the open space would be incorporated or lost through development.</p> <p>Therefore in relation to Site Specific Question 3 the following assumptions will be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that include an existing area/s of open space could have minor negative (-?) effect.</li> </ul>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All other sites will score a minor positive effect (+?) score will be recorded against Site Specific Questions 3.</li> </ul> <p><b>Gypsy and Traveller Site Options</b></p> <p>Development associated with the development of sites to accommodate Gypsy and Traveller need would not fall within an identified use on the adopted Schedule of Rates. As such CIL would not apply and a possible positive effect would not result.</p> <p>Therefore in relation to Site Specific Question 3 the following assumptions will be made</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A neutral effect (N) score will be recorded.</li> </ul>
<p>13. To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime.</p>	<p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p>The effect of new development on the reduction of crime and fear of crime will depend on factors which are not influenced by the location of development sites but through detailed design.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1 and 2</b></p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Questions 1 and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A neutral effect (N) score will be recorded.</li> </ul>
<p>14. Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth.</p>	<p><b>Residential Sites and Gypsy and Traveller Site Options</b></p> <p>Whilst housing development overall can contribute to economic growth, Sustainability Objective 14 relates to the link between, business growth and skills and forms the focuses of the following Site Specific Questions. It has therefore been assumed that the location of Residential and Gypsy and Traveller site options will not positively impact on the elements of economic growth identified within this objective.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1, 2, 3, and 4.</b></p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4. If however the proposed housing site would lead to the loss of existing employment land a negative impact on sustainable economic growth could result. In recognition that the retail sector plays a role in the prosperity and growth also skills,</p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>employment and business growth those housing sites that fall within either the Town Centre Boundary of Lichfield City Centre or Burntwood could result in a negative effect.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumptions have been made in relation to Site Specific Questions 1,2,3, and 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A neutral effect (N) score will be recorded.</li> <li>• Sites that are currently in Existing Industrial Areas or currently being used for employment use would have a significant negative effect (--) score will be recorded.</li> </ul> <p><b>Lichfield</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that fall within the Primary Retail Area of Lichfield City Centre a significant negative effect (--) score will be recorded,</li> <li>• Sites that fall within the Secondary Retail Area of Lichfield City Centre a minor negative effect (-) score will be recorded.</li> </ul> <p><b>Burntwood</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that fall within the Primary Retail Area of Burntwood significant negative effect (--) score will be recorded against.</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment Sites</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4</b></p> <p>Employment sites by the nature of the allocation have the potential to result in a positive effect against Site Specific Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 the extent of this effect will be unknown until detailed design stage and beyond.</p> <p>As such the following assumption will be made</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A significant positive effect reflecting the uncertain nature of the effect (Double +?).</li> </ul>
<p>15. To enhance the vitality and viability of existing, city, town and village centres within the district.</p>	<p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1</b></p> <p>High quality development in and to the edge of both Lichfield and Burntwood could help to encourage their continued vitality and viability.</p>

SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that are within and on the edge of Lichfield City Centre and Burntwood Town Centre will have a significant positive (++) effect.</li> <li>Sites outside Lichfield City Centre and Burntwood Town Centre will have a neutral effect (N) score against.</li> </ul> <p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 2</b></p> <p>High quality development in and to the edge of the identified key settlements – Alrewas, Armitage with Handscare, Fazeley, Fradley, Shenstone and Whittington could help to encourage their continued vitality and viability.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that are within and on the edge of the five identified key settlements will have a significant positive (++) effect.</li> <li>Sites outside the five identified key settlements will have a neutral effect (N) score against.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site Specific Question 3</b></p> <p><b>Residential Sites and Gypsy and Traveller Site Options</b></p> <p>High quality development in and to the edge of those settlements that have Neighbourhood Shopping Centre Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029 Policies Maps, Lichfield Inset 1 and Burntwood inset 3) will contribute and encourage their continued vitality and viability.</p> <p>Therefore the following assumption will be made in relation to Site Specific Question 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that are within and on the edge of settlements with Neighbourhood Shopping Centres will have a significant positive (++) effect.</li> <li>All other sites will have a neutral effect (N) score.</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment Site Options</b></p>




SA Objectives	Assumptions
	<p>A site by site assessment has been made in regard to relationship between employment sites and Neighbourhood Shopping Centres.</p>
<p>16. Increase participation and improve access to education, skills-based training, knowledge and information, and lifelong learning.</p>	<p>The effect of new development in relation to participation and improved access to education and skills training will to a large extent be influenced by factors that will be addressed at detailed design stage and it is also noted that personal behaviour will also impact on this indicator.</p> <p><b>All types of Site Options</b></p> <p><b>Site Specific Question 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following assumption has been made in relation to Site Specific Question 1 and 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A neutral effect (N) score will be recorded.</li> </ul>




# **APPENDIX J – LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

Site Allocation Indicator's Cumulative Effects


Indicator 1: To promote biodiversity protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats




Indicator 2: To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of the district




**Indicator 3:** To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting




**Indicator 4:** Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrated effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas, and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character




Indicator 5: Maximise the use of previously developed land/ buildings and the efficient use of land




Indicator 6: Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of transport and increased opportunities for non-car travel




Indicator 7: To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change




Indicator 8: To minimise waste and increase the reuse and recycling of waste materials



Indicator 9: Seek and improve air, soil and water quality




Indicator 10: To reduce and manage flood risk







Indicator 11: To provide affordable homes that meet local need




Indicator 12: Improve services and access to services to produce good health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities




Indicator 13: To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime




Indicator 14: Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth



**Indicator 15:** To enhance the vitality and viability of existing, city, town and village centres within the District



**Indicator 16:** Increase participation and improve access to education, skills-based training, knowledge and information, and lifelong learning



# **Sustainability Appraisal Non-Technical Summary: Local Plan Allocations Focused Changes Main Modifications Consultation 2018**



## Introduction

This document is called a Sustainability Appraisal Report. It is the key output of the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) processes. It presents information on the social, environmental and economic effects of implementing Lichfield District Local Plan Part 2, Local Plan Allocations (hereafter referred as the LPA) and the appraisal methodology adopted to identify these effects.

This report has been produced to meet the reporting requirements of both the Strategic Environmental Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal processes and will be updated should there be any changes to the LPA as it moves towards adoption.

The Draft LPA had been subject to two Regulation 19 consultations. The first took place between 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017 and the 12<sup>th</sup> May 2017. Approximately 5000 representation were received in the response to the consultation. This was followed by consultation on the Draft LPA Focused Changes document (Regulation 19) consultation which took place between the 8<sup>th</sup> January 2018 and the 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018. Just under 300 representation were received in the response to the consultation.

Between the two Regulation 19 consultations there were two significant factors that altered the planning landscape for Lichfield District and the context of the LPA. The first was receipt of three appeals from the Secretary of State, one of these appeal decisions for 750 dwellings at Land at Watery Lane was approved despite not being in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy. The second factor relates to the Government's consultation on the Housing White Paper which inter alia seeks to clarify the national policy position associated with Green Belt. The consultation documents were both subject to sustainability assessment.

The Local Plan Allocations 2008-2029 Focused Changes document included all required accompanying documentation (including a Sustainability Appraisal) and was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate 31<sup>st</sup> May 2018. A schedule of proposed Modifications (March 2018, Examination Core Document Reference CD1-3) was part of the submission. Proposed Modifications M3 and M4 was considered within the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. The subsequent updates to the submitted Sustainability Appraisal have been clearly listed within the submitted schedule of changes to local plan Allocation supporting documents (March 2018, Examination Core Documents Reference CD1-4).

The LPA was subject to Examination in Public (EIP). Hearing sessions opened on the 4<sup>th</sup> September and took place over a two week period. Following the hearing sessions, the Inspector provided the district council with suggested Main Modifications. The council are now required to consult on these Main Modifications

A total of seven Main Modifications have been developed and they can be found in full on the district council's website. Following assessment of the proposals it is considered that two suggested Main Modifications require inclusion within the Sustainability Appraisal. Proposed amendments to existing policy EMP1 Protection of Employment land (MM7) and the inclusion of a new policy Local Plan Review (MM1) are both considered to require assessment.

Therefore this report considers Main Modifications (MM1 and MM7) in the context of a Sustainability Appraisal. Further it includes such assessments within the submitted Sustainability Appraisal that accompanied the LPA through examination which has resulted in a Main Modification version of the Sustainability Appraisal.



### Lichfield District Council Local Plan Allocations

The Lichfield District Local Plan comprises two documents; the adopted Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy and the emerging Local Plan Allocations

To support the delivery of the LPS it includes:

- Land Allocations associated with meeting the growth requirements set out in the Local Plan Strategy (2015) including:
  - Determining remaining housing land requirements to deliver the overall 10,030 homes to 2029 in line with the adopted spatial strategy, including allocations of sites with the Broad Development Location (BDL) to the north of Tamworth , for housing in rural areas and the 'Key Rural' Settlements (including Green Belt release);
  - Consideration of 'infill' boundaries for Green Belt villages (as set out in Core Policy 1);
  - Sites to meet the identified Gypsy and Traveller requirements;
  - Land allocations to meet the Employment Land requirements, including the identification of primary and secondary retail areas for Lichfield City Centre;
  - A review of any remaining Local Plan (1998) Saved policies;
  - Consider Green Belt boundaries including the integration of the developed area of the former St Matthews into Burntwood and development needs beyond the plan period; and
  - Consider any issues arising through 'Made' and emerging Neighbourhood Plans where communities have sought the support of Lichfield District Council to progress with matters outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.

### What is the purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal?

The purpose of sustainability appraisal (SA) is to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainable development Objectives within plan-making practice.

SA is a legally required process that must be undertaken alongside plan-making with a view to fully considering and communicating likely sustainability effects of the preferred approach and alternatives to this approach. Specifically, in this instance, SA has involved:

1. Appraising reasonable alternatives, with a view to informing the process of preparing the LPA
2. Appraising the preferred approach as set out in the LPA (publication version), with a view to informing plan finalisation.

This document is a Non-Technical Summary, further detail can be found in the full SA report and appendices published alongside the LPA (publication version).

### What is the sustainability context and the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal?

An important first step in the SA process involves establishing the 'scope' i.e. those significant sustainability issues which should be the focus of the SA, and those which should not.

A review was undertaken of all relevant plans and programmes at national, regional and local level to identify relationships between these and the SA process and the identification of a baseline to provide the basis for predicting and monitoring the effects of the policies and site proposals in the LPA.

The SA Scoping Report (August 2016) provides a detailed review of the sustainability context a baseline of baseline conditions in Lichfield This information was amended slightly following consultation at scoping stage, Appendix C and D of the full SA report provides an updated review.

In addition while the LPA was accompanied by a SA it was concluded at this point that the LPA would not be assessed against the same criteria. The SA process would be started afresh to enable it to fully reflect the current considerations.

Key sustainability issues were identified through the Scoping Report – these include social, environmental and economic issues relevant to the LPA as follows

#### **Social**

- Affordable housing
- Access to health care
- Further education
- Aging population

#### **Environment**

- Protecting the landscape character
- Biodiversity especially key species and habitats
- Historic Environment
- Townscape
- Reduction in waste
- Energy use
- Air, Water and Soil quality.

#### **Economic**

- City, Town and Village viability and vitality
- Skills and further education

Drawing on the findings of the context/baseline review a SA framework was developed. This had 16 key sustainability objectives for assessing the LPA against and supported by Site Specific Questions to provide a more detailed and measureable assessment of sites and policies in regard to effect. In additional assumptions were drawn up to ensure consistency during assessment. The SA Framework is set out in below in Table 1.

#### **Plan Making and Sustainability Process**

Lichfield District Council adopted its Local Plan Strategy on February 2015 and undertook consultation on the proposed scope and nature of the Local Plan Allocations (Regulation 18) from August 2016 to October 2016. Assessment of the responses through the consultation did not identify any issues which could be considered as ‘showstoppers’. The scope of this consultation was directly informed by the Local Plan Strategy which had already been subject to SA. The SA was taken forward to support and influence the identification of preferred sites and replacement policies. Amendments and additions have been included within the LPA, these reflect consultation responses (Regulation 19) and a change in local housing supply and clarification on national planning policy.

#### **Saved Policies**

Lichfield District Council adopted its Local Plan Strategy on February 2015. In total there are currently 54 saved policies carried over from the 1998 Local Plan. Appendix J of the Local Plan Strategy identifies policies that have been replaced by the Local Plan Strategy and those that will be replaced by the LPA.

In terms of those relating to LPA an SA assessment was completed for the proposed replacement policy and the following reasonable alternatives were also considered.

- Policy absent
- Alternative if suggested
- Saved Policy

Following Regulation 19 consultation two proposed replacement policies received amendment, these too have now been assessed and are referred to as Amended Proposed Policy within the main body of the SA report and its accompanying appendices.

As outlined within the introductory section of this report Main Modifications proposals have resulted in two further policies assessments being completed.

The introduction of new policy MM1: Local Plan Review has resulted in the creation of a separate assessment. MM6 Protection of Employment Land has been included within the existing matrix and summary table for EMP1. This amendment policy option is referred to as Main Modification.

The SA assessment of effect, supporting commentary and recommendations if appropriate in relation to the Saved Policies are in Appendix H of the full report.

### Housing Sites Gypsy and Traveller Sites Policy Context

Lichfield District Council adopted its Local Plan Strategy in February 2015. Within that Strategy, Core Policy 1 'The Spatial Strategy' and Core Policy 6 'Housing Delivery' provide the policy context for the selection of alternatives and preferred options. These policies are supported by a raft of localised policies.

In addition the process of Gypsy and Traveller site identification was completed using the criteria outlined within Local Plan Strategy Policy H3: Gypsies, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople.

### Gypsy and Traveller Sites Methodology

A number of sites feature within the SHLAA others were identified solely as part of the implementation of policy H3. An SA assessment was completed for each of the identified reasonable alternatives (21 in total). Taken into consideration the effects identified within the SA, the policy context, and factors identified within the general methodology one Gypsy and Traveller Site was identified as a preferred option, (SA reference GT21). Appendix E of the full report contains the scoring and a summary of effects completed of the preferred option in full report Appendix F. Appendix G Table 7 summaries the selection of preferred options from alternatives options identified.

### Housing site Methodology

**Stage 1:** All sites within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2016 which were located within or adjacent to settlements identified within the settlement hierarchy were identified and subject to the SA process along with any additional sites which were submitted/ promoted through the Regulation 18 consultation. Such an approach was taken so that sites which could be considered to be potentially aligned to the adopted spatial strategy were considered. Any sites which were noted as being complete or under-construction (having had the benefit of planning permission), or sites assessed as capable of delivering less than 5 dwellings were removed from the schedule of sites prior to being assessed. This was because it was considered that these were already moving through the planning process and for sites of 5 or less dwellings were not taken through the SA process because the LPA was not allocating sites below this threshold.

Concurrently and in isolation an Urban Capacity Assessment was produced which assessed the deliverability of all sites identified within the SHLAA located within the existing built up areas of settlements. Where this assessment determined that an urban capacity site was deliverable,



consideration was given to other evidence, including their assessment within the SA (SA outputs), to conclude on whether the site should be proposed for allocation.

**Stage 2:** The Urban Capacity Assessment assesses each settlement within the settlement hierarchy in terms of its delivery against the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy. Where the assessment indicated that insufficient sites had been found including those found through stage 1, consideration to sites beyond the settlement boundary was given. This consideration was based on a range of evidence including the SA outputs.

**Stage 3:** Following Regulation 19 consultation a further review of housing supply within the District was completed. This resulted in additional reasonable alternatives being identified and assessed for effect.

An SA assessment was completed for each of the identified as a reasonable alternatives and full results are contained within Appendix E of the full report. A summary of scores was undertaken (the summary sheets for allocated sites are contained within Appendix F of the full report. Appendix G Table 6 summaries the selection of preferred options from alternatives options identified.

### Employment Sites Policy Context

Core Policy 7 Employment and Economic Development provide the policy context for the selection of alternatives and preferred options

### Employment Sites Context

Potential employment sites that feature within the District Council Employment land Review (ELR), Employment Land Availability Assessment (ELAA) 2016 and Regulation 18 consultation were identified as reasonable alternatives on the basis that these sites may be in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy

Of those sites the following were removed, sites under construction and site that had been completed in previous years because it was considered that these were already moving through the Plan process

Taken into consideration the effects identified within the SA, the policy context, wider evidence base including Employment Land Capacity Assessment and factors identified within the general methodology the following employment sites where identified as preferred options to fulfil the remaining development quantum.

An SA assessment was completed for each of the identified reasonable alternatives full results are contained within Appendix E of the full report. Summary of scores undertaken (the summary sheets for allocated sites are contained within Appendix F of the full report. Appendix G Table 6 summaries the selection of preferred options from alternatives options identified.

### What are the Appraisal Findings and Recommendations at the Current Stage?

The effects of the LPA sites and polices have been assessed against the SA objectives, and the results have been recorded in tables showing effect. The tables are presented in the following manner in the appendices of the SA Repot.

**Table 2: Example SA Table**

SA Objective	Site Specific Question	Score	Comment
To promote biodiversity protection enhancement and	Will it conserve protected/priority species	Double -	There are protected species present on site and on land adjacent

management of species and habitats			to the site 2016 survey data

The SA predicted the significant positive and negative effects of each of the policy and site options on the sustainability objectives using the following scoring method.

**Table 3 Scoring System**

Symbol	Likely Effect on the SA Objective
++	Significant positive effect on sustainability objective
+	Minor positive effect on sustainability objective
N	Neutral effect on sustainability objective
-	Minor negative effect on sustainability objective
--	Significant negative effect on sustainability objective
?	Uncertain

Assumptions for each of the SA Objectives were developed and supported the scoring process. The assumptions can be found within Appendix I of the full report.

The full results and score are available in Appendix E of the SA Report. Furthermore Appendix F includes charts illustrating and summarise effect for each of the sites which have been identified as allocated within the Publication Version of the LPA. A brief summary of the assessment results of sites and policies that have been assessed is provided below within Table 3 Summary of the predicated effects of the LPA sites and Table 4 Summary of the predicted effects policies. It should be noted that some indicators do not have sites slotted against them. This is due a neutral effect being record. In some instances this is due to the extent of the effect (if any) being clearly and consistently be identified at this point in the plan making decision taken process. Further explanation in relation to neutral impact can be found within Appendix H of the full report.

### Cumulative, Synergistic and Indirect Effects

The LPA performs well in terms of cumulative, synergistic and indirect effects relating to:

- **SA Indicator 5** use of previously developed land.
- **SA Indicator 11** provision of affordable homes
- **SA Indicator 14** economic prosperity

There are also a number of negative effects highlighted by the assessment. These include

- **SA Indicator 1** impact on Biodiversity
- **SA Indicator 2** effect on landscape
- **SA Indicator 9** loss of agricultural land.

Uncertainty remains regarding the extent of effect in relation to Climate Change SA indicator 7.

The assessment serves to highlight the need for those elements that are expected to result in negative effects to be addressed more overtly as part of the LPA process, supported by mitigation as appropriate, as well as enhancement of positive effects where possible.

In regard to impact generated from Main Modifications on durational impacts, MM1: Local Plan Review states the following;

*“Lichfield District Council shall carry out an early review of the Local Plan for Lichfield that will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination in accordance with the latest Local Development Scheme or no later than the end of December 2021.”*

Whilst the policy will not impact on the likely significant impacts associated with the delivery of sites, policy impacts will, to some extent, be curtailed after 2021. The significant impacts generated from the following policies will cease on the implementation of MM1 resulting in all impacts being experienced within the Short term period of the plan.

- Policy ST3: Road Line Safeguarding
- Policy E2: Services Access to our Centres
- Policy E3: Shop fronts and advertisements

These impacts (summarised in Appendix H) are overwhelmingly positive. There are however benefits associated with the duration restriction, most notably relating to significant negative impacts on Sustainability Objective 2 relating to Policies ST3.

### Mitigation

Mitigation measures have been suggested throughout the SA process to help mitigate any predicated harmful impacts of policies and allocated sites.

In summary mitigation will be delivered through the following mechanisms

- Local Plan Strategy Main Modification MM1 will after 2021 lead to the delivery of a set of replacement policies both Strategic and Non-Strategic in nature in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- Supplementary Planning Documents
- Key Development Considerations
- Partner plans, policies and programmes

### Monitoring

The predicated significant effects of the policies identified by the SA will be monitored to highlight specific performance issues and inform future decision making. Indicators for monitoring are identified within the SA framework above, and where possible those proposed as part of the LPS SA have been included to ensure continuity. The reporting of such monitoring will be through the Authority Monitoring Report.

### Conclusions

The evolving, iterative nature of the SA has enabled the integration of the core principles of sustainable development into the LPA. Taken together with the policies in the LPS, SPD and national planning policy, it is considered that the policies and sites identified within the LPA should help create sustainable communities

The LPA is likely to deliver significant benefits for sustainable development, particularly in relation to economic prosperity and meeting housing needs. Mitigation of predicated negative effects, such as loss of agricultural land, biodiversity and landscape through the effective implementation of measures including within supporting documents, such as the LPS, SPD's.

Whilst the additional of MM1 will have an impact on the detail of these policies it is considered that the overarching requirements contained within the NPPF 2018 through Strategic and Non –Strategic policy will ensure the Development Plan for the District will continue to provide the ability to make

development acceptable. The SA is legally compliant, and provides robust basis in which to base decision making in terms of site and policy selection.

#### [Habitats Regulations Assessment](#)

An assessment of the LPA under the Habitats Regulations has been prepared separately. Its findings have been considered and have informed the preparation of the LPA. Further information is available in the documents entitled Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment: Local Plan Allocations.

**Appendix A Table 1 Sustainability Assessment**

Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
Biodiversity, Geodiversity, Flora and Fauna	1 To promote biodiversity protection enhancement and management of species and habitats	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it conserve protected/priority species?</li> <li>2. Will it conserve protected/priority habitats and local nature conservation sites?</li> <li>3. Will it protect statutory designated sites?</li> <li>4. Will it encourage ecological connectivity (including green corridors and water courses)?</li> </ol>	<p>Proportion of local sites where positive conservation management has been or is being implemented.</p> <p>Number, type of quality of internationally and nationally designated sites.</p> <p>Number of species relevant to the district which have achieved SBAP targets</p> <p>Number of Local Nature Reserves within Lichfield District.</p>
Flora and Fauna, Landscape, Cultural heritage	2 To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/geological assets and lands character of the district	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does it respect and protect existing landscape character?</li> </ol>	<p>The proportion of housing completions on sites of 10 or more which have been supported , at the planning application stage by an appropriate and effective landscape character and visual assessment with appropriate landscape proposals.</p> <p>Number and area of RIGS within District.</p>

Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Will it protect sites of geological importance?</li> <li>3. Does it offer the opportunity to improve and promote landscape connectivity sympathetic to the existing District Landscape character?</li> <li>4. Will it lead to the sterilisations of mineral resources?</li> <li>5. Will it improve green infrastructure including National Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative?</li> <li>6. Will it result in the loss of historic landscape features?</li> </ol>	<p>Number of sites subject to development where archaeology is preserved in situ compared with those scientifically recorded.</p> <p>National Forest Coverage within the District.</p> <p>Proportion of Forest of Mercia or Central Initiatives promoted schemes implemented within the District.</p> <p>Loss of historic landscape features erosion of character and distinctiveness (HLC)</p> <p>Extent and use of detailed characterisation studies informing development proposals (HLC)</p>

Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
		7. Will it safeguard sites of archaeological importance (scheduled or unscheduled) and their setting?	
Cultural Heritage	3 To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it preserve and enhance buildings and structures and their setting and contribute to the Districts heritage?</li> <li>2. Will it improve and broaden access to, and understanding of, local heritage, historic sites, areas and buildings?</li> <li>3. Will it preserve and enhance conservation areas including their setting?</li> <li>4. Will it offer opportunities to bring heritage assets back into active use?</li> </ol>	<p>Number and Proportion of major planning proposals which improved access to heritage features as part of the scheme.</p> <p>Number of listed buildings or structure in Lichfield District</p> <p>Heritage at risk and number of assets removed from Register.</p> <p>Proportion of Conservation Areas with an up to date character appraisal and management plan.</p>
Cultural Heritage Population	4 Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrated effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it achieve high quality and sustainable design for buildings, spaces and the public realm sensitive to the locality?</li> </ol>	Improvements in the quality of the townscapes, e.g. delivery of street/public realm audits , improvements works de-cluttering worth both in urban and rural areas.



Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it value and protect diverse and locally distinctive settlement and townscape character?</li> <li>Does it safeguard historic views and valuable skylines of settlements?</li> <li>Is the site within a main settlement or a key rural settlement?</li> <li>Is the site within close proximity to key services (e.g. schools, food shop, public transport, health centres etc.)?</li> </ol>	Development meeting design standards within Supplementary Planning Documents. .
Soil Water and Air	5 Maximise the use of previously developed land/buildings and the efficient use of land.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it result in the loss of land that has not previously been developed?</li> <li>Is the site capable of supporting higher density development and/or a mix of uses?</li> </ol>	Proportion of new development on Brownfield Land. No of redundant buildings bought back into use. Proportion of long term vacant dwellings in the District. Housing Mix of sites with planning permission. Housing Density of sites with planning Permission

Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the site allow for the re-use of existing buildings?</li> <li>Will it reduce the amount of derelict degraded and underused land within the District?</li> </ol>	
Climatic Factors	6 Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of transport and increased opportunities for non-car travel.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the site location encourage the use of existing sustainable modes of travel?</li> <li>Will it reduce the overall impact on traffic sensitive areas?</li> <li>Will it help develop walking, cycling rail and bus networks to enable residents access to employment, services and facilities?</li> </ol>	Traffic Levels (million vehicle kilometres) in the local road network. Access to bus services Increase opportunities for walking and cycling.
Climatic Factors	7 To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce the causes of climate change?</li> <li>Will it encourage prudent use of energy?</li> <li>Will it provide opportunities for additional renewable energy generation capacity within the District?</li> </ol>	Carbon dioxide emissions within the Authority Areas Renewable Energy Capacity within the District.
Soil Water and Air	8 To minimise waste and increase the reuse and recycling of waste materials	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce household and commercial waste?</li> </ol>	Residual Household water per household

Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?</li> <li>Will it reduce the proportion of waste sent to landfill?</li> </ol>	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting Municipal waste landfilled.
Soil Water and Air	9 Seek and improve air, soil and water quality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Which Source Protection Zone does the development fall within?</li> <li>Does the site fall within the River Mease SAC?</li> <li>Is the site within or directly connected to road to an AQMA?</li> <li>Will it result in the loss of quality agricultural land?</li> </ol>	Population living within Air Quality Management Areas Number of planning applications granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on water quality. Proportion of homes built on Greenfield land.
Soil Water and Air	10 To reduce and manage flood risk	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the site located outside an area of risk from flooding?</li> </ol>	Number of Planning Permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on fluvial flooding. Number of Planning Permissions granted contrary to Lead Local Flood Authority advice on surface water flooding. Number of existing properties within the Environment Agency's flood risk areas.

Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
		2. Will there be an opportunity for flood risk reduction?	Proportion of new development/dwellings incorporating Sustainable urban drainage techniques.
Population and Human Health	11 To provide affordable homes that meet local need	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it provide sufficient housing to meet existing and future housing need?</li> <li>2. Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?</li> <li>3. Will it reduce the number of households waiting for accommodation or accepted as homeless?</li> <li>4. Will it meet the needs of the travelling community and show people?</li> </ol>	Number of households on the household register Number of people accepted as homeless (annually) Net Additional Dwellings Net affordable housing completions Housing mix Net additional Pitches.
Human Health	12 Improve services and access to services to produce good health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it improve accessibility to health care for existing residents (including older residents) and provide additional facilities for new residents?</li> </ol>	Life expectancy at birth (male and female) Number of new or improved healthcare facilities delivered annually through development

Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it support a healthy life style including opportunities for recreational/physical activity?</li> <li>Will it provide new accessible green space?</li> </ol>	Number of new sports pitches or other leisure facilities delivered annually through development
Population and Human Health	13 To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce crime through design measures?</li> <li>Will it contribute to a safe built environment?</li> </ol>	Reduction in overall British Crime Survey comparator recorded crime – Lichfield District. % of residents who say that they feel very or fairly safe when outside in Staffordshire during the day. and after dark.
Material Assets	14 Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it encourage higher skilled economic sectors in the District?</li> <li>Will it encourage new employment that is consistent with local needs?</li> <li>Will it encourage growth of existing businesses?</li> </ol>	Employment Rate Number of VAT registrations per 1000 Business Births Unemployment by ward Proportion of the District Employed in key sectors.

Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
		4. Will it encourage small businesses to grow?	
Material Assets	15 To enhance the vitality and viability of existing city, town and village centres with the District	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will it improve existing facilities within Lichfield City and Burntwood Town Centre?</li> <li>2. Will it protect and enhance the ability of our key rural settlements to meet the day to day needs arising with these settlements and from the wider rural areas they serve?</li> <li>3. Will it support and protect existing neighbourhood centres serving the local needs of our urban communities</li> </ol>	<p>Total amount of retail floor space (by type) in Lichfield City Centre and Burntwood Town Centre.</p> <p>New retail spaced developed within villages</p> <p>Loss of shops and other retail businesses to other uses</p> <p>Vacancy rates in Lichfield City Centre and Burntwood Town Centre.</p> <p>Loss of local community , leisure and shopping facilities to other uses.</p>
Population and Human Health	16 Increase participation and improve access to education, skills based training knowledge and information and lifelong learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it increase educational attainment amongst young people?</li> <li>• Will it reduce the number of working age residents who have no, or lower level qualifications?</li> </ul>	<p>Proportion of working age population with no, or lower level qualifications.</p> <p>Success rate for Work Based Learning</p> <p>5 of Working Age Population with NVQ level 4 and above.</p> <p>Success rate for further education.</p>

Non- Technical Report Sustainability Appraisal Local Plan Allocations

Sustainability Topic	Sustainability Objective	Site Specific Questions	Monitoring Indicator
			% of 18-59 year olds attending Higher Education Institutions.

**Appendix B Table 2 Sites Predicted Effect**



Table 3

SA Objective	Sites with overall Positive Effects(recorded one or more ++ against site specific questions and /or recorded two or more + against site specific questions)	Sites with overall Negative Effects (recorded one or more -- against site specific questions and /or recorded two or more - against site specific questions)
1		A2,A3,A4,A5,AH,R1,FZ2,F1,NT1,HR1(255),HR2(135),OR1,OR3,OR5,S1,W2,F2,(ELAA 97),B1,B2,B3,B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L2,L3,L4,L5(89-90), L5(1065), L5(19),L6,L7,L8,L9,L10,L12,L13,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,L20,L21,L23,L25,L26,L27,L28,B20,B21,L31,HR2,OR7,OR8,L30,H1
2		L29,HR2,OR7,L30,H1,A2,AH1,FZ2,R1,NT1,NT2,HR1(255),OR1,OR3,OR4,OR5,S1,L2,L5(89-90),L5(19),L6,L8,L10,L19,L22
3	L29,FZ2,OR3,OR5	L31,L29,OR4,A2,NT1,W2,W3,L1,L4,L6,L8,L13,L18,L26
4	B20,B21,L31,L29,A2,A3,A4,A5,AH1,FZ2,FZ3,F1,NT2,S1,W2,W3,GT21,B1,B2,B3,B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L3,L4,L5(19),L5 (89-90),L5(1065),L6,L7,L8,L9,L10,L12,L13,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,L20,L21,L22,L23,L24,L25,L26,L27,L28	L29,OR7,OR8,R1,OR1,OR3,OR4,OR5,L1,L2,L6
5	B20,B21,L31,L29,OR8,OR7,H1,A4,R1,FZ2,OR1,OR3,OR4,OR5,W2,GT21,B1,B2,B3,B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B17,L1,L4,L5(1065),L6,L7,L8,L12,L13,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,L21,L22,L23,L24,L25,L26,L27,L28	A2,A3,A5,AH1,FZ3,NT1,NT2,W2,W3,HR1(255),HR1(135),S1,F2(ELAA97),F2(ELAA 105),F2(ELAA113),B16,L2,L3,L5(19),L8,L9,L10,L20
6	B20,B21,L31,L29,OR7,OR8,L30,H1,A3,A4,AH1,R1,FZ2,FZ3,NT1,OR5,S1,W2,W3,F2(ELAA97),F2(ELAA105),F2(ELAA113),A6,B1,B2,B3,B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L4,L5(19),L5(879-90),L5(1065),L6,L7,L8,L9,L10,L12,L13,L16,L18,L19,L20,L21,L22,L23,L24,L25,L26,L27,L28	HR2,OR7,OR8,H1,NT1,NT2,OR1,OR3,EMP1(ELAA97),EMP1(ELAA113)
7		
8	B20,B21,L31,L29,OR8,L30,R1,FZ2,B1,B3,B4,B8,B10,B13,B16,L1,L4,L5(1065),L6,L7,L12,L13,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,20,L21,L22,L23,L24,L25,L26,L27,L28,L29	L3,OR5

9		HR2,OR7,H1, A2,A3,A5,AH1,FZ3,F1,NT1,NT2,W2,W3,HR1(255),HR1(135),B2,B3,B4,B5,L2,L4,L 5(19),L5(89-90),L8,L9,L10,L20,F2(ELAA 105),F2(ELAA 113)
10		A2,S1
11	B20,B21,L31,L29,HR2,OR7,OR8,H1,A2,A3,A4,A5,AH1,FZ2,FZ 3,F1,NT1,NT2,HR1(255),HR1(135),OR1,OR3,OR4,OR5,S1,W2 ,W3,GT21,B1,B2,B3,B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L2,L3, L4,L5(19),L5(1065),L5(89- 90),L6,L7,L8,L9,L10,L12,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,L20,L21,L22,L2 3,L24,L25,L26,L27,L28,	GT21
12	B20,B21,L31,L29,HR2,OR7,OR8,L30,H1,A2,A3,A4,A5,AH1,R1 ,FZ2,FZ3,F1,HR1(255)HR1(135),OR1,OR3,OR4,OR5,S1,W2,W 3,F2(ELAA97),F2(ELAA105),F2(ELAA113)OR6,A6,B1,B2,B3,B 4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L2,L3,L4,L5,L6,L7,L8,L9,L10, L12,L13,L14,15,16,L17,L18,L19,L20,L21,L22,L23,L24,L25,L26 ,L27,L28	
13		
14	L30,F2(ELAA97)F2(ELAA105),F2(ELAA 113),OR6,A6,L6,L17,L22,L27	L31,L29,OR7,S1,R1,FZ2,S1,R1,FZ2,B1,B2,B3,B4,B8,B13,B16,B17,L3,L14,L23,L24, L27
15	GT21,B20,B21,L31,L29,OR7,A2,A3,A4,A5,AH1,FZ2,FZ3,F1,W 2,W3,R2(ELAA97),F2(ELAA105),F2(ELAA113),OR6,A6,B2,B3, B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L2,L3,L4,L5(19),L5(89- 90),L5(1065)L6,L7,L8,L9,L10,L12,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,L20,L2 1,L22,L23,L25,L26,L27,L28	
16		

**Appendix C Table 3 Policies Predicted Effect**

**Table 4**

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Proposed Policy Options with overall Positive Effects(recorded one or more ++ against site specific questions and /or recorded two or more + against site specific questions)</b>	<b>Proposed Policy Options with overall Negative Effects (recorded one or more -- against site specific questions and /or recorded two or more - against site specific questions)</b>
1	NR11 National Forest NR 10 Cannock Chase AONB IP2:Lichfield Canal	
2	NR11 National Forest NR 10 Cannock Chase AONB ST3:Road Line Safeguarding IP2:Lichfield Canal BE2: Heritage Assets Policy Lichfield	ST5: Road and Junction Improvements –Fradley ST3:Road Line Safeguarding
3	E3: Shop fronts and advertisements ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City IP2:Lichfield Canal	E2 Service Access to our Centres
4	IP2:Lichfield Canal NR11 National Forest NR 10 Cannock Chase AONB E3: Shop fronts and advertisements E2 Service Access to our Centres ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City ST3:Road Line Safeguarding BE2: Heritage Assets Policy Lichfield	ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City
5	Burntwood 3 Lichfield 3 ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City	ST5: Road and Junction Improvements – Fradley IP2:Lichfield Canal EMP1: Employment Areas & Allocations(Main Modifications Additions)
6	ST5: Road and Junction Improvements Fradley ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City ST3:Road Line Safeguarding IP2:Lichfield Canal	
7		
8		
9	ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City	ST5 Road and Junction Improvements Fradley

Non- Technical Report Sustainability Appraisal Local Plan Allocations

		ST3:Road Line Safeguarding IP2:Lichfield Canal
10	IP2: Lichfield Canal	
11		EMP1: Employment Areas & Allocations(Main Modifications Additions)
12	NR11 National Forest IP2: Lichfield Canal	
13		
14	Burntwood 3Lichfield 4 E2: Service Access to our Centre EMP1: Employment Areas & Allocations ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City ST3:Road Line Safeguarding	E3: Shop fronts and advertisements ST5 Road and Junction Improvements Fradley
15	IP2: Lichfield Canal	E3: Shop fronts and advertisements
16		

This page is intentionally left blank