

Public Document Pack

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



District Council House, Frog Lane
Lichfield, Staffordshire WS136YU

Customer Services 01543 308000
Direct Line 01543 308065

Tuesday, 3 March 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

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

A meeting of the Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee has been arranged to take place **WEDNESDAY, 11TH MARCH, 2020 at 6.00 PM IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM** District Council House, Lichfield to consider the following business.

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

Yours faithfully

Christie Tims
Head of Corporate Services and Monitoring Officer

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

Councillors Cox (Chairman), Ball (Vice-Chair), S Wilcox (Vice-Chair), Binney, D Ennis, Gwilt, Ho, A Little, Marshall, Parton-Hughes, Ray, Warburton and Westwood



www.lichfielddc.gov.uk



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



[lichfield_dc](https://twitter.com/lichfield_dc)



MyStaffs App

AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------|
| 1. | Apologies for Absence | |
| 2. | Declarations of Interest | |
| 3. | Minutes of the Previous Meeting | 3 - 8 |
| 4. | Work Programme | 9 - 12 |
| 5. | Lichfield City Centre Masterplan Consultation | 13 - 52 |
| 6. | Local Plan Review Update | 53 - 62 |
| 7. | Burntwood Development | Verbal Report |
| 8. | HS2 Update | Verbal Report |



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

21 JANUARY 2020

PRESENT:

Councillors Cox (Chairman), Ball (Vice-Chair), S Wilcox (Vice-Chair), Binney, D Ennis, Gwilt, Ho, Marshall, Parton-Hughes, Ray, Warburton and Westwood.

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

19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllr A Little

20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interests.

21 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting as circulated were agreed and signed as a correct record.

22 WORK PROGRAMME

The work programme was discussed by the Committee. Some disappointment was noted that there had still been no report in respect of the Development of Burntwood. It was reported that it remained on the work programme to keep minds focused and although nothing to report at this time, the Leader and Deputy Leader would be meeting the Leader of Burntwood Town Council shortly and would then be able to give a verbal update on the Town Deal soon.

It was confirmed that the Government had still not come to a decision on the location and makeup of the Local Enterprise Partnerships but this would remain on the work programme until there was.

It was also noted that there may be updates on HS2 dependant on what was decided nationally.

It was asked if there was opportunity to consider how the Council could reduce its carbon footprint through its activities. It was reported that Councillor A Yeates had been appointed as Champion for this area so it may be more appropriate for the Community, Housing and Health (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee to consider and it was agreed to scope this further.

RESOLVED: That the work programme be noted.

23 ECONOMIC IMPACT OF EVENTS AND FESTIVALS IN LICHFIELD CITY

The Committee received a report on the findings of the work undertaken by Bournemouth University (BU) to assess the economic impact of key events and festivals that take place in Lichfield City. The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for this area was in attendance and

requested the Committees views on the outcomes from the BU study and how events and festivals could be improved.

The Committee discussed various areas where they felt improvements could be made. The first was to have consideration for the current businesses in the city centre. It was noted that there had been some negative comments made in the study by local businesses and it was suggested that there could be some compensation for those who lose income on the days these events took place. An example was given that a baked goods stall was situated outside a bakery. It was reported that there was currently no mechanism for compensation however better coordination of the location of the stalls by event organisers could reduce impact. It was asked whether offering the stall directly in front of the business to them to use themselves could be considered. It was also noted that the use of generators was affecting businesses and it was noted that integrated power supplies for the use of events could be considered as part of the city centre master planning process or that businesses own supply could be used. The Committee felt there should be some recognition of the fact that local business pay rates and stall holders do not.

The number of events and festivals were discussed and it was agreed that there could be scope for more however there should be a more diverse offering than currently. It was felt that there were no events to attract younger people although it was noted that the Council may not be able to directly influence this and this demographic may just not wish to attend. It was also discussed that events outside the city centre could be organised which in turn would create a more varied offering including a potential Country show for the rural areas of the district.

Health and safety at events was considered and it felt that stewarding was vital. It was proposed that a permanent team could gain experience and so add value and reduce risks. It was felt that better stewarding could also enable access during events especially emergency vehicles. It was noted that road closure orders stated that event organisers should allow access and that had not always been successful. The Committee agreed that the application process should be simplified and streamlined.

Marketing of events was then discussed and it was agreed that this was key. It was agreed that having a single point of contact at the Council would be of great benefit and help deal with the other points that the Committee had raised. It was discussed that a resource like this could help enable more community based events and liaise with businesses, Cathedral, other organisations and event organisers to ensure there was more coordination and guidance through the whole process.

The Committee requested that the BU study key recommendations be considered further when investigating improving the festival and events for the city along with a potential resource for a single point of contact at the Council to help market, enable and coordinate events. With this, there should be a simpler application process, a more diverse offering of events that benefit the whole district.

RESOLVED: (1) That the report be noted and the views of the Committee and recommendations of the BU Study on improving festivals and events be considered by the Cabinet member in preparing a policy approach for LDC.

(2) That the following recommendations from the Bournemouth University report (page 22) be considered further

“The key events programme brings socio-economic benefits to the city, and consideration should be given to enhance and develop it further.

It is suggested that event organisers should look to work more closely and collaboratively with the council and local businesses. Improved communications from event organisers to local businesses would be beneficial. This should include making them aware of any road closures, and any opportunities there are for businesses to get involved with their event.

More events could be encouraged throughout the year to account for seasonal peaks and troughs. A more varied event programme, celebrating the history and heritage of Lichfield may also attract a wider audience.

There should be more promotion and marketing of events to increase awareness of them. Events should be promoted to a wider audience within a 2 hour drive of Lichfield to encourage more non-locals to attend.

It is also important that key events reflect what they are marketed as, with stalls, activities and products reflecting the theme of the event.

Greater consideration should be given to the layout and placement of stalls at events. Through working with local businesses, event organisers should look to place stalls which result in minimal congestion or in areas that will not cause issues with local businesses.”

24 LICHFIELD CITY CENTRE CAR PARKING

The Committee received a report on the current occupancy levels, fee income and proposed improvements to the car parking estate within the ownership of Lichfield District Council. The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member requested the Committee’s views on Sunday charging and potential betterment of the service provided.

The current charging regime was reported and that there was one set of charges for Monday to Saturday and then £1 charge for Sunday parking. It was reported that there were contemplations of charging the midweek amount on Sundays to bring in extra income that could be used for improvements including more cashless payment systems, more electric vehicle (EV) charging points and digital messaging signage to aid car park users.

It was asked how much income would be raised if the extra charges were brought in. It was confirmed that there would not be any extra charging on evenings and with the Sunday alone, it would be approximately £176k but noted that this would be if parking use was as it was at this point and not reduced, which there was a risk of.

The Committee had many concerns that they felt should be considered or investigated further before any progression was made. The first was the effect it could have on the high street and trading as well as the attractiveness of events that were held on the weekend. Members were concerned that it may not be the right time to introduce extra charging as other close areas outside the district were offering better retail experiences with free parking namely Ventura Park in Tamworth and the soon to be completed McArthur Glen Outlet at Cannock Chase. It was asked whether car park charging in other authorities were considered and it was reported that there was regular benchmarking carried out. It was reported that there would have to be a good communications plan to ensure visitors understood the benefits to the service

It was discussed that the city was a religious centre and it may not be fair to charge worshipers and it was suggested to charge the current £1 for the first two hours then the proposed charge after that to help mitigate this concern. It was added that this may help people who leave their vehicles overnight.

When suggested that charging may encourage people to use public transport more it was noted that the Sunday bus service was reducing and was still a cost similar to the proposed charge so many people may stay at home and order online.

There was some suggestion that there should be no charge at all on a Sunday to encourage local shopping and community benefit.

Overall, the Committee agreed with the need to better the car parking provided and investigations for investing in improvements and EV charging but felt the proposed rise in income would not be enough and so other sources should be investigated. It was felt that the projects should be scoped and costed before any decision on charging was made. It was felt that clear communications as to the benefits of the improvements would have to be made especially as investment in EV charging would only benefit a few users to begin with.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and the Committees views be taken into account and a further report be submitted when ready on the scope and costs of improvement works to car parking.

25 LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

The Committee received a report updating Members on the consultation on the Local Plan Review Preferred Options document. It was reported that the Leader and Deputy Leader had met with local groups including the Burntwood Action Group and there had been a number of consultation events.

It was reported that residents in Fazeley opposed development in the green belt in that area and traffic was already a concern due to Drayton Manor Theme Park and it was asked if Staffordshire County Council had been asked for views and it was reported that they had been consulted. It was also noted that the preferred options were to encourage growth and help areas meet their own housing needs. It was suggested that residents of that area be encouraged to submit representations to ensure all views were considered. It was requested that SCC be invited to a meeting to discuss infrastructure further with the Committee.

It was asked why greenbelt land at Hammerwich had been reclassified from 'important' to 'moderate' as the area was of historical importance. It was reported there were no proposal to remove this land from the green belt.

Neighbourhood plans were discussed and the Committee were pleased to note the progress made by Burntwood Town Council in developing their plan. It was noted that Kings Bromley had also progressed their plan

Thanks were given to the Development Plans team for their hard work.

RESOLVED: (1) That the progress associated with the Local Plan Review be noted;

(2) That the progress associated with the evidence base being advanced to support the local plan review be noted; and

(3) That the recent progress in relation to neighbourhood plans within Lichfield District be noted; and

26 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY AND SECTION 106 UPDATE

The Committee received a report updating them in terms of the administration and progress of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the use of develop contributions to provide key infrastructure, in particular affordable housing. It was reported that there would be a review of the Regulation 123 list to bring the Council in line with regulatory changes.

Discussions centred on affordable housing and there were concerns that 50% CIL monies went to Lichfield City area however there were far less than 50% of the affordable homes for the district, built in the city. It was felt that CIL, S106 and affordable housing should be investigated in more detail and it was suggested that there be a Member Task group created to do this.

It was felt that this group could look at where charging could be introduced including for apartment development as well as the level of offsite contributions as in some cases, this had been smaller than expected. It was reported that one issue was the desire to promote development of brownfield sites however the extra work involved in making the land acceptable to build on lessened the viability to have affordable housing.

It was agreed that there may need to have some input from the Community, Housing & Health (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee as they have the remit for affordable housing although not the planning policy for it.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and further items be added to the work programme.

(The Meeting closed at 8.35 pm)

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2019-20

Item	20 June	18 Sept	17 Dec	21 Jan	11 Mar	Details/Reasons	Officer	Member Lead
Policy Development								
Terms of Reference	✓					To note	Christine Lewis	
Amendments to Local List of Buildings of Local Architectural and Historic Interest		✓				To report on proposed changes to the Local List	Claire Hines	Cllr Angela Lax
Economic development activity and performance		*				To receive a briefing paper on economic development activity across the district and performance of the local economy	Jonathan Percival	Cllr Iain Eadie
Master Planning Consultation			✓			Special meeting	Craig Jordan	Cllr Iain Eadie

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2019-20

Item	20 June	18 Sept	17 Dec	21 Jan	11 Mar	Details/Reasons	Officer	Member Lead
Small Business grant scheme				*		To receive a briefing paper on the operation of the Council's Small Business grant scheme	Jonathan Percival	Cllr Iain Eadie
Local Plan Updates	✓	✓		✓	✓	Reports on progress with the preparation of the Local Plan	Ashley Baldwin	Cllr Iain Eadie
Spatial planning matters		✓			✓	Briefing paper(s) on Neighbourhood Plan preparation, S106 and CIL receipts and allocations & monitoring and implementation of policies	Ashley Baldwin	Cllr Iain Eadie
Lichfield City Centre future planning (including Birmingham Road site)	*	*		✓	✓	To report on the appointment of consultants and subsequent master planning work	Craig Jordan	Cllr Iain Eadie
Burntwood development					✓	Updates when available	Craig Jordan	Cllr Iain Eadie

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2019-20

Item	20 June	18 Sept	17 Dec	21 Jan	11 Mar	Details/Reasons	Officer	Member Lead
Review of the operation of the Planning Committee		✓				Report to consider a full year of operation since review.	Claire Billings/ Jeff Upton	Cllr Angela Lax
Briefing paper on Development Management performance	✓			✓		6 monthly reporting of planning performance	Claire Billings	Cllr Angela Lax
Outcome of LEP review	✓					Outcome of Government review into Local Enterprise Partnerships verbal update if necessary, report or briefing paper depending on outcome of review and implications for District when available	Craig Jordan	Cllr Iain Eadie
Economic impact of Events and Festivals		*		✓		To report on a study assessing the economic impacts of events and festivals held in Lichfield	Lisa Clemson	Cllr Iain Eadie

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2019-20

Item	20 June	18 Sept	17 Dec	21 Jan	11 Mar	Details/Reasons	Officer	Member Lead
Car parking estate and operations				✓		To report on the Council's car parking estate and operations Possible briefing note	John Roobottom	Cllr Iain Eadie
CIL and s106				✓		Review of how the council is using s106 to deliver affordable housing; how CIL is delivering infrastructure improvements and whether the council's CIL charging regime remains appropriate.	Ashley Baldwin	Cllr Iain Eadie
High Speed 2		*			✓	To receive a briefing paper(s) on issues relating to Phase 1 and 2a of HS2 as they impact on Lichfield district.	Craig Jordan	Cllr Iain Eadie

Lichfield City Centre Masterplan

Report of the Cabinet Member for Investment, Economic Growth & Tourism
Councillor I. Eadie



Date: 11th March 2020

Contact Officer: Helen Bielby

Tel Number: 01543 308252

Email: Helen.bielby@lichfielddc.gov.uk

Local Ward Members
All Members

**Economic Growth,
Environment and
Development (Overview
and Scrutiny)
Committee**

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Following the agreement of the District Council to publish the draft Lichfield City Centre Masterplan, a public consultation took place over four weeks in January/February 2020 to establish the views and opinions of key stakeholders and the wider public to the proposals contained within the document. This report summarises the representations received, gives some detail to the changes to the document as a result of this and outlines the proposed actions going forward.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the consultation responses to the Lichfield City Centre Masterplan and recommends that, subject to changes to the document resulting from the consultation, Cabinet approve the document as a basis for the Council's ambitions for development within Lichfield City Centre.

3. Background

- 3.1 David Lock Associates were commissioned in July 2019 to undertake work to formulate a Masterplan for Lichfield City Centre. Following an Analysis, Issues and Options exercise, a draft Masterplan was duly prepared.
- 3.2 Public consultation on the draft Lichfield City Centre Masterplan took place from the 6th January 2020 to 3rd February 2020. A 'drop in' event took place on the 17th and 18th January at St. Marys and approx. 1100 people attended and spoke to both the consultants and District Council representatives. The exhibition boards available at the drop-in events summarised the content of the Masterplan document. The consultation was also advertised in the Lichfield Mercury on 2nd and 16th January 2020, with copies of the draft Masterplan available to view at the District Council House. Flyers summarising the content of the draft Masterplan were made available at Lichfield library, Lichfield City Council offices and via distribution to tenants by Three Spires Shopping Centre management.
- 3.3 A total of 141 responses were received from local residents and local interest groups and organisations via either online or via a paper questionnaire. In addition a number of organisations and individuals responded via letter or email.

- 3.4 A **draft** report on the consultation has been produced by DLA (attached at Appendix A including a breakdown of representations at Appendix 1 to that document) which explains the process that has been undertaken for the public consultation, an analysis of the responses received and a breakdown of who responded. It is noted that whilst 30% of respondents did not state their age (including organisations), of those that did, under 18's formed the largest group to respond (24%). This is encouraging as it is not typical for this age group to respond well to this type of consultation. 85% of respondents identified as residents while 32% work in Lichfield. 94% of respondents said that they shop in Lichfield. A list of organisations that responded is included in DLA's Consultation Report.
- 3.5 Overall the feedback received was positive with 77% of respondents answering 'Yes' to the question *"Do you think that the overall strategy is correct"*. One issue regarding this from a number of respondents was whether there should be more focus on sustainability and carbon neutral initiatives within the plan. Furthermore concerns were raised that the cumulative scale of future development proposals seems out of character with the realistic capacity of the historic environment.
- 3.6 In terms of the Birmingham Road Gateway, 78% of respondents answered yes to *"Do you think the 'Birmingham Road Gateway' development opportunity will help improve the city centre?"* Further feedback included the need for more affordable housing, car parking need/issues and consideration of public open space to be incorporated into the proposals.
- 3.7 72% of respondents agreed that the District Council House development opportunity would help to improve the city centre. Concerns were raised about the type of uses proposed, separation of building ownership and also car parking.
- 3.8 One key issue is the Bird Street Courtyard proposals. This garnered more individual responses than the other proposed development opportunities. 75% of respondents answered 'Yes' to the question *"Do you think the 'Bird Street Courtyard' development opportunity will help improve the city centre?"*. Additional comments included that the B&M store and adjacent Staffordshire County Council land should be incorporated into the proposals, that the NCN Cycle Route currently sited in the car park should be mentioned and historic landforms should be reflected. Concerns have been raised regarding loss of car parking, building heights, layout and design and views into/out of the site need to be carefully considered.
- 3.9 In response to the issue of development on the University West car park, 67% of respondents agreed that this would help improve the city centre. Concerns were again raised regarding permanent loss of open space that was previously on the site, loss of car parking and design/layout and use of potential buildings. The use of the land for educational space was also raised.
- 3.10 In terms of other development sites, respondents raised the development at the former Angel Croft (Beacon Street), the land at Quonians Lane and land at Stowe Road. Land at Sandford Street car parks and Swan Road/Friary Car parks was also put forward as development sites. A suggestion for a multi-purpose outside space for market traders was also made.
- 3.11 The ideas contained within the plan to help pedestrian accessibility to the city centre from Lichfield City train station by way of the 'Birmingham Road Corridor' interventions was supported by 88% of

respondents. Many responses had specific ideas for how this could be implemented including overpass/underpass from the railway station, synchronisation of traffic light junctions and changes to the highway in general. In addition 83% of respondents agreed that the proposed 'Lichfield Transport Hub' would enhance the arrival experience to the city by bus, coach, train and taxi but raised concerns that the bus station must be of a size to allow for future expansion and that there should be an enclosed waiting area. .

- 3.12 Although 81% of respondents agreed that a Circular Minster Pool Walk would encourage more people to use the Minster Pool area there was some opposition to this proposal due to concerns about impact on the biodiversity, trees and tranquillity of the area. In addition 80% of respondents agreed that the 'Bird Street Walk' proposals would make the route safer and more welcoming, although having looked at this proposal again DLA have concluded that the existing width of the passageway is considered too restrictive to permit the potential for any real improvements.
- 3.13 There was good support (77%) for the ideas of pedestrian priority streets and improvements to pedestrian walkways and linkages. However there was mixed views to the reopening of lower Bore Street. It was also raised that pedestrian priority streets need better enforcement, that they should not exclude cyclists and that the whole of the city centre could be pedestrianised. Moreover that noise and light pollution must be considered. In addition 93% of respondents supported the strategy to improve pedestrian walkways and linkages, with ideas including large city centre maps to be displayed in the city. Respondents also encouraged a review of street furniture and that heritage improvements could be referenced such as shop front improvements, tourism signage and a revival of heritage features within the public realm. Other public realm suggestions included more opportunities for cycling (including cycle paths and cycle stands) and further referencing of heritage assets within the public realm.
- 3.14 82% of respondents answered 'Yes' to the question "Do you think the Delivery Strategy provides a sensible way forward for implementing the masterplan", it is noted that a number of respondents consider that the Birmingham Road gateway site should be a delivery priority but that the commercial elements to be delivered should take place in parallel with public realm improvements. Questions were also raised regarding funding of developments and public realm projects.
- 3.15 Other comments have been raised and these are summarised within the DLA report. These include the connectivity issues between Lichfield City and Lichfield Trent Valley, more support to attractions such as the Cathedral and the tourism economy and the use of VMS car parking signs and the installation of more EV charging points. Moreover a number of organisations have requested to be further consulted in regards to future development proposals.
- 3.16 All comments received have been noted and analysed. Changes to the document have been proposed by DLA as result of these comments. These include wording/sentence changes as well as other changes including changing some of the detail of the proposed development opportunities, the finer detail of which would be considered further via site development briefs or similar. For example, DLA have responded to the representations regarding Bird Street car park redevelopment with proposed changes to the brief comprising an emphasis on (a) environmental enhancements in the short-term; with (b) a longer-term opportunity for comprehensive development. It is noted that the Masterplan Objectives, Masterplan Quarters, Transition Areas and Design Principles would remain broadly the same.

- 3.17 Chapter 5 of the Masterplan details how the strategies and proposals contained within the document could be delivered. High level viability testing has been used to ensure that the proposals are feasible and deliverable, subject to costs that cannot be quantified until the process is further advanced, including site abnormalities', CPO and legal costs, off-site costs etc. The document envisages a 20 year implementation process and considers the Council's role in implementing and funding the key projects.
- 3.18 It is proposed that the final version of the Masterplan, once approved by the Council, will be used as a base document, from which further plans/strategies for the finer detail regarding the development of the city centre will emerge. This documents could include; a Car Parking Strategy, a Public Realm Strategy and further consideration of Connectivity into an out of the city centre to local towns and villages as well as key transport nodes such as Lichfield Trent Valley. These plans and strategies will include implementation project proposals, giving key consideration to viability and delivery of said projects.

Alternative Options	1. Members could request fundamental changes to the draft Masterplan prior to its adoption by the Council. This would require a further commission to the consultants to review and significantly amend the work that has been produced to date.
Consultation	1. The draft Masterplan has been subject to public consultation as outlined in the main body of this report.
Financial Implications	1. Although there are no financial implications arising out of this report it must be noted that the implementation of the projects included in this document may require significant capital funding from the District Council.
Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	1. The master planning process will help support and deliver the Council's strategic objective of promoting a vibrant and prosperous economy. 2. It will also support the priorities of achieving healthy and safe communities and clean, green and welcoming places to live.
Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	1. None
Crime & Safety Issues	1. None
Environmental Impact	1. None directly from this decision, although some of the plans and strategies will be able to contribute to the Council's ambitions regarding sustainable development
GDPR/Privacy Impact Assessment	1. Not applicable

Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
------------------	------------------	------------------------

A	The draft masterplan is not recommended by the Committee to be adopted by the Council	Members have played an active part in the formulation of the document and have had the opportunity to provide consultation responses to the draft plan.	Yellow
B	Some of the proposals contained within the masterplan may not be welcomed by all stakeholders	The public consultation has demonstrated considerable support for the proposals included in the masterplan. Further public consultation may take place on specific development opportunities prior to statutory consultation via planning applications etc	Yellow
C			
D			
E			

Background documents

[Draft City Centre Masterplan \(DLA Associates\)](#)
[Consultation Report \(February 2020\)](#)

Relevant web links

This page is intentionally left blank

Consultation Report

Lichfield City Centre Masterplan

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	3
Consultation process	3
2.0 OVERVIEW OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES.....	5
Stage One: Baseline review and analysis	5
Stage Two: Draft Masterplan consultation	5
3.0 SCHEDULE OF KEY CHANGES TO THE MASTERPLAN	6
Changes to draft Masterplan	6
4.0 CONCLUSIONS	9

APPENDICES

Appendix 1A	Press adverts
Appendix 1B	Consultation flyer
Appendix 1C	Consultation leaflet
Appendix 1D	Consultation questionnaire (online version)
Appendix 1E	Consultation questionnaire (paper version)
Appendix 1F	Public consultation boards
Appendix 2	Draft Masterplan Consultation – Summary of responses received

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 A consultation process took place to enable local stakeholders, interest groups, residents and businesses of Lichfield and the surrounding area to have their say on the **Lichfield City Centre Masterplan**. Comments received as part of this consultation process have helped shape and evolve the Masterplan.
- 1.2 This Consultation Statement articulates the main issues raised by respondents as part of the consultation process and identifies how those issues have been addressed in the Lichfield City Centre Masterplan.

Consultation process

- 1.3 The draft Masterplan was informed by the feedback provided from previous stakeholder and community engagement exercises, particularly those which focussed on the Birmingham Road site in Spring 2019. This was supplemented with a number of one-to-one conversations with key officers, local elected members, members of the project group and key stakeholders.
- 1.4 The following stakeholders, identified by Lichfield District Council, anticipated to have an interest in the Lichfield City Centre Masterplan, were invited to engage in the consultation process:
 - Leader, Lichfield District Council (LDC)
 - Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Investment, Economic Growth and Tourism, LDC
 - Officer Working Group for the Lichfield City Centre Masterplan, including:
 - Assistant Director, Business & Enterprise, Staffordshire County Council (SCC)
 - Group Manager, Community Highway Liaison, SCC
 - Assistant Chief Executive, LDC
 - Head of Economic Growth, LDC
 - Policy Officer, LDC
 - Clerk of Lichfield City Council (LCC)
 - Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee, LDC
 - Beacon Street Area Residents Association
 - Birmingham Chambers of Commerce
 - Leomansley Area Residents Association
 - Lichfield Arts
 - Lichfield Cathedral
 - Lichfield City Centre Strategic Partnership
 - Lichfield City Councillors
 - Lichfield Chamber of Trade and Commerce
 - Lichfield Civic Society
 - Lichfield District Councillors
 - Lichfield Garrick Theatre
 - Staffordshire University / South Staffordshire College
 - Three Spires Shopping Centre

- 1.5 The Draft Lichfield City Centre Masterplan report was subject to a four-week period of consultation with residents and secondary school students of, businesses and services in, and visitors to the city, as well as other stakeholders. Consultation on the draft Masterplan was open from 6th January to 3rd February 2020. During this time, the public were asked for their views on the content of the draft Masterplan, including the suggested Development Opportunities and Public Realm Priorities for the city centre.
- 1.6 The consultation was advertised in the Lichfield Mercury on 2 January 2020 and 16 January 2020 (copy of press advert available at **Appendix 1A**).
- 1.7 Copies of the draft Masterplan consultation document were made available for public inspection between the consultation dates, at the District Council House, Frog Lane, Lichfield, WS13 6YU. Copies of the draft Masterplan flyer (**Appendix 1B**) and leaflet (**Appendix 1C**), summarising the content of the Masterplan document were distributed to the following locations for wider information and dissemination:
- Lichfield Library, The Guild of St Mary's Centre, Market Square, Lichfield, WS13 6LG
 - Lichfield District Council House, Frog Lane, Lichfield, WS13 6YU
 - Lichfield City Council, Donegal House, Bore Street, Lichfield, WS13 6LU
 - Three Spires Shopping Centre, 12 Gresley Row, Lichfield, WS13 6JF
- 1.8 The public consultation involved a questionnaire survey which members of the public were invited to complete. An online interactive version of the questionnaire was made available at: www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/lichfieldmasterplan to make it even easier for people to give their views and to encourage a broad demographic of the local population to participate (screenshots of the online version of the questionnaire available at **Appendix 1D**). The online questionnaire was provided in addition to a downloadable Word version of the questionnaire (hard copy questionnaire available at **Appendix 1E**), for those who preferred to complete the questionnaire in the more conventional way.
- 1.9 Public drop-in events were held at Lichfield Library on Friday 17 January between 9am and 5pm and on Saturday 18 January between 9am and 4pm. The exhibition boards available at these drop-in events summarised the content of the Masterplan document (**Appendix 1F**). A team from David Lock Associates were available at the events to talk through the proposals and to answer questions.
- 1.10 An estimated 550 people visited the exhibition event on the Saturday, with a similar number of visitors on the Friday. This is calculated on the basis of the total number of people which entered Lichfield Library during the exhibition events (1,400 people), compared with the number of visitors to the Library on the previous Saturday (850 people).

2.0 OVERVIEW OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Stage One: Baseline review and analysis

- 2.1 The first stage was analysis and review of all existing information about the city centre. This stage of the masterplan built on work already undertaken by the District Council, including issues identified through previous stakeholder and community engagement exercises, particularly those which focussed on the Birmingham Road site in Spring 2019.
- 2.2 The evidence base was supplemented by a number of initial one-to-one conversations with key officers, local elected members, members of the project group and key stakeholders. The 'Analysis, Issues and Options Report' is the culmination of the stage one work.

Stage Two: Draft Masterplan consultation

- 2.3 A total of 141 responses were received from local residents and local interest groups and organisations on the draft Masterplan consultation. 98 of these were received through the POP consultation app, 13 as completed questionnaires, and 30 by email (without a questionnaire).
- 2.4 In our experience, this is a typical level of response for a project of this nature, at the Draft Masterplan consultation stage. A greater level of responses are typically received earlier in the process, in response to the 'Issues' stage of a City Masterplan, with fewer responses at the 'Draft' Masterplan stage.
- 2.5 Most age groups were well-represented, with the under 18s providing the highest percentage of responses. All under 18 responses were received through the POP consultation app.
 - Under 18: 24%
 - 18-34: 6%
 - 35-64: 20%
 - 65+: 19%
 - Unspecified: 30% (no entry supplied, or organisation)
- 2.6 The number of 'under 18's' responding to the consultation is not typical for a consultation of this nature, which is very encouraging. This would suggest that the interactive nature of the POP consultation app was particularly successful in appealing to this younger demographic.
- 2.7 85% of respondents identified as residents, while 32% work in Lichfield. A significant 94% of respondents stated that they shop in Lichfield.
- 2.8 In undertaking the consultation questionnaire, no information was collected on individual names or personal addresses, in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018.
- 2.9 Responses from specific groups/organisations comprised the following:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beacon Street Area Residents • Environment Agency • Friel Homes • Historic England • Leomansley Area Residents • Lichfield Cathedral • Lichfield City Council • Lichfield City Councillors • Lichfield Civic Society • Lichfield District Councillors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lichfield District Council's Conservation Team • Lichfield District Council's Ecology Team • Lichfield ReCycle • Redleaf • Trustees of St Johns Hospital • SCC Economic Development • SCC Highways • Staffordshire Gardens & Parks Trust
--	---
- 2.10 After this period of consultation on the draft masterplan, comments have been analysed and recommendations provided (see Appendix 1).

3.0 SCHEDULE OF KEY CHANGES TO THE MASTERPLAN

- 3.1 In undertaking consultation on the draft Lichfield City Centre Masterplan document, all responses have been recorded and reviewed. These responses have informed the final masterplan document, where appropriate and are summarised in **Appendix 2**.
- 3.2 Due to the Data Protection Act 2018, no personal information (including the names of individuals, groups or businesses) has been included within this Consultation Report and all comments set out in Appendix 2 remain anonymous.
- 3.3 The key changes made as a result of the representations received are summarised below.

Changes to draft Masterplan

- 3.4 The responses received as part of the public consultation on the draft Masterplan document has informed the final Masterplan for Lichfield city centre. The key representations which helped shape and evolve the draft Masterplan include:

Masterplan Context & Analysis

- Amendment to Masterplan Objective 5, to ensure that public realm improvements (Quality Accessible Environment) ensures that any such improvements are sensitive to existing residents with respect to noise and light pollution;
- Correction of typographical error referring to 'Rectory Lane' rather than 'Reeve Lane';
- Amendment to emphasise the need for any future development proposed within the City Centre East Transition Area to not harm the significance of heritage assets;
- Amendment to wording to provide for heritage assets being 'protected' rather than 'preserved';
- Amendment to wording to replace references to listed buildings with the fuller description of heritage assets;
- Spires of St Michael's Churches to be referenced, in addition to those of St Mary's (and the Cathedral);
- Biodiversity Net Gain to be referenced under Masterplan Objective 6 (The Green and sustainable City); and
- Road names added to Masterplan Quarters, for clarity.

Development Opportunities:

1. Birmingham Road Gateway

- Development to be designed to manage the interface between the proposed restaurant/café offer and the bus station at the Birmingham Road Gateway Development Opportunity;
- Additional text to emphasise the need for any new development in close proximity to Lichfield City Railway Station to be subject to negotiations with Network Rail;
- The Trustees of St John's Hospital to be added as a consultee as part of future development proposals at the Birmingham Road Gateway Development Opportunity site with LDC; and
- Correction of leaseholder status of existing multi-storey car park on Birmingham Road.

2. District Council House

- Removal of reference to the future use of the Council Chamber as a wedding/occasion venue, to allow for more flexible use of the space; and
- Use of the Council House car park in the evenings and weekends to be clarified as being maintained, where practicable.

3. Bird Street Courtyard

- Environmental enhancements at the Bird Street Courtyard to be emphasised within the short-term, with a longer-term opportunity for a more comprehensive development of the site and available adjacent buildings;
- Additional reference to improvements to the strategic cycle network through Bird Street Courtyard along the Sustrans route, to include new surface treatment to provide a clearer and safer route;
- Clarification to be provided in relation to proposed storey heights at Bird Street Courtyard, to identify that whilst 3-storeys on this site might be difficult to achieve due to the sensitivity of the setting, a cross-check viability assessment reducing the development as currently configured to 2-storeys, indicates that a reduced height scheme on the same footprint would be marginally unviable. If 3-storeys are deemed unacceptable, reviewing the design or including further landownerships may be necessary to improve the viability position;
- Clarification to be provided in relation storey heights within Bird Street Courtyard; heights to be established through detailed design work, whilst maintaining vistas of the Cathedral spires;
- Clarification that the majority of the retained car parking spaces within Bird Street Courtyard would be prioritised for blue badge holders;
- Clarification that Historic England and SCC's Historic Environment team would be consulted on any planning application at Bird Street Courtyard;
- Wider landownerships of LDC and SCC around Bird Street Courtyard added to illustrative masterplan extract plan for added clarity;
- Cross-reference made to the 2010 Development Brief for Bird Street Car Park; and
- Additional reference to new cycle parking facilities across the city centre at key locations, including at Bird Street Courtyard.

4. University West Car Park

- Amendment to potential uses as part of the University West Car Park Development Opportunity, to allow for educational uses or commercial business space.

A. Birmingham Road Corridor

[no change proposed].

B. Lichfield Transport Hub

[no change proposed].

C. Bird Street Walk

[no change proposed].

D. Circular Minster Pool Walk

- Amendment to Circular Minster Pool Walk to emphasise that the proposed northern route would be a footpath-only route to retain the tranquillity of this area.

E. Pedestrian Priority Streets

[no change proposed].

F. Pedestrian Walkways & Linkages

[no change proposed].

G. Signage and Wayfinding

[no change proposed].

Delivery Strategy

- Delivery Strategy to be corrected in relation to the anticipated phasing for the Birmingham Road Gateway Development Opportunity;
- Private landownership of the Garden of remembrance, in relation to the Circular Minster Pool Walk to be referenced within the Delivery Strategy; and
- Status of transport funding from SCC in relation to the Birmingham Road Corridor (including improvements for sustainable transport) to be clarified.

Other Comments

- Reference to the need for LDC to prepare a Car Parking Strategy for the city centre; and
- Enhanced reference to the importance of the Cathedral in the context of the City Centre Masterplan.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 This Consultation Statement sets out the consultation process which has taken place to enable local stakeholders, interest groups, residents and businesses of Lichfield and the surrounding area to have their say on the Lichfield City Centre Masterplan.
- 4.2 Public consultation was undertaken on the draft Lichfield City Centre Masterplan between 6th January to 3rd February 2020. In undertaking this public consultation, every response received has been recorded and considered. These responses have informed the final masterplan document, where appropriate, to provide a delivery mechanism tool to enable Lichfield District Council to help bring forward new development and the stated ambitions for the future city centre of Lichfield.

Appendix 1A Press adverts

2 LICHFIELD MERCURY THURSDAY, JANUARY 2, 2020 www.lichfieldmercury.co.uk

Mercury

CIN Group Editor
Managing Director
Advertising Manager
Newsdesk
Email: mercury@lichfield.co.uk

Sportsdesk
Sports email: sports@lichfield.co.uk

News/Sport fax
Advertising
Distribution
General Enquiries
01827 548490
01827 548490
01827 548490
01827 548490
01827 548490
01827 548490

Established by James Amphlett in 1875, the Mercury is a newspaper dedicated to the coverage of news & events (primarily Lichfield, Burntwood and surrounding villages). The Mercury is independent of any public or party, government body or local authority and endeavours to provide fair, accurate and balanced reports for readers.

Corrections & complaints

If we have published anything that is inaccurate, please contact the editor, Charlotte Hart, on 01827 548490, via email at charlotte.hart@lichfield.co.uk or post to: The Editor, Lichfield Mercury, Venturia Park Road, Burntwood, Staffordshire ST9 3LZ and, once verified, we will correct it as soon as possible.

The Lichfield Mercury is published by Central Independent News and Media, a subsidiary company of Reach PLC, which is a member of IPSO, the Independent Press Standards Organisation. We adhere to the Editors' Code of Practice as enforced by IPSO, who are contactable for advice at IPSO Gate House, 1 Farringdon Street, London EC4A 3DF. Website: www.ipsoc.org.uk Telephone: 0300 123 2200 email: advice@ipsoc.org.uk

If you have a complaint concerning a potential breach of the Code of Practice, we will deal with your complaint directly or IPSO can refer your complaint to it. Please go to www.ipsoc.org.uk/complaints where you can view our Complaints Policy and Procedures. A 'How to Complain' pack is also available by writing to The Legal and Compliance Department, Reach PLC, One Canada Square, Canary Wharf, London E14 5AP.

DSO, Regulated

ORDER PHOTOS...

To order photos from today's paper or classic images from our archives, please go online to reachphotosales.co.uk/Reach

For photo inquiries, please call our customer services on 01604 683902 or email sales@reachphotosales.co.uk

Register to have say on council's plan for the next four years

LICHFIELD District Council is appealing for residents to register to take part in a focus group to give your feedback on a four-year plan that will set its priorities.

The authority is putting together its strategic plan that will set out its vision for the council from 2020 to 2024.

LDC says it will help focus on what is important locally and direct resources and budgets where they will have the most benefit for local people and businesses.

The council says it now needs to know if it has selected the right priorities for the district. These are "to enable people, shape places, develop prosperity and be a good council that innovates and puts its customers at the heart of all it does".

The district's residents will have the chance to give their views about the emerging plan at two focus groups on Thursday, January 9.

The first focus group will be at District Council House on Frog Lane in Lichfield from 2pm to 4pm. The second will take place at Burntwood Memorial Institute from 5pm to 7pm.

Member for Customer Services & Innovation, said: "This is your chance to tell us what you think of our priorities and to give us your ideas."

"We hope plenty of people from right across the district will get involved in helping us to develop our strategic plan."

To register your interest in attending one of the focus groups, please email allan.bowen@lichfield.gov.uk or call 01543 306129.

To find out more, go to www.lichfield.gov.uk/draftstrategicplan

Councillor Andy Smith, Cabinet

Council leader hits back over criticism of hoardings

THE Leader of Lichfield District Council has hit back at criticism of the new hoarding images displayed around the Birmingham Road development site from the leader of the Labour Group.

Councillor Steven Norman has said that the pictures are "disappointing" and had believed that the £23,000 cost "was for artworks rather than commercial advertising poster images".

"I accepted that because the site was at the entrance to the city and may still be vacant for another decade something needed to be done to show that the site was to be developed when economic conditions allowed," he said.

"However, I don't think I was alone in thinking that these would be paintings of some kind rather than the confusing jumbled up posters they appear to be - 36 images in fact at a cost of £1839 each."

"The so-called 'enabling works' for the site has increased by £105,000 to £3,180,000 and is already over budget."

"It is not a great start to 2020 but at least Lichfield City is getting over its moony throw at the project that has been 20 years in the making while Burntwood Town's council taxpayers wait for their share."

The Leader of LDC Cllr Doug Pullen has challenged Cllr Norman's comments.

"I'm sorry that they aren't to Cllr Norman's personal taste - we've also had lots of positive feedback," said Cllr Pullen.

"There's zero 'commercial advertising' on the hoardings, just plenty of images from across Lichfield District, chosen to promote Lichfield, Burntwood and our rural areas."

"Things are moving on at pace with this site - short-term improvements will start this month and the Draft City Centre Masterplan is out for consultation next week."

"Please do engage with us on this draft masterplan - even if it's only to critique the art"

Chance to give views on city's masterplan

LICHFIELD residents have a "great opportunity" to have their say on what the city looks like in the future by participating in the masterplan consultation.

David Lock Associates - specialists in town planning and urban design - has produced a draft masterplan for Lichfield City Centre on Lichfield District Council's behalf, supported by Springboard - city centre characterisation specialists - and Integrated Transport Planning.

The council says it will shape the future growth of the city centre, set out opportunities for enhancing the quality of the environment and the range of different uses it offers, and provide a prospectus for investment in Lichfield.

In partnership with the district council, David Lock Associates is running a public consultation on the draft masterplan from Monday to February 3.

There will also be public drop-in events at Lichfield Library on Friday, January 17, between 9am and 5pm, and on Saturday, January 18, between 9am and 4pm. A team from David Lock Associates will be available at the events to talk through the proposals and answer questions.

Councillor Iain Eadie, Lichfield District Council's Cabinet Member for Investment, Economic Growth & Tourism, said: "This consultation offers a great opportunity for people to have their say on what Lichfield looks like in the future."

"We know people have been commenting online about the early release of the masterplan, so this is the chance to directly influence what the final plan looks like."

"The masterplan sets out four key developments for the city centre, while being mindful of the historic character and identity of the city."

Some of these may sit well with lots of our residents and businesses in the city, while I am sure others might generate a lot of different points of view.

"It's important we hear from a good range of people, and I hope plenty of our residents, visitors and stakeholders will join us and the team from David Lock Associates at one of our consultation events to find out more and give their views."

Once the consultation closes, the council says feedback will be collated and reviewed with appropriate changes made to the masterplan before it is considered by councillors in the spring.

To read the draft Lichfield city centre masterplan and give your views, visit www.lichfield.gov.uk/lichfieldmasterplan. The plan is also available on request at District Council House on Frog Lane.

RICHARD WINTERTON AUCTIONEERS LTD
www.richardwinterton.co.uk

Lichfield Valuations Jewellery & Watches
Mondays 9.30am - 12.30pm
Except on Bank Holidays - see our website for details

The Hub
at St Mary's

FIND US UPSTAIRS
In The Hub at St Mary's Market Square
Lichfield City Centre
WS13 6LG

The Lichfield Auction Centre, Wood End Lane, Fradley Park, WS13 8HF
01543 251081 | www.richardwinterton.co.uk | office@richardwinterton.co.uk

Self Drive Seaside Special

3 Nights from £99**

LLANDUDNO
Staying at the Grand Hotel
Located at the foot of the spectacular Great Orme, the hotel boasts a commanding view across the bay and all Llandudno's picturesque hills.

Halfway between
10 miles from the sea & 10 minutes from the city
*Nightly self-drive

3 Nights Arriving Friday
Feb 7, 14, 21, 28
Mar 6, 13, 20, 27
Apr 3, 10, 17, 24

MAJESTIC
Self Drive Holidays
01626 770246 | www.majestic.co.uk

Lichfield Mercury, 2 January 2020

12 LICHFIELD MERCURY THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2020

www.lichfieldmercury.co.uk

Something for everyone in spring season opener

REVIEW

KEITH DONNELLY
Lichfield Guildhall

WITH a varied career that has seen him playing all around the world, writing songs for the likes of Jasper Carrott and Phil Coul, and keeping thousands of people entertained at festivals large and small, Keith Donnelly opened Lichfield Arts Spring 2020 season in his own inimitable style.

With a set that ranged from broad comedy, to well-crafted songs, some intricate guitar play-

ing, and parodies and spoofs of some classic rock and pop songs, there was something for everyone.

Whitby Town was a solid opening, a love song, but Pagliarini Blues took elements of so many other songs, using the chord progression that underlined them all to make a point about originality, and how everything borrows from everything else.

The spoof songs were well thought out with Simon and Garfunkel's The Sounds of Silence becoming the children's songs The Sounds of Pinter, and the mega-long, slapstick Ghost Riders in the

Sky being a new version of Johnny Cash's Ghost Riders in the Sky.

Politics were never really far from Donnelly's mind, with issues at the Airport being a pointed attack on Donald Trump, whilst The Girl on Platform Three was another love song, this time with a happy ending.

He succeeded with a series of spoof songs, that took in songs by the likes of Leonard Cohen, James Blunt, Warren Zevon, and Daft Punk, allowing the audience to look at familiar songs from a different viewpoint.

BEN MACHAIR



Keith Donnelly



Collin Weston collects for Mummy's Star

You're all Stars, says grateful fundraising couple

A LICHFIELD couple have thanked generous shoppers after collectives they held for charity raised more than £1,206.

Collin Weston and Elizabeth Jones dressed up as Santa and an elf respectively at The Plant Plot, and as The Incredible Hulk and Leonardo from the Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles

at the city's Tesco Extra store to collect for Mummy's Star.

Mummy's Star supports women, and their families, affected by cancer during pregnancy or within 12 months of giving birth.

Collin told the Mercury he wanted to see if he and Elizabeth could help fundraise for "such a worthy cause".

"In total we raised £1,206.37, which is incredible, considering the short period of time, that we did it in," he said.

"It was only thanks to the exceptional generosity of those wonderful people visiting both Tesco and The Plant Plot, plus the venues' support, that we reached the figure that we did. "People would come and

share with us their very personal and touching stories.

"I can't thank everyone enough for their support.

"Finally, Louise at Mummy's Star has been such a support and a constant source of help, so a big thank-you to her, Mummy's Star, a thank-you to everyone else, especially my partner Liz."



PUBLIC CONSULTATION RUNNING UNTIL 3 FEBRUARY 2020

The draft Lichfield city centre masterplan sets out a clear direction for the future development and public space improvements of the city centre. The council, in partnership with David Lock Associates, is consulting on this masterplan and needs your feedback.

LICHFIELD CITY CENTRE MASTERPLAN

Public consultation: drop-in events

Friday 17 January

9am - 1pm | Lichfield Library

Saturday 18 January

9am - 4pm | Lichfield Library

HAVE YOUR SAY

To read the draft masterplan and complete an online survey go to: www.lichfield.gov.uk/lichfieldmasterplan

Lichfield
district council

DAVID LOCK
ASSOCIATES

Lichfield Mercury, 16 January 2020

Appendix 1B Consultation flyer



Appendix 1C Consultation leaflet



Lichfield District Council wants the city of Lichfield to continue to prosper as a vibrant, successful and valued place, by diversifying the range of uses and activities available and making the most of the city's existing historic assets and character.

LICHFIELD CITY CENTRE MASTERPLAN

The draft masterplan proposes the delivery of new development and public realm improvements which are designed to complement and enhance existing infrastructure. The Council has appointed a team of town planning and urban design specialists, led by David Lock Associates, to produce the masterplan for the city centre.

The draft masterplan has been informed by an extensive analysis of the city centre which identified key issues and concerns. The analysis built on the feedback provided at part of the public consultation exercise held in January 2019, which focused on the Birmingham Road site. The results have shaped the draft masterplan.

The draft masterplan is supported by a Delivery Strategy to help ensure that projects in the masterplan are both achievable and deliverable.

THE DRAFT MASTERPLAN IS ASPIRATIONAL, SETS OUT A CLEAR DIRECTION FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY CENTRE, BUT IS ALSO REALISTIC, HAVING REGARD TO WHAT IS ACHIEVABLE AND, IMPORTANTLY, DELIVERABLE.

Lichfield District Council
DAVID LOCK ASSOCIATES

DELIVERY

The draft masterplan identifies ideas for future development and public realm improvements to complement and enhance existing infrastructure. The draft masterplan will shape the future growth of the city centre of Lichfield as a means of responding to what is already a vibrant and valued place.

The draft masterplan is supported by a Delivery Strategy to help ensure that projects in the masterplan are both achievable and deliverable.

The Delivery Strategy sets out how the projects identified in the draft masterplan will be delivered through the short, medium and longer term. Potential infrastructure funding sources are identified to help facilitate their delivery.

The draft masterplan will be considered as part of the Local Offer review process and any future Development Plan for the city.



GETTING INVOLVED

A full copy of the draft masterplan can be downloaded from www.lichfield.gov.uk/development/masterplan together with an interactive development **map of the city centre**. Additionally, a questionnaire can be downloaded, completed and emailed to lichfieldmasterplan@lichfield.gov.uk.

Consultation on the draft masterplan will be open from 1st January to the 31st February 2020.

There is a public exhibition for you to come and look at the main details of the masterplan are provided below.

Friday 17 January
10am - 4pm | Lichfield Library

Saturday 18 January
10am - 4pm | Lichfield Library

After this period of consultation on the draft masterplan, the final masterplan will be produced and the main details of the masterplan will be provided to the Council.

THE DRAFT MASTERPLAN STRATEGY: FOUR CORE PROPOSALS

The draft masterplan strategy focuses on four core proposals. These have been developed having regard to the analysis undertaken, which provided the insight as to the role, function and characteristics of Lichfield and also the issues that need to be addressed to maintain the city centre as a vibrant, successful and valued place.

ONE: MASTERPLAN OBJECTIVES

The masterplan objectives have been identified to help respond and address identified issues in the city centre, and to help ensure projects set out in the masterplan.

TWO: MASTERPLAN QUARTERS

In order to better understand the city centre and provide a means of focusing investment, the masterplan identifies four overlapping City Quarters:

- City Centre
- City Core
- City Centre and
- City Centre and

THREE: MASTERPLAN OPPORTUNITY AREAS & PUBLIC REALM PRIORITIES

The masterplan proposes a series of specific public realm improvements and opportunities in the public realm.

OPPORTUNITY AREAS

- Birmingham Road Corridor** - an area of high potential for public realm improvements to create a vibrant urban gateway to the city.
- Central Square** - providing a vibrant environment in the city centre.
- St. Martin's Churchyard** - a high potential area for public realm improvements to create a vibrant environment in the city centre.
- St. Martin's Churchyard** - a high potential area for public realm improvements to create a vibrant environment in the city centre.

PUBLIC REALM PRIORITIES

- Birmingham Road Corridor** - an area of high potential for public realm improvements to create a vibrant urban gateway to the city.
- Central Square** - providing a vibrant environment in the city centre.
- St. Martin's Churchyard** - a high potential area for public realm improvements to create a vibrant environment in the city centre.
- St. Martin's Churchyard** - a high potential area for public realm improvements to create a vibrant environment in the city centre.

FOUR: MASTERPLAN DESIGN PRINCIPLES

The masterplan design principles have been derived to help ensure that development coming forward in the city centre achieves high levels of quality and sustainability, with the following design principles:

- Architectural design quality** - new developments to reflect the city's historic character and quality, and to provide high quality architectural design.
- Materials & detailing** - in new developments to reflect the city's historic character and quality, and to provide high quality architectural design.
- Attractive & usable public realm** - new public realm to offer a high level of amenity and to be designed to reflect the city's historic character and quality.
- Designing for health** - promoting an active and healthy lifestyle to deliver health and wellbeing benefits.



Appendix 1D Consultation questionnaire (online version)

The image displays four sequential screenshots of an online consultation questionnaire for the Lichfield City Centre Masterplan, presented on a wooden plank background.

Screenshot 1 (Top Left): The questionnaire title is "Lichfield City Centre Masterplan Questionnaire". It states: "This is your opportunity to comment on the draft Lichfield City Centre Masterplan. Consultation on the draft masterplan is open from 6th January to the 3rd February 2020." Below this are input fields for "please enter your postcode" and "please select your age range" (a dropdown menu). A green "Start Questionnaire" button is present. At the bottom, a disclaimer states: "Lichfield District Council will only use the information provided in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 for the purposes of informing the Lichfield City Centre Masterplan. The information will not be shared with any third parties without your consent unless required to by law." A "POP Public Opinion Poll" logo is in the bottom left corner.

Screenshot 2 (Top Right): The title is "MASTERPLAN APPROACH". The text reads: "Development opportunities & public realm priorities have been identified to help meet the six masterplan objectives." Below this is the question: "Do you think the overall strategy is correct?". Navigation arrows (back, forward, and thumbs up/down) are visible. The "POP Public Opinion Poll" logo is in the bottom left corner. At the bottom right, it says "Lichfield City Centre Masterplan Remaining Cards: 99".

Screenshot 3 (Bottom Left): The title is "PUBLIC REALM PRIORITIES". The text reads: "Are there any additional Public Realm Priorities that should be considered?". Navigation arrows are visible. The "POP Public Opinion Poll" logo is in the bottom left corner. At the bottom right, it says "Lichfield City Centre Masterplan Remaining Cards: 1".

Screenshot 4 (Bottom Right): The text reads: "Thank you for completing the questionnaire. If you have any further comments, please add them below." Below this is a large text area for comments. A green "Submit Answers" button is at the bottom. A URL is visible at the very bottom: "http://www.pop-dls.com/lichfield/php/upload/answers.php".

Appendix 1E Consultation questionnaire (paper version)

DAVID LOCK ASSOCIATES **Lichfield District Council**

Lichfield City Centre Masterplan Consultation Questionnaire

This is your opportunity to comment on the draft **Lichfield City Centre Masterplan** that is available via Lichfield District Council's website.
Please provide your comments using the on-line interactive questionnaire. Alternatively, you can complete this questionnaire form and e-mail to lichfieldmasterplan@davidlock.com
Consultation on the draft masterplan is open from 6th January to the 3rd February 2020.

Lichfield District Council will only use the information provided in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 for the purposes of informing the Lichfield City Centre Masterplan. The information will not be shared with any third parties without your consent unless required to do so.

A. ABOUT YOU

(These questions are optional)

i. Please enter your postcode: _____

ii. Do you live in Lichfield? Yes ☐ No ☐

iii. Do you work in Lichfield? Yes ☐ No ☐

iv. Do you regularly shop in Lichfield (at least once every fortnight)? Yes ☐ No ☐

v. Are you visiting Lichfield? Yes ☐ No ☐

vi. What is your age range?

Under 17 years old	<input type="checkbox"/>	45-54 years old	<input type="checkbox"/>
18-24 years old	<input type="checkbox"/>	55-64 years old	<input type="checkbox"/>
25-34 years old	<input type="checkbox"/>	65-74 years old	<input type="checkbox"/>
35-44 years old	<input type="checkbox"/>	75 years or older	<input type="checkbox"/>

B. MASTERPLAN APPROACH

1) Development opportunities and public realm priorities have been identified to help meet the six masterplan objectives.
Do you think that the overall strategy is correct?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

2) Is it helpful to think about the city centre in terms of (quarters)?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

C. DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Development Opportunities have been identified to enhance the role and function of the key sites in the City Centre.

3) Do you think the 'Birmingham Road Gateway' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

4) Do you think the 'District Council House' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

5) Do you think the 'Bird Street Courtyard' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

6) Do you think the 'University West Car Park' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

7) Are there any additional Development Opportunities that should be considered?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

D. PUBLIC REALM PRIORITIES

Public Realm Priorities have been identified, to deliver improvements to patterns of movement within the city centre.

8) Do you think the 'Birmingham Road Corridor' interventions will improve pedestrian accessibility to the city centre from Lichfield City train station?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

9) Do you think the 'Lichfield Transport Hub' will enhance the arrival experience to the city by bus, coach, train and taxi?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

10) Do you think the 'Bird Street Walk' interventions will make this route safer and more welcoming?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

11) Do you think a 'Circular Minster Pool Walk' will encourage more people to use the Minster Pool area?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

12) Do you think the 'pedestrian priority streets' interventions will improve pedestrian safety?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

13) Do you think the improvements to 'pedestrian footways and linkages' will enhance pedestrian access and safety?
Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)



DAVID LOCK
ASSOCIATES



Lichfield
District Council

14) Do you think 'clear and consistent signage' will make it easier for people to navigate their way around the city centre?

Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

15) Are there any additional Public Realm Priorities that should be considered?

Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

E. MASTERPLAN DELIVERY

16) Do you think the Delivery Strategy provides a sensible way forward for implementing the masterplan?

Yes ☐ No ☐ (If you responded 'no' please explain why)

17) Do you have any further comments?

Thank you for taking the time to
complete this questionnaire

Appendix 1F Public consultation boards



Appendix 2

**Draft Masterplan Consultation – Summary of responses
received**

DRAFT

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2: Draft Masterplan Consultation – Summary of responses received

Draft Lichfield City Centre Masterplan Consultation		
Project	Comment	Suggested Masterplan Change
The Masterplan Approach		
Overall Strategy	77% of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 1 'Do you think that the overall strategy is correct?'	
	There is strong support for the weight given towards sustaining and enhancing the significance of the historic environment and heritage assets. The majority of respondents agreed that the Masterplan approach is appropriate, although some concerns were raised in relation to specific development opportunities.	
	More focus on sustainability as a guiding principle for the Masterplan. Lichfield should be proactive in working towards carbon neutrality.	Addressed in Draft Masterplan (Objective 6).
	The cumulative scale of future development proposals appears to be out of character with the realistic capacity of the historic environment; scale of development proposed has the potential to lead to over-intensive and inappropriate forms.	Comment noted. The proposed mix of uses has been developed having regard to the complementary uses which would support a "Speciality" centre and in ensuring proposals in the masterplan are both achievable and deliverable.
Quarters	73% of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 2 'Is it helpful to think about the city centre in terms of quarters?'	
Development Opportunities		
1. Birmingham Road Gateway	78% of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 3 'Do you think the 'Birmingham Road Gateway' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?'	
	The respondents who provided additional commentary in response to this development opportunity were generally very positive about the proposed mix of uses and consider the proposal to be an improvement on the former Friarsgate scheme.	
	There is a need for affordable housing in Lichfield.	Addressed in Draft Masterplan: 'focus on providing affordable homes to meet identified local need' (Paragraph 3.5).
	Pressure on local GPs due to increased residential properties.	Comment noted.
	The provision for car parking is inadequate to accommodate existing demand and proposed new activities (e.g. cinema).	Analysis of existing parking data informed the city-wide strategy for parking provision and is considered appropriate for the City Centre's needs, whilst seeking to also promote more sustainable forms of travel and less reliance on car usage.
	Questioned whether car parking could be reduced / relocated to the periphery of the City, instead of a new MSCP?	
	Suggestion that the new multi-storey car park should offer 10-minutes free parking, to allow for pick-up/drop-off at the Bus Station and Train Station.	Suggested additional text under 'Parking and servicing'; Future car park pricing strategy and associated management to be considered by LDC.

	Consideration should be given to creating a public open space at the junction of St John Street and Birmingham Road to enhance the approach from Lichfield City Railway Station and the setting and appreciation of the Listed Hospital of St John and the District Council House.	Comment noted. However, the provision of an area of open space adjacent to the junction of St John Street and Birmingham Road is not considered to provide an appropriate or attractive location for residents/ visitors to use. Areas of public open space are provided for elsewhere across the city.
	The inter-relationship between any new restaurants and the Transport Hub will need to be carefully designed to provide an attractive outlook.	Suggested additional text under ' <i>Key Design & Development Considerations</i> '; <u>Development will be designed to manage the interface between the proposed restaurant/cafe offer and the adjacent bus station.</u>
	Would like details on size of any proposed hotel.	The detailed design of any such new hotel would be driven by operator demand and be subject to a planning application.
	Support limiting St John street development to 2 storey. Elsewhere the proposed 4 storey development is considered too high. Issues with vehicular access to site need addressing. A new MSCP is welcomed but need to time it correctly to prevent a shortfall in car parking. Proposed pedestrian route should be closer to the Garrick.	The Delivery Strategy proposes an indicative phasing approach, to bring forward replacement car parking spaces in advance of any car parking being displaced from development opportunity sites.
2. District Council House	72% of respondents answered ' yes ' to Question 4 ' <i>Do you think the 'District Council House' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?</i> ' The respondents who provided additional commentary in response to this development opportunity considered that this would help utilise the Council offices more efficiently.	
	Concerns about offering a competing arts and wedding venue to The Guildhall and Lichfield Registry Office, having a potentially detrimental impact on these existing facilities.	Suggested amendment; 'The Council Chamber and adjacent buildings could be converted subject to appropriate consents to provide a self-contained wedding/occasion venue <u>for hire</u> , with the attractive courtyard garden providing outdoor and breakout space' (paragraph 3.17) Applicable to all references to 'wedding/occasion venue'
	Also need parking for functions if converting the council chamber for events. Parking should be available for public use outside office hours.	Suggested amendment; 'In the evening and at weekends when the wedding/occasion venue is in use, <u>use of visitors could utilise</u> the District Council House car park <u>for visitors could be maintained, where practicable</u> . (Key Design & Development Considerations).

	Separation of the former Headmaster's House from the third Grammar School building is highly undesirable and both should continue to be in the same ownership.	Comment noted.
	If sections of the Council House are to be vacated by the District Council, office use, or similar, seem most appropriate. Express doubts as to whether the city requires more meeting or internal venue space.	Comment noted.
3. Bird Street Courtyard	75% of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 5 'Do you think the 'Bird Street Courtyard' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?'	
	The principle of development on Bird Street Courtyard is contentious. While some respondents opposed any development, others were open to development in principle, where the design of buildings was sensitive to heritage assets.	
	Support the retention of some parking on the site but believe consideration should be given to those travelling from the north who need parking. Support in principle the redevelopment of Bird St car park.	Support noted.
	Consider that the Master Plan could be much more radical by redeveloping both the B&M site and the car park site.	Comment noted – for discussion with LDC. Suggested amendment to emphasise (a) environmental enhancements in the short-term; with (b) a longer-term opportunity for comprehensive development.
	Suggests that B&M store is demolished in order to open up the view from Market Street to Minster Pool and the Cathedral beyond, with a new public space provided.	
	The Masterplan should mention National Cycle Network (NCN) Cycle Route 54, which is currently routed through Bird Street Car Park and dangerous for cyclists.	Suggested additional text under 'development aspirations'; <u>Improvements to strategic cycle network through Bird Street Courtyard along the Sustrans route, to include new surface treatment to provide a clearer and safer route.</u>
	Consider that Bird Street car park is ripe for some form of development. Considers that the current proposal would not maintain views and feels uninspired. Express concern about the proposed loss of some car parking spaces and request adequate parking is maintained for those visiting the Cathedral (not necessarily in Bird Street car park). Consider that the removal of the majority of parking spaces will negatively impact the businesses in the centre.	Comment noted. Displaced parking is re-provided elsewhere in the City Centre. Comment noted, although the city centre benefits from being compact in form. The re-provision of parking spaces elsewhere in the city centre is considered an appropriate approach.

	<p>Three storeys are too high for the area overlooking Minster Pool and to the Cathedral.</p>	<p>Suggested additional text under 'Issues and Obstacles' (page 65);</p> <p><u>It should be noted that the viability appraisals were undertaken assuming a three-storey development to allow 2 floors of residential above ground level. It is appreciated that achieving 3 storeys on this site may be challenging due to the sensitivity of the setting. A cross check viability assessment reducing the development to 2 storeys indicates that a reduced height scheme on the same footprint would be marginally unviable. If 3 storeys are deemed unacceptable, reviewing the design or including further landownerships may therefore be necessary to improve the viability position.</u></p>
	<p>The Bird street car park is the most useful car park in Lichfield as it is close to the shops. The car park provides easy access to the Cathedral. The views of the Minster Pool and Cathedral are a stunning welcome to visitors. Building beside the Minster will ruin the enjoyment of this stunning walkway.</p>	<p>Comment noted – see above</p>
	<p>Reduced parking at the Bird Street car park gives considerably less parking for North Lichfield residents and for visitors to the cathedral.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>It is likely that by having a maximum of 3 storeys in height, that this might set a precedent for all new development in this area, which could have a negative impact on the diversity of the skyline.</p>	<p>Suggested amendment under 'storey heights';</p> <p>Proposals should have regard to the prevailing height of development in the locality with particular regard to vistas to and from the Grade I listed Cathedral. <u>Heights to be established through detailed design work, whilst maintaining vistas of the Cathedral spires. Up to three-storey development is considered appropriate, subject to vistas of the Cathedral spires being maintained.</u></p>
	<p>Parking here should be for Blue Badge Holders – this could remove the need for any Blue Badge holders' cars to access any of Market Street, Bore Street etc.</p>	<p>Suggested amendment;</p> <p>'Up to 55 retained car parking spaces, <u>the majority of which will be prioritised for Blue Badge holders;</u>' (paragraph 3.26)</p>
	<p>Consult with Historic England and Staffordshire County Council's Historic Environment Team.</p>	<p>Suggested amendment;</p> <p><u>Historic England and Staffordshire County Council's Historic Environment Team</u> (new bullet point to paragraph 3.27)</p>

	Adjacent land within LDC and SCC control should be identified on the plan.	Suggested amendment to plan to reflect comments.
	Bird Street Car Park Development Brief (2010) should be referenced.	Suggested cross-reference to be made to the 2010 Development Brief.
	The Masterplan should make reference to the historic character and morphology of the site. An attempt should be made to reflect historic property boundaries. New development shouldn't abut Minster Pool Walk.	The Analysis, Issues and Options Report provides a high-level analysis of the historic character and morphology of Lichfield. Any development proposal would be subject to a planning application which would include a historic environment assessment.
	Pedestrian access improvements should be high priority. There should be increased public realm space adjoining Minster Pool Walk.	Comments noted.
	The desire to use this space for development has been on the District Council's hit list for many years for financial gain, showing little regard for the wishes of residents. Car park loss will directly impact on residents of Beacon Street.	Comments noted. This development opportunity seeks to provide a balanced response to the wide-ranging views on the future use of this site.
4. University West Car Park	67% of respondents answered ' yes ' to Question 6 ' <i>Do you think the 'University West Car Park' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?</i> ' The proposed area of coach parking is generally considered important by the majority of respondents. However, some respondents consider that either the existing car park should be retained, or it should revert back to open space.	
	Does not support this proposal as a former area of open space.	Comment noted.
	Do not consider that the definition of this area as the Business & Learning Quarter is appropriate as it is primarily residential. Two or three storey development on the car park would block line-of-sight visibility to the Conduit Clock tower on the Bowling Green roundabout from the Bishops Lodge apartments. Loss of significant capacity in the car park would cause difficulties to visitors of residents at the Bishops Lodge apartments.	Comment noted. Some parking will be retained. Displaced spaces will be re-provided a short walk away.
	Questioned whether this development opportunity could provide additional educational space, to allow the Cathedral School to expand within Lichfield.	Suggested amendment under 'potential development capacity' to provide flexibility towards either educational uses or commercial business space (complementary to the Business & Learning Quarter).

Other Development Opportunities	Consider that the proposed development at Angel Croft would support and strengthen the Cathedral Quarter.	Comments noted. The proposed development at Angel Croft falls within the 'transition area' of City Centre West, as set out in the masterplan.
	The area between Dam Street and Cross Keys (centred on Quonians Lane), although within a Conservation Area, could be considered.	Comment noted.
	A multi-purpose covered outside space to encourage market traders of customers of all ages.	Comment noted.
	Potential commercial development on Stowe Road, adjacent Bromford office. Possible residential development on Swan Road/Friary and Sandford Street car parks.	Comment noted.
Public Realm Priorities		
A. Birmingham Road Corridor	88% of respondents answered ' yes ' to Question 8 ' <i>Do you think the 'Birmingham Road Corridor' interventions will improve pedestrian accessibility to the city centre from Lichfield City train station?</i> '. Improvements to the public realm, especially the provision of safer access routes from Lichfield City Station, are strongly supported by the vast majority of respondents.	
	This is supported as a very high priority, and needs early delivery in conjunction with the first phases of the Birmingham Road Gateway.	Support noted.
	Suggest an underpass/overpass to facilitate pedestrian access that does not depend on stopping car traffic.	Comment noted.
	Widening the road to accommodate a central filter lane for right-turning traffic should be considered to reduce the amount of queuing traffic.	Comment noted.
	Synchronisation of traffic lights at the new junction with those at the junction of Birmingham Road and St John Street would improve traffic flows. Further synchronisation of the lights with those at the Greenhill/Rotten Row junction and the pedestrian crossing at the exit from the Three Spires Shopping Centre would also help improve flows.	Comment noted.
	The Birmingham Road/St John St junction needs to be made safer. Another traffic light junction will make transiting Birmingham Road from either direction unacceptable.	Potential new pedestrian crossing points are proposed as part of this junction.

B. Lichfield Transport Hub		
	<p>83% of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 9 '<i>Do you think the 'Lichfield Transport Hub' will enhance the arrival experience to the city by bus, coach, train and taxi?</i>'.</p> <p>The vast majority of respondents strongly support provision of a new bus station, as it would provide a more welcoming gateway to the City Centre.</p>	
	There should be an enclosed waiting area within the bus station to enhance the arrival experience for bus passengers.	Comment noted – this is subject to the detailed design.
	The bus station should be of an adequate size to accommodate future expansion including for coach parking if necessary.	Comment noted. The size of the bus station has been informed by discussions with the County Council and bus operators. Coach drop off/ pick-up bays are provided for as part of the Lichfield Transport Hub.
	Note that some bus operators do not favour station layouts that require buses to reverse.	Comment noted.
C. Bird Street Walk		
	<p>80% of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 10 '<i>Do you think the 'Bird Street Walk' interventions will make this route safer and more welcoming?</i>'.</p> <p>Although the majority of respondents provide support for this public realm priority, the existing width of Bird Street Walk is considered too restrictive to permit the potential for any real improvements.</p>	
	Consider that the B&M store should be demolished to improve what is currently a very dingy alley.	Comment noted – see above
D. Circular Minster Pool Walk		
	<p>81% of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 11 '<i>Do you think a 'Circular Minster Pool Walk' will encourage more people to use the Minster Pool area?</i>'.</p> <p>There is some opposition to this proposal, with several respondents concerned about the potential impact on Minster Pool, biodiversity, trees and the tranquillity of the Remembrance Garden.</p>	
	Supports the proposal but is mindful of potential difficulties in achieving it, not least in relation to land ownership. Careful planning will be required in regard to seating and signage.	Support noted.
	The proposal is supported and will offer improved circulation opportunities. It is not considered that this proposed northern section requires to provide a cycleway facility.	Support noted.

	<p>A cycle route to the north of Minster Pool linking to Beacon Park could really improve bicycle connectivity as part of a National Cycle Network route.</p> <p>The proposal would be an ideal solution, if the section on the north side of the pool were to be a shared cycle/pedestrian path with adequate 'Share with Care' notices to protect pedestrians.</p> <p>Constructing a path will disturb the biodiversity of the north side of the pool. Trees will have to be chopped down & late-night revellers will cause a nuisance to residents.</p> <p>The route would need access through the Garden of Remembrance, which is a Grade II* listed structure and, and the gardens of a number of listed buildings, which should remain a quiet reflective space.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Any new path would seek to avoid any adverse impacts upon existing biodiversity and landscaping. Any changes proposed would be subject to detailed design and assessment.</p> <p>Suggested amendments to 'Key Improvements';</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The route to the north of Minster Pool is proposed as a footpath-only route to retain the tranquillity of this area. Improvements to the existing strategic cycle network through Bird Street Courtyard are proposed, to include new surface treatment to provide a clearer and safer route.
E. Pedestrian Priority Streets	<p>77% of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 12 'Do you think the 'pedestrian priority streets' interventions will improve pedestrian safety?'.</p> <p>This public realm priority is welcomed by most respondents, in providing a positive impact on residents, visitors and the environment.</p> <p>Opening up Bore Street to direct traffic would be extremely undesirable and likely to encourage more unauthorised traffic from Tamworth Street to Bore Street. This is counterproductive to providing a safe pedestrian area. The bottom end of Bore Street junction should be re-designed.</p> <p>Re-opening of Lower Bore Street to vehicles, closing of Conduit/Market/Breadmarket Street requires careful and sensitive consideration due to impact on local businesses.</p> <p>Pedestrian priority streets need better enforcement.</p> <p>Pedestrian priority streets should not exclude cyclists.</p> <p>Need to consider light/noise pollution.</p> <p>The city centre should be pedestrianised, blue badge holders can be relocated into nearby car parks and servicing of premises could be subject to an hours restriction. Bollards could be installed on the entrance to the city centre on Tamworth Street.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Any such change to the street network would be subject to future discussions between LDC/SCC and local residents and businesses, as appropriate.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The masterplan seeks to maintain and enhance access for all users, regardless of their mobility needs.</p>

	Removing cars or more severely restricting vehicular access around Market Square would present a much better city centre environment.	Comments noted.
F. Pedestrian Walkways & Linkages	91% of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 13 'Do you think the improvements to 'pedestrian walkways and linkages' will enhance pedestrian access and safety?'. Most respondents agreed with this public realm priority, although many considered there should also be an emphasis on improving (and maintaining) existing infrastructure.	
	There is too much emphasis on walking and cycling for a city with high levels of retired and elderly people.	Comment noted.
	Pedestrian pathways from the proposed Angel Croft scheme should be retained.	Comment noted.
	Noise and light pollution must be considered.	Suggested additional text under Objective 5; 'The masterplan identifies public realm improvements to enhance connectivity between the Birmingham Road Gateway and the city centre, both visually and physically. These improvements must be sensitive to existing residents with respect to noise and light pollution. (Paragraph 2.46)
	Proposed Angel Croft development will provide an excellent walkway from the Cathedral Quarter to Beacon Park.	Comments noted.
G. Signage and Wayfinding	93% of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 13 'Do you think the improvements to 'pedestrian walkways and linkages' will enhance pedestrian access and safety?' and is strongly supported.	
	Large city maps with key attractions could be included, along with distances to such attractions.	Comment noted.
	There could be reference to potential heritage improvements such as shop front improvements, heritage tourism signage, revival of heritage features in the public realm, walkways and cycleways that appropriately connect heritage assets and better reveal their significance.	Comments noted. To be considered as part of future signage and wayfinding strategy (Public Realm Priority G).
	A review of all street furniture and installations should take place.	The masterplan promotes a co-ordinated approach to signage and street furniture.
Other Public Realm Priorities	Park & Ride should be considered to keep cars out of the city centre.	Comment noted. A Park and Ride is not considered appropriate to the scale and function of Lichfield.

	<p>More 'radical' approach to encouraging more sustainable forms of transport should be considered. More consideration should be given to cyclists, including the potential for cycling to the city centre from the east or west, via Dam Street and a traffic-free Bird Street Courtyard.</p> <p>The Masterplan should mention National Cycle Network (NCN) Cycle Route 54, which is currently routed through Bird Street Car Park and dangerous for cyclists.</p> <p>Improve access to the city centre through segregated cycle paths or 'share with care'. Improved cycling facilities throughout the city centre to include priority boxes at junctions, and where possible, 3metre shared cycle and pedestrian routes. More cycle stands should be provided.</p> <p>There is no reference to heritage assets within the public realm improvements section as the potential impact on the Grade II* structure in the Garden of Remembrance and how it is unlikely to be compatible with a new cycleway.</p>	<p>Addressed in draft masterplan, under Design Principle Four (Designing for Health) and under 'moving around the city centre'.</p> <p>A new cycle hub is proposed at the station.</p> <p>Suggested amendments to text;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to Sustrans National Cycle Route 54 being integrated within Bird Street Courtyard with onward cycle connectivity provided as part of the Circular Minster Pool Walk. • Reference to new cycle parking facilities across the city centre at key locations, including at Bird Street Courtyard. <p>Suggested additional paragraph following paragraph 4.12; <u>4.13 Regard must be had to the setting of the surrounding Listed buildings, including the Grade II* Listed War Memorial in the Garden of Remembrance.</u></p>
Delivering the Masterplan		
Delivery Strategy	<p>82% of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 16 '<i>Do you think the Delivery Strategy provides a sensible way forward for implementing the masterplan?</i>'.</p> <p>The delivery strategy is generally supported by the majority of respondents, although a number of respondents consider that Birmingham Road Gateway should be a delivery priority.</p> <p>Birmingham Road Gateway, and specifically the proposed multi-storey car park and bus station, need to be prioritised.</p> <p>Development should be phased to ensure replacement car parking spaces are available.</p>	<p>Correct errors on page 63;</p> <p>Under phasing for Birmingham Road Gateway;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase One: Residential apartments and small-scale business units (western section of site). • Phase Two: Leisure scheme comprising hotel, cinema and restaurants, along with residential houses and apartments. (central section of site). • Phase Three: Re-provision of MSCP, along with some leisure and restaurant uses. • Phase Four: Re-provision of existing Bus Station

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase One: Residential apartments and small-scale business units (western section of site). • Phase Two: Re-provision of MSCP, along with some leisure and restaurant uses. • Phase Three: Leisure scheme comprising hotel, cinema and restaurants, along with residential houses and apartments. (central section of site). • Phase Four: Re-provision of existing Bus Station <p>Under phasing for District Council House;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase One: Residential apartments and small-scale business units (western section of site). • Phase Two: Re-provision of MSCP, along with some leisure and restaurant uses. • Phase Three: Leisure scheme comprising hotel, cinema and restaurants, along with residential houses and apartments. (central section of site). • Phase Four: Re-provision of existing Bus Station
	The commercial 'profitable' elements should be progressed in parallel with the public realm improvements.	Comment noted – this is the assumption set out under Timescales in Section 5 of the draft masterplan.
	More detailed delivery strategy for the public transport/southern gateway could be provided.	Comment noted. However, it is considered premature at this stage to provide further detail than included.
	We have concerns with the tables produces from page 62 and both the description of development proposed and the limited reference to heritage.	Comment noted – heritage is considered as part of the overall masterplan proposals.
	Negotiations will need to take place with Network Rail in relation to development adjacent to Lichfield City Railway Station.	Suggested additional text; <u>Negotiations required with Network Rail, regarding any new development adjacent to Lichfield city Railway Station.</u>
	Concern that the Birmingham Road Gateway will be 5-7 years away, this site is the number one priority for the city.	Comments noted. Delivery will be subject to the determination of the planning application and the selected delivery route.
	Deliverability only considered for commercial elements with a vague reference to delivery of public sector infrastructure; this (public funding) would seem highly unlikely and we would expect contributions from developers to be sought.	The Delivery Strategy identifies potential funding opportunities for both the Development Opportunities and the Public Realm Priorities.

	We can see no difference in the viability status of the Birmingham Road proposal over Friarsgate.	The former Friarsgate scheme was a retail-led proposal which is not a financially viable proposition for a city centre in the current retail market. The Masterplan proposes a broad mix of uses appropriate to Lichfield and which is based on local market evidence of the uses which would be capable of delivery.
Other Comments		
Other Comments	Improvements to Lichfield City train station should be considered – café, toilets etc.	New facilities proposed as part of new Transport Hub.
	Connectivity between Lichfield City and Lichfield Trent Valley stations (including signage) needs to be addressed. Increased car parking at Lichfield Trent Valley station and shuttle bus service between Lichfield Trent Valley and Lichfield City to reduce the number of car trips.	Comment noted.
	There will be fewer parking spaces overall.	Comment noted. Addressed in main section above.
	There should be more reference to the Cathedral's contribution to the City. There is some contradiction in the emphasis on protecting views to the Cathedral, and then proposing a three-storey building on Bird Street Car Park. None of the proposed developments will bring Lichfield to national or international attention or encourage longer dwell times or overnight stays.	Comment noted. Development height at Bird Street Courtyard addressed in main section above. The proposed mix of uses is intended to encourage longer stays. The masterplan recommends that a wider Marketing Strategy should be developed to provide visitor information not only within Lichfield through new signage, but also in raising Lichfield's profile through marketing and social media to encourage people to visit.
	There should be more support of the tourism economy. The profile of the City needs to be raised, but there is no proposed development or use that will bring Lichfield into regional, national or international attention, or encourage longer dwell time or overnight stays.	Addressed in draft masterplan as part of Public Realm Priority G (Signage and Wayfinding); in the suggested development of a wider marketing strategy for the city.
	The re-provision of a leisure facility should be considered in the city centre.	Comment noted. However, alternative suitable sites are being considered by LDC beyond the city centre (addressed at paragraph 2.9 of draft masterplan).
	A separate car parking schedule would be beneficial. The use of VMS electronic car park signage should be investigated.	Comment noted.

	Lichfield City Council should be added to the list of consultees on Birmingham Road Gateway.	Suggested amendment to 'issues and obstacles' to include negotiations with Lichfield City Council and the trustees of St John's Hospital.
	The Trustees of St John's Hospital would welcome being included in any stakeholder discussions/events concerning the Birmingham Road Gateway and the Birmingham Road Corridor.	
	Where appropriate, Historic England would be keen to be a stakeholder at the appropriate time.	Comment noted. Historic England will be a statutory consultee to any future planning application affecting heritage assets.
	Infill development and redevelopment on brownfield sites will not always be appropriate (paragraphs 2.81.2.83).	Suggested amendment; 'Select infill and redevelopment opportunities on brownfield sites designed to overlook the park and establish an attractive edge <u>where this would not harm the significance of heritage assets</u> '. (paragraphs 2.81 and 2.82)
	Replace 'preserved' with 'protected' and do not reference listed buildings as separate to heritage assets (simply use heritage assets).	Suggested amendment; Replace ' preserved ' with ' <u>protected</u> ' in paragraphs 2.61 & 2.85. Replace ' listed buildings ' with ' <u>heritage assets</u> ' in paragraphs 2.4, 2.31, 2.85 and 3.29 and on pages 63, 65 and 67.
	Reference the other spires of St Mary's and St Michael's churches in paragraph 2.5.	Suggested amendment to reference the spires of St Mary's and St Michael's Churches.
	Biodiversity net gain and climate change should be referenced.	Suggested amendment to reference biodiversity net gain under Objective 6 (The Green and Sustainable City).
	Include road names on Masterplan map.	Suggested addition of road names on Masterplan Quarters plan.
	No funding is currently identified in the SCC capital programme for investment in the Birmingham Road corridor including improvements for sustainable transport.	Suggested amendment; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport funding from Staffordshire County Council - As Highway Authority, Staffordshire County Council will<u>could</u> play a key role via their involvement in the development of the Birmingham Road Corridor and Transport Hub in addition to their support for sustainable travel schemes including pedestrian and cycling initiatives; (paragraph 5.23)



	A clear challenge is the issue of climate change.	Comments noted. Masterplan Objective 6 (The Green & Sustainable City) seeks to promote climate change resilience.
	Need for EV Charging points, need for VMS signage, need for a shop signage policy and need for public art to be included in Masterplan.	Provision of EV charging points is to be considered as part of the planning application process, consistent with District and County Council policy requirements at that time. The masterplan identifies the potential use of public art.

Local Plan Review Update

Report of the Cabinet Member for Investment, Economic Growth & Tourism
Councillor I. Eadie



Date: 11 March 2020
Contact: Craig Jordan/Stephen Stray
Officer:
Tel Number: 01543 308202/308147
Email: craig.jordan@lichfielddc.gov.uk/stephen.stray@lichfielddc.gov.uk
Local Ward Members: All Members

**Economic Growth,
Environment and
Development
(Overview and
Scrutiny) Committee**

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The consultation on the Local Plan Review Preferred Options closed on the 24th January 2020.
- 1.2 Representations were received from approximately 460 individuals or organisations with a further 685 individual members of the public submitting a standard response regarding proposals for Burntwood. The consultation responses are currently being processed.
- 1.3 Whilst a range of supporting evidence has now been completed, further evidence is still required to support the publication (regulation 19) version.
- 1.4 The Local Plan evidence base completed to date is being reviewed internally with additional 'critical friend' support provided externally by a Barrister and Planning Consultancy.
- 1.5 The next version of the Local Plan will be the publication (regulation 19) version. At this formal stage, the document should be the Council's final position on the document with limited scope for further alteration.
- 1.6 It is proposed to amend the current Local Development Scheme programme so that the publication version consultation date changes from May 2020 to July 2020. This will allow sufficient time for the processing of representations to be completed and for the further work to support the evidence base to inform the publication version of the Local Plan. There is sufficient time within the LDS programme for this alteration without change to the timing of the subsequent steps including the submission date of January 2021. Members will recall that there is a commitment in the adopted Lichfield District Local Plan Allocations to submit a review of the Local Plan by no later than the end of December 2021.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the progress and next steps associated with the Local Plan Review.
- 2.2 That the Committee recommends that Cabinet approves the revised Local Development Scheme timetable set out in paragraph 3.9 of this report.

3. Background

- 3.1 Members will be aware that the Council published the Local Plan Review – Preferred Options for consultation from the 29th November 2019 for 8 weeks until the 24th January 2020. The Preferred Options version provided additional detail based on fresh evidence and responses received to the previous consultation of the Preferred Options & Policy Directions version held between January and March of 2019. It proposes changing the plan period to 2040 to align better with evidence base time periods. It also includes a revised approach to delivering a potentially achievable level of growth of approximately 11,780 new homes including a shortfall of 4500 contribution towards the Greater Birmingham and Black Country housing Market Area and an additional buffer of housing sites of around 20% – 25 %. It seeks to accommodate this growth whilst causing minimal impact on the Greenbelt. It therefore proposes changes when compared to the previous version of the emerging local plan in respect of how growth could be distributed across the district and its settlements. Most particularly, instead of proposing a distribution pattern allocating sites broadly in line with the settlement hierarchy, it seeks to allocate a significant proportion of the growth through the release of land for development via:
- Growth north of Lichfield City
 - Growth of the sustainable villages of Fradley, Fazeley, Mile Oak & Bonehill and Whittington
 - Sustainable growth of Burntwood
 - Marginal growth of the rural settlements
- 3.2 The plan acknowledges the level of employment need required but recognises that further work is still required at this stage to identify all the possible options for meeting this need. It furthermore, introduces the concept of a new settlement, the location of which would be determined in a future plan review period. The plan whilst seeking to minimise impact on the Green Belt also proposes some changes to it in order to accommodate the level of growth proposed and identifies areas of safeguarded land in which land is removed from the Green Belt for future plan review periods.
- 3.3 The responses to the latest consultation are now being processed. Representations were received from approximately 460 individuals / organisations. A further 685 individual members of the public submitted the same response which had been prepared and circulated by the Burntwood Action Group (BAG). The main themes being identified at the time of writing in respect of the responses reviewed to date are outlined in the bullet points below.
- Concern over the proposed allocations and the delivery of associated infrastructure requirements.
 - The sustainability of the revised strategy
 - Loss of Greenbelt and identification of safeguarded land
 - The consultation process
 - The level of additional housing that can be accommodated in Lichfield District to contribute towards meeting the identified Birmingham and the Black Country's unmet housing need.
 - To allocate sites not identified in the Preferred Options version November 2019
- 3.4 A more comprehensive summary of the key issues identified to date are outlined at Appendix A. This table will be added to when all of the representation responses have been processed. Following the finalisation of the inputting and careful review of all of the responses received, the full list of responses and comments along with a completed list of key issues will be reported back to this committee.

Evidence base

- 3.5 Whilst a significant amount of evidence has been gathered and completed to date and was published in support of the Preferred Options version of the Local Plan review, a significant amount of further evidence is still required, including evidence that is being prepared in partnership with other authorities where appropriate. It is anticipated that the areas of evidence outlined below will become

available to inform the emerging Local Plan during the April to June of 2020. The areas of evidence include:

- Infrastructure evidence including transport modelling and updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan
- Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Viability Evidence
- Staffordshire Low Carbon Study
- Stage 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)
- Open Space and Green Infrastructure Study
- Renewable Energy

- 3.6 In addition to the above areas of evidence required, it is considered prudent to critically review the evidence completed to date. This review is being undertaken internally, but also with additional 'critical friend' assistance from a Planning Barrister and in respect of the Green Belt Review a planning consultancy. Where possible, it will also be appropriate to update the completed evidence to support the publication (regulation 19 version) so that it is based on the most up to position.

Local Development Scheme

- 3.7 It is important that continued progress is made on the plan because there is a commitment in the adopted Lichfield District Local Plan Allocations to submit the Lichfield District Local Plan Review by no later than the end of December 2021. However, notwithstanding the need to progress, the Council will need to satisfy itself that upon submission of the plan, it is deemed to be 'sound' and legally compliant. The next version of the Local Plan will be the publication (regulation 19) version. At this formal stage, the document should be the Council's final position on the document with limited scope for further alteration before submission.
- 3.8 The current Local Development Scheme proposes the publication (regulation 19) version for consultation in May 2020 and for submission to the Secretary of State in January 2021. It is proposed to now amend the current Local Development Scheme programme so that the publication version consultation date changes from May 2020 to July 2020. This will allow sufficient time for the processing of representations to be completed and for the further work to support the evidence base to inform the publication version of the Local Plan. It is considered there is sufficient time within the LDS programme based on the information currently available to officers for this alteration to be done without change to the timing of the subsequent steps including the submission date of January 2021.

Next steps

- 3.9 It is proposed to amend the timetable in the Local Development Scheme in order for the publication (regulation 19) version to be published in July instead of May for the reasons outlined in this report. Accordingly, it is anticipated that a further report will be prepared for EGED Overview & Scrutiny in June 2020 that will prepare the way for the publication (regulation 19) version to be considered by Cabinet and then published in July 2020. It will be informed by careful review and response to the representations received to the Preferred Options consultation which closed on the 24th January 2020 and the additional evidence gathered. The full response to all of the representations received and all of the evidence subsequently gathered will be reported back to this committee in June 2020.

Alternative Options
1. Lichfield District could seek to publish the publication version of the plan in accordance with the Local Development Scheme timetable, however, there is insufficient time for the plan to be supported by consideration of the

	representations received or for a comprehensive evidence base to be gathered to support the publication version at this stage.
Consultation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consultation has been undertaken on the previous stages of the Local Plan Review. The Preferred Options document consultation has now closed and responses are being inputted and reviewed. 2. Consultation will be required on future stages of the Local Plan
Financial Implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Officer time will be needed to undertake future consultations on the Local Plan Review. 2. The costs of consultation will be met within approved budgets. 3. A budget has been established to support the Local Plan Review evidence base.
Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the priority of a vibrant and prosperous economy by identifying needs and opportunities for investment 2. Supports the priority of Healthy and Safe communities by ensuring the provision of housing. 3. Supports the priority of clean, green and welcoming places to live by assisting in allocating land for affordable housing, as well as supporting the delivery of residential and commercial developments.
Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An Equality Impact Assessment accompanies the Local Plan Review document. This will require ongoing update.
Crime & Safety Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None.
Environmental Impact	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council is required to assess the environmental impacts of any plan which it produces. Accordingly a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report accompanied the earlier Scope, Issues and Options version of the plan. Subsequent versions of the emerging Local Plan have been accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal and a Habitat Regulations Assessment. The Preferred Options Local Plan review version published in November 2019 was accompanied by updated versions of the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment which were also subject to the consultation process. These documents form an important part of the supporting evidence to the local plan review and help the council to assess the possible impacts of the plan and its policies and therefore how impacts can be addressed or mitigated against. These processes will continue to be undertaken at each stage of the Local Plan review.
GDPR/Privacy Impact Assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A privacy impact assessment was completed for the Preferred Options document.

	Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
A	The quantum of comments received means that officers do not meet the deadlines programmed.	It is considered that with the proposed revision to the LDS timetable, officers will be able to ensure efficient upload and turnaround of responses.	Yellow

B	Evidence base requirements emerge that were unforeseen.	Officers will need to continue to assess the need for evidence. It is considered that a delay in the timing of the publication version in the Local Development Scheme to July 2020 is required in order for the evidence base to be comprehensive.	Yellow
C	Evidence base being undertaken now identifies a risk to the Plan being sound.	Officers will need to continue to monitor emerging evidence base outputs. Where the risk of soundness is identified officers will need to consider all aspects of this risk before recommending an alternative Plan.	Yellow

Background documents

[Local Plan Review Preferred Options](#)

Relevant web links

[Local Plan Review](#)

[Local Plan Review Preferred Options](#)

[Evidence Base](#)

[Neighbourhood Plans](#)

Appendix A: Summary of key Issues to date*

Key Issues	Officer response
<p>Objection and concern at the consultation process undertaken by the Council. Suggestion that not enough was done to promote the consultation, particularly in those areas where strategic development is proposed.</p>	<p>The approach taken for the consultation was reported to members prior to the beginning of the consultation (Cabinet 12/11/2019). The consultation was conducted in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which sets out how the Council will undertake consultations. The approach to consultation (set out below) was in excess of the requirements of the adopted SCI.</p> <p>The consultation lasted for eight weeks (extended from six weeks to account for the Christmas and New Year period) during which;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letters (approx.3,200) and emails (approx. 2,400) were sent to all registered stakeholders on the Councils 'planning policy portal' to advise of the consultation; • Nine 'drop-in' events/exhibitions were held at venues across the District, including in those communities where development was proposed, these were attended by at least three members of the Spatial policy & Delivery Team where exhibition materials and copies of all relevant documentation were available; • 'Un-manned' exhibition was set up in Burntwood Library and posters advertising the consultation were placed in Lichfield Library; • Consultation was advertised in the local press and online via the Council's website and social media platforms; • Members of the team were made available each day throughout the consultation for queries over the phone and in person at District Council House.
<p>The proposed allocations and strategy within the preferred options document has moved away from the settlement hierarchy and approach set out within the previous consultation document (Preferred Options & Policy Directions 2019). Such an approach does not appear to be based upon the supporting evidence and results in development being directed away from certain settlements identified as sustainable within both the evidence and earlier consultation documents. In</p>	<p>Preferred options document includes four strategic development allocations and further allocated housing requirements to settlements within the settlement hierarchy. Locations identified for growth and the associated supporting evidence will be considered as the Local Plan progresses and the additional evidence work is completed.</p>

Key Issues	Officer response
<p>particular, some representors make the case that Burntwood should be allocated a greater level of growth given its location within the settlement hierarchy and that other settlements considered to be 'less sustainable' within the evidence and settlement hierarchy are receiving a higher level of growth.</p>	
<p>There is a lack of clarity/justification as to how the allocations and housing requirements for settlements have been arrived at.</p>	<p>A site selection paper discusses the approach to identification of proposed strategic sites. A Suite of evidence is used in forming a planning judgement as to the appropriate distribution and location of growth to meet requirements. The location of proposals will be considered as the Local Plan progresses and the additional evidence work is completed.</p>
<p>Consideration should be given to the distribution of housing in particular wider distribution to 'service villages' identified within the settlement hierarchy. Plan as written only allows for allocated sites, development within village settlement boundaries or as rural exception sites. Where settlements are allocated a housing number the presence of a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood area designation does not necessarily mean sites will be allocated.</p>	<p>Preferred options document includes four strategic development allocations and further allocated housing requirements to settlements within the settlement hierarchy. Where neighbourhood plans do not progress and/or do not seek to allocate to meeting housing requirements such issues will be addressed through a local plan allocations document.</p>
<p>The Council should provide less homes to meet the unmet needs arising from within the wider housing market area and that the contribution within the preferred options document has not been justified.</p>	<p>The previous consultation document suggested the Council consider testing a contribution of between 3,000 and 4,500 homes to meet unmet needs. The preferred options document refines this and suggests a contribution of 4,500 homes could be accommodated and be deliverable within the plan period. LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.</p>
<p>The Council should provide more homes to meet the unmet needs arising from within the wider housing market area and that the contribution within the preferred options document has not been justified.</p>	<p>The previous consultation document suggested the Council consider testing a contribution of between 3,000 and 4,500 homes to meet unmet needs. The preferred options document refines this and suggests a contribution of 4,500 homes could be accommodated and be deliverable within the plan period. LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.</p>

Key Issues	Officer response
Support for a new settlement approach in future plan period. However, this is unclear at this stage.	Preferred Options document sets out the approach to look for and support a new settlement within the District in future plan periods.
<p>Objection to proposed strategic housing allocation to the West of Fazeley (Policy SHA2). Concern is raised with regard to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing infrastructure, in particular roads, health facilities and schools, will not be able to cope with the level of growth. Pressure will be on infrastructure within Tamworth Borough. The scale of the allocation (800 homes) when compared to the current size of the village and that such growth is disproportionate. No 'exceptional circumstances' to release Green Belt for development. 	The preferred options document details the supporting infrastructure which would be required to be delivered alongside the strategic housing allocation. This includes provision of appropriate school facilities, access and highways infrastructure. The District Council will continue to engage with infrastructure providers to ensure appropriate infrastructure can and will be provided and planned for.
There are no 'exceptional circumstances' demonstrated to release Green Belt within the District.	Green Belt Review 2019 makes clear that 'exceptional circumstances' would need to be demonstrated if changes to the Green Belt boundary are proposed. This has been judged to be the case in the preferred options document as stated at paragraph 16.5 in terms of meeting development needs and the identification of new Green Belt to the north of Lichfield City.
Objection to the release of Green Belt around Burntwood for safeguarded land (at Coulter Lane). A number of responses were also related to this issue but considered that Green Belt was being released for development.	The preferred options document does not propose to release Green Belt at any location around Burntwood for development within the plan period. The document identifies land at Coulter Lane to be identified as 'Safeguarded Land' as defined within national policy. National policy states that consideration should be given that where changes to the Green Belt boundary are being proposed then areas of land between the urban area and the Green Belt (Safeguarded Land) should be identified to ensure the Green Belt boundary is capable of enduring beyond the plan period. The preferred options document identifies areas of such safeguarded land in conformity with national planning policy.
Objection to Green Belt release for development in Hammerwich off Norton Lane & Hospital Road and the 'downgrading' of Green Belt in the area.	There is no allocation or development proposed within the Green Belt in this location. The Green Belt has not been 'downgraded'. The Green Belt Review provides an assessment of parcels of Green Belt as

Key Issues	Officer response
	required by national guidance but does not change the status of Green Belt land.
The Green Belt Review 2019 is not a robust piece of evidence and should be removed from the evidence base supporting the Local Plan Review.	The Green Belt Review 2019 has been conducted based upon the methodology set out within the document. The methodology was subject two consultation with external stakeholders and the public prior to the commencement of the assessment work. The Green Belt Review has been subjected to a 'critical friend' (ARUP) review to ensure the evidence is sound.
Burntwood's infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the past growth and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable.	The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood.
Identification of a strategic housing allocation in Whittington is a different approach to many other villages. Why has the opportunity to identify through a review of the neighbourhood plan not been afforded to the village.	Site identified was considered to be strategic in the context of the village of Whittington. Evidence has been prepared which details the site selection process.
There is a lack of a specific affordable housing requirement (set out as a percentage) within the policy. This does not provide sufficient clarity for development proposals.	Evidence within the HEDNA suggests the Council will be justified in seeking to achieve as much affordable housing as viably possible on appropriate development sites. Further viability evidence is being collected which will inform the policy and provide a clear position in terms of the appropriate level of affordable housing to be sought.
With regard to employment land it should be made clear where new allocations are to be made and where existing allocated employment areas area. Council should consider whether a higher employment requirement is required considering the level of housing growth being proposed.	Existing allocated employment areas are identified on the policies maps which accompanied the Preferred Options document. Current evidence suggests there are limited additional options for locating employment growth, this is explicitly referred to within the consultation document. All possible options will need to be considered as the local plan review progresses.

NB

*** At the time of writing, approximately one fifth of the representations remain to be processed. Accordingly, it is anticipated that the list of key issues may be added to in due course.**

