

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, 6 March 2018

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, 14TH MARCH, 2018 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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Neil Turner', written in a cursive style.

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

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

Councillors Cox (Chairman), Drinkwater (Vice-Chair), Miss Hassall (Vice-Chair), Awty, Mrs Baker, Mrs England, Mrs Evans, Mrs Fisher, Marshall and Mrs Stanhope MBE



www.lichfielddc.gov.uk



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



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



[MyStaffs App](#)



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 1 - 4
4. Work Programme 5 - 6
5. Local Plan Update 7 - 34
6. Buildings at Risk Update 35 - 40
7. Review of 2017 Festivals and Events Programme & Preview of 2018 Programme 41 - 48



This page is intentionally left blank

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

23 JANUARY 2018

PRESENT:

Councillors Cox (Chairman), Drinkwater (Vice-Chair), Miss Hassall (Vice-Chair), Awty, Mrs Baker, Mrs Eagland, Mrs Evans, Marshall and Mrs Stanhope MBE.

(In accordance with Council Procedure Rule No.17 Councillors Smith, Spruce, Pullen, Pritchard and Wilcox attended the meeting).

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology was received from Councillor Mrs Fisher.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on the 19th September 2017 as circulated were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4 WORK PROGRAMME

Consideration was given to the work programme and it was reported that another meeting of the Car Park Strategy Member Task Group would be required and it was requested that this be arranged.

An update was also given by Councillor Mrs Baker in regard to the Public Realm Member Task Group and it was reported that a meeting with Officers had been scheduled and matters were progressing.

Details were requested on the item regarding Heritage Assets and it was confirmed that it did not include landscape but more the listed buildings on the "at risk" register. It was noted that this report would be considered at the March meeting.

Also at the March meeting, it was confirmed that there would be an item on Events in the District.

RESOLVED: That the work programme be noted.

5 LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

The Committee received a report giving an update on the consultation on the Draft Local Plan Allocations document which would be closing on the 19th February 2018. It was noted that after Officers had considered responses, a report would be submitted to Cabinet. The intention would then be to submit the Plan for Independent examination following the consultation process.

The report also updated Members on the Local Plan Review and the Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report that had been prepared to inform it. Other section of the report covered the implementation of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Governance Structure and Administration arrangements and the progress of Neighbourhood Plans.

Discussions focused around Neighbourhood Plans and concern was expressed that progress of the Burntwood plan had stalled and it was requested whether Lichfield District Council Officers could offer any assistance. It was reported that Officers were available to give Parishes advice and indeed it was in the District Council's interests to ensure neighbourhood plans were prepared in accordance with the Local Plan. An update on the Armitage with Handsacre Neighbourhood Plan and it was reported that the consultation responses were currently being considered.

It was noted that a decision was awaited for the Crown site and if approved would be considered as a windfall site. It was noted that the Curborough site would not be considered as a windfall site as is proposed to be included within the Local Plan Allocations document and as such the site would contribute to the housing requirements of the current Local Plan.

- RESOLVED:** (1) That the progress associated with the Local Plan Allocations be noted;
- (2) That the Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report be noted;
- (3) That the timetable proposed for initial consultation on the Local Plan Review be noted;
- (4) That Cabinet be recommended to approve the Local Plan Review Scoping document in line with the identified scope; and
- (5) That the recent progress in relation to neighbourhood plans within Lichfield District be noted.

6 NOTES OF THE LOCAL PLAN SUB GROUP

The Committee received the notes of the Local Plan Sub Group for the meetings held on the 5th October and 20th December 2017.

RESOLVED: That the noted be received.

7 IMPLEMENTING THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

The Committee received a report giving an update on progress with implementing the Council's Economic Development Strategy along with information on the current performance of the Strategic Plan's priority objective of delivering a Vibrant and Prosperous Economy.

It was reported that to deliver the strategy, activities could not be delivered by just the Council and so collaborative working with partners were being undertaken and the Committee discussed each of these partnership arrangements and activities separately.

The Tamworth and Lichfield shared business support service was confirmed to be still working well with daily communications between the sites and shared event hosting.

Local Business Groups was then discussed and it was noted that Officers gave support to both the Lichfield BID and Burntwood Business Community. It was asked if there were too many business groups in the area including the Chamber of Commerce and Federation of Businesses. It was reported that the groups focused on different areas including small

business or manufacturing and it was the Officer's role to help bring them together. It was requested if more collaborative working across these bodies could be encouraged.

It was reported that there were two European Funded Programmes and when asked, it was noted that they were due to end in March 2019 but an extension could be applied for.

The next section was Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and Growth Hubs and it was noted that the Council was a member of both the GBSLEP and SSLEP who offered different support. It was asked if there could be more signposting for businesses to know what each LEP could offer and it was reported that when referrals were received, both Growth Hubs were recommended. The Leader of the Council confirmed that the identity of the LEP's were an issue especially outside of the large cities and the GBSLEP had made a commitment to ensure this changed. There was concern that the level of investment in neighbouring authorities could have a knock on effect for the district however the Officers felt it was a positive effect.

Place was discussed and Members were pleased to note that the Olaf Johnson site in Burntwood had moved forward and felt residents would be happy to see progress. There was some concern that the number of affordable housing was small with 137 over five years. The level of premises within the district receiving Broadband was considered at length and Members felt the 5% still not able to access it was high and in turn having an impact on especially rural business opportunities materialising. It was reported that work was underway on alternative methods including community fibre partnerships to tackle this.

Under the section of Business, Members were pleased to note that there would be another survey undertaken and it was requested that details on focus, objectives and methodology be shared with the Committee when appropriate. Members were also pleased that a CRM system had been developed to capture information.

Regarding KPIs, it was requested whether information on lost and displaced jobs could also be recorded along with jobs created along with apprenticeships.

RESOLVED: That the current work being undertaken to deliver the priorities within the Economic Development Strategy for Lichfield District, performance having regard to the Council's priority objective of a Vibrant and Prosperous Economy, KPI's and economic development activities helping to deliver these KPI's be noted.

8 REVIEW OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Committee received a report seeking views on the size and operation of the Planning Committee. It was reported that the Development Management Service was subject to an independent review by the Planning Officers Society in December 2016 and as part of it, one of the recommendations was to look at the size of the Committee as it was larger than neighbouring authorities. It was reported that following this recommendation, a Member/Officer task group was set up to investigate this further. It was reported that best practice advice encouraged smaller committees as they were focused and offered greater consistency in decision making.

Performance regarding major planning appeals was considered and it was noted that although it had got better, the threshold had been changed meaning the council was in the lower quartile giving the risk of designation.

It was reported that after its investigations, the task group was in agreement that the Planning Committee should reduce to 15 Members with 3 further Councillors fully trained to act as replacements if circumstances arose. It was also suggested that the Committee Room host

the meetings as the visual and audio facilities were enhanced in that room. However the Chamber would still be used when large public galleries were anticipated.

The Committee were supportive of the views of the task group and also welcomed the opportunity to review the new Committee operation after one year. It was requested that, as much as possible, a good geographical spread in the Membership be achieved. It was also asked if types of training could be considered exemplifying day courses at Warwick University and the use of case studies.

RESOLVED: (1) That the report be noted and Planning Committee be recommended to approve:

- the reduction in the size of the Planning Committee to 15 Members;
 - the training of 3 additional Members to act as permanent replacements as circumstances arise;
 - the hosting of Planning Committee meetings in the Committee Room on the provision that the Council Chamber will still host when larger public galleries are anticipated; and
- (2) That the performance and operation of the new Planning Committee be subject to review by the Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee after one year of its operation.

(The Meeting closed at 8.25 pm)

CHAIRMAN

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2017-18

Item	Mar	Jun	Details/Reasons	Link to 2017/18 One Year Action Plan	Officer	Member Lead
Policy Development						
Terms of Reference		✓			Christine Lewis	
Festivals and Events		✓	Review of the 2017 programme and introduction to 2018 planned events		Lisa Clemson	
Car Parking Strategy review			Via a task group, review proposed potential changes to the service including evening and Sunday charging and success of Check in and Check Out trial.		John Roobottom	Cllr Ian Pritchard
Implementing the Local Plan	✓	✓	Reports on progress with the Local Plan Land Allocations Document and related SPD on the redevelopment of the former Rugeley Power Station site. Note: Local Plan matters are a standing item for the Committee		Ashley Baldwin	Cllr Ian Pritchard

Pages 5

Agenda Item 4

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2017-18

Item	Mar	Jun	Details/Reasons	Link to 2017/18 One Year Action Plan	Officer	Member Lead
Public Realm Friarsgate			For the task group to continue its work		Sarah Woffenden	Cllr Ian Pritchard
Protecting the district's Heritage Assets	✓		To review how the number of heritage assets on the 'at-risk' register could be reduced.		Claire Hines	Cllr Ian Pritchard

Local Plan update

Report of the Cabinet Member for Economic Growth, Environment & Development Services:
Councillor I. Pritchard



Date: 14th March 2018
 Contact Officer: Craig Jordan/ Ashley Baldwin
 Tel Number: 01543 308202/ 308147
 Email: craig.jordan@lichfielddc.gov.uk/
 ashley.baldwin@lichfielddc.gov.uk
 Key Decision? YES
 Local Ward ALL
 Members

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

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Consultation on the Draft Local Plan Allocations document (Regulation 19 Consultation) closed on the 19th February 2018. Officers are considering all responses received and will prepare a report to Cabinet. The intention is to submit the Plan for Independent Examination in May 2018 which will be in line with the adopted Local Development Scheme.
- 1.2 The Local Plan Strategy adopted in 2015 commits the Authority to preparing a Local Plan Review. To inform the Review a Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report has been subject to consultation. Responses to the consultation are set out at **APPENDIX A**.
- 1.3 Officers are preparing a Local Plan Review document for the purposes of public consultation in April 2018.
- 1.4 There is a need to update the Council's Statement of Community Involvement due to changes in legislation. These changes are however factual and will not require public consultation.
- 1.5 Neighbourhood Plan progress is positive with Lichfield City and Whittington & Fisherwick recently completing their referendums.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the comments received and officer responses to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report (**APPENDIX A**).
- 2.2 That the Committee notes the need to update the Council's Statement of Community Involvement as a result of legislative changes.
- 2.3 The Committee notes the ongoing progress in relation to neighbourhood plans within Lichfield District.

3. Background

Local Plan Allocations

- 3.1 Consultation on the Draft Local Plan Allocations document (Regulation 19 Consultation) took place during 8th January 2018 – 19th February 2018. In total 251 representations were received. These representations are currently being analysed by officers. This analysis will inform the next steps associated with the Local Plan Allocations progression.

3.2 Officers will prepare a report for consideration by Cabinet (1st May 2018) which will set out the next recommended steps. The adopted Local Development Scheme indicates that the next intended action is to submit the Plan for the purposes of Examination.

Local Plan Review

3.3 The adopted Local Development Scheme identifies April 2018 as the initial stage of consultation on the Local Plan Review.

3.4 As identified at the January EGED (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee meeting the review will cover:

- Review of vision and objectives;
- Review of policies contained within adopted Local Plan Strategy;
- The need to meet the requirements of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) inclusive of any legislative update;
- Identify options to assist with delivery of economic growth, inclusive of housing development;
- Deal with any gaps in the Local Plan framework;
- Review of supporting documents such as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

3.5 Officers are in the process of developing a draft document reflective of the above.

3.6 A Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report was subject to consultation, closing in January 2018. In total 10 responses were received. These responses have been processed, analysed and officer responses have been prepared (**APPENDIX A**).

3.7 The feedback received informs the emerging Local Plan Review Sustainability Appraisal, which in turn informs the emerging Local Plan Review document.

Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

3.8 There are a number of legislative changes associated with the SCI. This is due to recent amendments to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The changes are summarised below:

- Changes to the need to publicise the designation of a neighbourhood area and modification to neighbourhood areas
- Identification of which policies are strategic for the purposes of neighbourhood planning
- Add neighbourhood planning qualifying bodies to those required to be notified of planning applications
- From 1st June planning consultations should include extra days where bank holidays occur.
- A requirement to keep the SCI up to date and review it every 5 years
- From 1st June Permission in Principle and subsequent Technical Details Consent regime for non major residential development will come into force, requiring publicity

3.9 This will require a factual update of the SCI to be undertaken. At the time of writing it is not considered that any further changes will be required to the SCI. Due to the nature of changes required it is not proposed for public consultation to be undertaken on an updated version of the SCI.

Neighbourhood Plans

3.10 There is continued progress with a number of Neighbourhood Plans within the District. Both the Lichfield City and Whittington & Fisherwick neighbourhood plans have successfully proceeded through independent examination where it was recommended that both plans, subject to modifications, proceed to a referendum within their respective neighbourhood areas. The referendums for each plan took place on 22 February 2018. The referendum results were as follows; the Lichfield City neighbourhood plan referendum received a turnout of 17.0% with 2384 (57%) votes in favour and 1806 (43%) against the making of the neighbourhood plan; the Whittington & Fisherwick neighbourhood plan referendum received a turnout of 19.6% with 392 (90%) votes in favour and 43 (10%) against the making of the neighbourhood plan. The District Council will now prepare a decision statement proposing the 'making' of the neighbourhood plans and this will be reported to Cabinet and Full Council.

3.11 In addition to the above Neighbourhood Plans there has been further progress on a number of other Neighbourhood Plans which can be summarised as follows:

- Alrewas Neighbourhood Plan – Alrewas Parish Council have submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the District Council. The District Council consulted upon the draft plan between 5th January and 27th February 2018, this consultation period was extended after the Parish Council identified an error in the submission document. In order to ensure the plan was consulted upon for the required time period the District Council extended the consultation. The Alrewas Neighbourhood Plan is now being examined by the Independent Examiner who undertook the first examination on the previous draft Neighbourhood Plan. A report will be provided by the Independent Examiner in due course once the examination concludes. Following this Lichfield District Council will be required to consider the Examiners report and produce a decision statement which will outline whether the Neighbourhood Plan can proceed to referendum or not.
- Longdon Neighbourhood Plan – Longdon Parish Council have submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the District Council. The draft Neighbourhood Plan is currently being consulted upon prior to being submitted to an Independent Examiner for examination. The consultation will close on 9 March 2018.
- Armitage with Handsacre Neighbourhood Plan – Armitage with Handsacre Parish Council have submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the District Council. The draft Neighbourhood Plan is currently being consulted upon prior to being submitted to an independent examiner for examination. The consultation will close on 6 April 2018.
- Elford Neighbourhood Plan – Elford Parish Council recently undertook formal consultation on their draft Neighbourhood Plan. Lichfield District Council provided a number of comments on the plan Neighbourhood Plan and continues to work with the Parish Council as they progress.

3.12 Lichfield District Council will continue to work with communities providing advice and guidance throughout the Neighbourhood Plan process. This includes providing detailed comments and representations on drafts of the Neighbourhood Plans when requested by the Parish Councils.

3.13 Fazeley Parish Council recently expressed an interest in progressing a Neighbourhood Plan for their area, the District Council has provided initial advice on this basis and will continue to provide advice and support to the Parish should they determine to proceed to produce a Neighbourhood Plan.

Alternative Options	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Committee do not accept the proposed officer responses to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report consultation representations. 2. The Committee recommend that consultation on the changes to the Council's Statement of Community Involvement be undertaken.
---------------------	--

Consultation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consultation will be required on any major modifications to the Local Plan Allocations. 2. Consultation is required on the Local Plan Review.
Financial Implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The cost of any future Examination in Public has been estimated along with the need to seek Counsel support, this is reflected in the MTFS as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Local Plan Allocations Examination in Public costs 2018/19 £60,000 2. Earmarked Reserves to cover legal fees and consultancy support £30,000. 3. Officer time will be needed to run consultation events on the Local Plan Review. 4. There will be a need to commission evidence associated with the Local Plan Review.
Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the priority of a vibrant and prosperous economy as it assists in the delivery of the planning function of the Council. 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 Allocations. 2. An Equality Impact Assessment will accompany the Local Plan Review
Crime & Safety Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None.

	Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
A	Clarity over the GBHMA shortfall is not achieved and the Council are unable to effectively progress with the Local Plan Review.	Officers continue dialogue with neighbouring authorities on this matter. Consideration of any outcomes arising from the GBHMA shortfall will be made as new evidence is published.	Yellow
B	Evidence required to support the Local Plan Review has a detrimental impact on the proposed timescales and allocated budget.	Consideration of evidence base requirements is an iterative process. Officers will continue engagement with stakeholders involved in shaping evidence base requirements to ensure the initial scope is clear. Project management practices are followed in the preparation and delivery of evidence base. New requirements arising from external factors such as future consultations will be considered by officers.	Yellow
C	Modification requirements are proposed by the Local Plan Allocations Inspector which detrimentally impacts the timetable for adoption.	Officers will consider Inspector findings and if modifications are required an updated timetable will be presented to Members.	Yellow

Background documents:

Local Plan Strategy 2015

Local Plan Allocations Regulation 19 (Focused Changes) consultation

Statement of Community Involvement

Local Development Scheme

Relevant web links:

[Local Plan Strategy 2015](#)

[Local Plan Allocations Regulation 19 \(Focused Changes\) consultation](#)

[Statement of Community Involvement](#)

[Local Development Scheme](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

Local Plan Review Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report: Consultation Sheet

Comment	Response
<p>Statutory Organisation: Historic England</p>	
<p>We welcome the reference to the up to date National Heritage List for England on page 18 and would also recommend that you refer to the latest Heritage at Risk Register, 2017, to ensure that all of the baseline data is up to date. I enclose a link to the recent West Midlands document, below: https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/har-2017-registers/wm-har-register2017.pdf/</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation Insert “There are a number of entries for Lichfield on the 2017 Heritage at Risk Register including 4 scheduled monuments, 3 Grade II* Listed Buildings and a Conservation Area” in the Townscape and Historic Environment section in the Baseline Data Section.</p>
<p>On page 25 within the table discussing baseline information, do you have any detail about local list heritage assets, likely non designated archaeology resource across the Borough?</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation Information on local list heritage assets and likely non-designated archaeology resource within the District will be added to the baseline information section of the Scoping Report.</p>
<p>We welcome the inclusion of a specific indicator for cultural heritage on page 30 and are pleased to see the inclusion of protection and enhancement, as the overall aspirations for the Plan. May we enquire as to why only Grade II are referenced in the monitoring objectives? Is it because development that will harm Grade II* and Grade I will be wholly resisted by the Council? What about harm to their setting aswell? How will you positively reduce risk to the 13 Grade II* and Grade I assets on the register currently?</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation Delete ‘Grade II’ from the sentence ‘Number of Grade II Buildings considered to be buildings at risk’ and replace with the word ‘Listed’ in Table 5.1, Section 12 ‘Likely Evolution without a Plan’ column. The number of Grade II and II* are currently incorrect due to a typographical error in Appendix B. The sentence should be amended to reflect that the District has 4 Grade I and Grade II* assets and 13 Grade II assets in the Historic Environment Indicator in Appendix B.</p>
<p>We would further recommend the inclusion of targets for the monitoring indicators – for example at risk buildings we would want to see a % reduction in at risk buildings as a result of the Local Plan and a no net increase of damage to the historic environment but a % decrease in damage, for example.</p>	<p>Duly Noted The monitoring indicators for all Objectives do not include percentage gains. It would be difficult to set a meaningful percentage improvement or decline figure at this point. Further, the ability of the Local Plan to directly influence % ‘damage’ caused to the historic environment is restricted.</p>

	<p>Recommendation None</p>
We support the inclusion of an objective on historic landscape on page 30.	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation None</p>
Page 60, within the table, suggest delete the term 'important' and instead protect heritage assets.	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Delete the word 'important' from the sentence 'The Local Plan Review should develop policy that protects important heritage assets' in Appendix A under 'Historic England Corporate Plan 2016- 2019'.</p>
<p>Within the SWOT analysis on page 104, will development pressure also be a threat for the medieval core or is there no development planned in this area?</p> <p>Also what about building heights which could threaten the setting of Lichfield Cathedral and other heritage assets?</p>	<p>Duly Noted The information requested in regards to buildings heights and the setting of Lichfield Cathedral is mentioned within Paragraph 2.69 of the Historic Environment SPD from which the SWOT Analysis is summarised from, which states that 'the layout of new development should be designed to... protect local views'. Recommendation Remove the SWOT Analysis table from the Historic Environment Section of Appendix B to avoid confusion.</p>
We are interested to work with the Council on their planning policies to address the issues identified on page 104.	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation None</p>
We would further recommend listing the three Good Practice Advice Notes and our range of Historic Environment Advice Notes within the section on relevant plans, as these advice documents will assist in the delivery of the local plan review. Please see our website for further details.	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation The following documents will be included in the review of Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies: GPA1 – Local Plan Making Historic England Advice Note 3 – The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans. Historic England Advice Note 8 – Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environment Assessment.</p>

<p>Additionally, please find enclosed a link to an Historic England advice note for Strategic Environmental Assessment and the historic environment. https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/sustainability-appraisal-and-strategic-environmental-assessment-advice-note-8/heag036-sustainability-appraisal-strategic-environmental-assessment.pdf/</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation See above.</p>
<p>Statutory Organisation: Natural England</p>	
<p>We acknowledge the context for this consultation i.e the benefits of early review of the district’s local plan strategy in terms of the planning challenge posed in relation to housing supply for the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation None</p>
<p><u>Biodiversity</u> We welcome the report’s coverage of biodiversity themes and issues.</p> <p>We note that the entry regarding European Sites in Appendix B1 links to previous Habitats Regulations assessment (HRA) of the existing local plan strategy and the conclusion that only Cannock Chase SAC and the River Mease SAC require measures to avoid and mitigate adverse effects on their integrity. With regard to the assessment during local plan making of road traffic impacts upon air quality Natural England draws your attention to the High Court judgement in March last year dealing with the methodology for assessment of air quality impacts on statutory nature conservation sites. Referred to as the ‘Wealden Judgement’ this case law affects Local Planning Authorities’ approach to the assessment of ‘cross border’ and in combination effects due to road traffic generated by planned new development.</p>	<p>Duly noted and consideration will be given to the Wealden Judgement during the site and policy assessment stage in particular at cumulative effects section, additionally the Judgement will also be considered via the updated Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA).</p> <p>Recommendation Add ‘<i>Potential risk from cumulative impacts including from cross border upon European and nationally designated sites</i>’ in Table 4.1 - Sustainability Issues in the Landscape and Ecology section.</p> <p>Further include the following text to the Baseline Information taken from - Improvement Programme for England’s Natura 2000 Sites Site Improvement Plan, River Mease, October 2014 and Improvement Programme for England’s Natura 2000 Sites: Site Improvement Plan, Cannock Chase, October 2014:</p> <p><i>“Both sites currently are in unfavourable condition with pressures including drainage, air pollution, invasive species, hydrological changes, visitors, water abstraction, siltation and water pollution”</i></p> <p>After ‘There are 7 Special Areas of Conservation... and the River Mease SAC’ in the Landscape and Ecology section in the Baseline Data.</p>

<p>We note the scoping report's inclusion of two Air Quality Management Areas at the A38 between Lichfield and Alrewas and at Muckley Corner on the A5. In terms of European and nationally designated sites further consideration in relation to the Wealden Judgement may be needed. Natural England will liaise with the Council accordingly during the review of the local plan strategy.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Please see comments above regarding the Wealden Judgement.</p>
<p><u>Geodiversity</u> We note that the appendices appear to omit any reference to geodiversity and local geological sites. This should be addressed as the SA process moves on to the next stage.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation A geodiversity section to be included in Appendix B, and the inclusion of a LoG site at Barrack Lane Quarry in Hammerwich to be added within the section.</p>
<p><u>Landscape</u> Wider landscapes and landscape character - We note that the district includes the following National Character Assessment³ (NCA) areas: Needwood & South Derbyshire Claylands Cannock Chase to Cank Wood Trent Valley Washlands Mease/Sence lowlands</p> <p>In order to understand and characterise likely trends we advise that the strategic environmental objectives (SEOs) for each NCA area are considered and relevant material from these SEO reflected in the SA process. This approach would reflect NPPF para 156 (i.e. Seeking to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes).</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation Add '<i>and 4 National Character Assessment (NCA) areas.</i>' to the end of sentence 'Lichfield supports a variety of wildlife rich habitats...78 sites of Biological Interest' in Table 4.1 in the Landscape and Ecology section Add '<i>Needwood & South Derbyshire Claylands Cannock Chase to Cank Wood Trent Valley Washlands Mease/Sence lowlands</i>' to Appendix B under Landscape Character on page 109</p>
<p>Given the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area issue you may also wish to consider commissioning a landscape sensitivity and capacity assessment in order to objectively assess the effects of new development in the context of the district's various landscape settings. The following link provides information: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/landscape-and-seascape-character-assessments</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation Historic Environment Landscape Character Assessment and a Landscape Character assessment are identified as key studies/subject areas that the Council consider necessary to support the Local Plan Review.</p>
<p><u>Soils and agricultural land quality</u> We welcome the scoping report's reference to this subject on the map in figure 3.8 of the report</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation None</p>

<p><u>Proposed Objective 4</u> 4. 'Maximise the use of previously developed land/ buildings and encourage the efficient use of land'. We acknowledge the main thrust of this objective but would also emphasise the synergies that can exist between long-standing brownfield/previously developed land and biodiversity value. The proposed % metric would present a more refined message if a corresponding % metric was used to express the proportion of previously developed sites retained and managed as an asset for biodiversity and/or green/open space.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Policy NR3: Biodiversity, Protected Species and their Habitats currently uses this methodology. The policy review element of this will consider how any future policies within the Local Plan Review should incorporate a % metric method. Recommendation None</p>
<p><u>Proposed Objective 7</u> 7. 'To reduce water and air pollution'. Acknowledging the linkages between this objective and the subsequent objectives 9 and 11 it would appear logical to amend the text of no.7 to read 'to reduce and manage water and air pollution'</p>	<p>Duly Noted Please see comment from Environment Agency below. Objective 7 reworded to "<i>To manage availability of water resources, and to reduce water and air pollution</i>". Recommendation None</p>
<p><u>Indicators</u> A significant number of the proposed sustainability objectives may be achieved by means of creating, restoring and enhancing areas of green (and blue) infrastructure and providing for their subsequent management. The indicators presented so far do not appear to include metrics that recognise or measure this synergy. A variety of metrics may be appropriate to reflect the multi-functional benefits of green infrastructure resources, for example: - Extent of open/greenspace created restored or enhanced. - Sustainable transport links created (footpaths, cycleways). - SUDS incorporated into the design of new developments</p>	<p>Duly Noted Whilst this is something that we support, the creation of additional indicators with monitoring requirements has resource implications. The SUDS Indicator is already captured and the following will be incorporated. Recommendation Add '<i>Extent of open/ greenspace created, restored or enhanced</i>' to the Indicator section for Proposed Objective 7 in Table 5.1. Add '<i>Sustainable transport links created (footpaths, cycleways)</i>' to Proposed Objective 14 in Table 5.1.</p>
<p>Statutory Consultee: Environment Agency</p>	
<p><u>Chapter 2 Relevant policies and programmes</u> The following documents should be added for consideration within the SEA/SA process: Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments (PFRAs) were originally published in 2011 under the Floods Directive and are in the process of being revised for publication in December 2017. The 2011 PFRA for Staffordshire can be viewed here: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328094437/http://www.environment</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation The following documents will be included in the review of Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments (PFRAs), 2011 • Humber Flood Risk Management Plan 2016 </p>

<p>ent-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/135526.aspx#</p> <p>The Humber Flood Risk Management Plan 2016 should be included in the list of relevant plans and Appendix A. This is a different plan from the Humber RBMP and just covers flood risk. Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs) highlight the hazards and risks of flooding from rivers, the sea, surface water, groundwater and reservoirs, and set out how Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) work together with communities to manage flood risk.</p> <p>Your Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) should be included, although this will require updating to support the Local Plan Review.</p>	
<p><u>Chapter 3 Baseline Information</u> <u>Population, Housing & Communities</u></p> <p>Some of the key existing rural settlements identified for housing growth currently have flood risk issues which need to be taken into account when identifying locations for new development. Comments on specific locations have already been provided as part of the Local Plan Allocations 2008 - 2029 Consultation in 2017, but please see a summary below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armitage with Handsacre: Villages are adjacent to the River Trent floodplain. Existing Environment Agency maintained flood defences help to reduce flood risk in some locations. Parts of the villages are also covered by Environment Agency Flood Warning Areas. • Alrewas: Alrewas is located at the confluence of the Rivers Trent and Tame and the Curborough Brook and is surrounded by Flood Zone 3 and 2 on two sides of the village. Parts of the village are covered by Environment Agency Flood Warning Areas. Any new development should avoid these areas. • Shenstone: The Fotherley Brook at Shenstone has areas of Flood Zones 3 and 2 associated with it. Any new development should avoid these areas. • Fazeley Mile Oak & Bonehill: Parts of Fazeley are at risk of flooding from the River Tame / Bourne Brook. Environment Agency maintained flood defences reduce food risk to some areas and Environment Agency Flood Warning areas also cover some locations. 	<p>Duly noted, consideration will be given to the information provided during the policy and site assessment stage.</p> <p>Recommendation None</p>

<p><u>Landscape & Ecology</u></p> <p>Although flood risk is not widespread throughout the plan area, flooding in the more rural communities often affects a relatively small number of properties and can be caused by complex flooding mechanisms. It is important for these communities to take measures to improve their preparedness by working closely with organisations such as the Environment Agency, district and county councils and the National Flood Forum.</p> <p>The impacts of climate change are likely to increase flood risk and flooding incidents. We recommend this section references the climate change allowances for flood risk available as part of the NPPG here (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances). Table 1 identifies how high vulnerability development such as housing will need an additional 30% added to allow for the impacts of climate change on flood levels in the Humber district. Impacts will vary according to the type of development proposed and its projected lifespan, however climate change allowances are generally higher than that used under previous guidance. This links to the Climate, Energy and Waste section.</p>	<p>Duly noted</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The sentence “<i>The impacts of climate change are likely to increase flood risk and flooding incidents. As a result of this climate change allowances in regards to flood risk will need an additional 30% added for high vulnerability developments such as housing to allow for the impacts of climate change on flood levels in the Humber district . This increased risk of flooding in turn creates water pollution issues</i>” has been added to the ‘Climate, Energy and Waste’ section of the Baseline Data.</p>
<p>A sustainable approach to flood risk management should consider the natural functions of rivers and reduce long term dependence on raised flood defences. This includes identifying opportunities to better utilise areas of natural floodplain to store flood waters and to attenuate rainwater that will reduce flood risk within the plan area and further downstream. Natural Flood Management measures could play an important role in managing overall flood risk and should be encouraged wherever possible. Your Authority should work with other bodies and landowners encourage and promote implementation of natural flood risk management measures which will contribute towards delivering a reduction in local and catchment-wide flood risk and impacts of climate change as well as achieving wider environmental benefits. This should be linked in with the wider objectives of the Humber River Basin Management Plan under Water Framework Directive (WFD).</p> <p>Further advice on how your SFRA should be updated can be found at the bottom of this letter.</p>	<p>Duly Noted</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>None</p>

<p>As referenced within the Humber RBMP and CAMS documents, there are number of the waterbodies within Lichfield District are under pressure with regards to water availability with the Lichfield and Shenstone GWMU and Bourne/Black Brook being classified as currently 'over abstracted'. The development implications of this is considered further within your 2010 Water Cycle Study, which needs to be updated to support the Local Plan Review.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation Following text to added to the Baseline Information, Landscape ecology <i>"As referenced within the Humber RBMP and CAMS documents, there are number of the waterbodies within Lichfield District are under pressure with regards to water availability with the Lichfield and Shenstone GWMU and Bourne/Black Brook being classified as currently 'over abstracted'"</i></p> <p>Further a Water Cycle Study has been identified as a key study to support the Local Plan Review.</p>
<p><u>Climate, Energy and Waste</u> This section should reference the impacts of climate change on flood risk (as detailed above) and correspondingly the impacts of increased flooding on water pollution issues and correspondingly Water Framework Directive failure.</p>	<p>Duly noted Please see above comment on Landscape and Ecology regarding climate change and increased climate change allowances. Recommendation None</p>
<p><u>Chapter 4 Identifying Sustainability Issues</u> <u>Key Sustainability Issues</u> Table 4.1, Landscape and Ecology – Climate change is likely to increase the risk of flooding and this should be acknowledged on page 25.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation The sentence '<i>Climate change is likely to increase the risk of flooding</i>' has been added to Table 4.1 within the Landscape and Ecology section.</p>
<p>Page 26 under Climate, Energy and Waste should be reworded to reflect the wider remit of the Water Framework in improving the ecology of watercourses, not just the water quality. This is in line with the RBMP objectives (not Environment Agency objectives) which all Authorities have a legal duty to support in operating their functions. This should be reworded to state:</p> <p><i>Bring water bodies up to Good Status in line with the objectives of the Humber River Basin Management Plan (RBMP).</i></p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation The sentence 'Bring up water to a 'good quality' standard rating in line with Environment Agency objectives' has been reworded to '<i>Bring water bodies up to Good Status in line with the objectives of the Humber River Basin Management Plan (RBMP)</i>' in Table 4.1 on page 28.</p>

<p>As advised above in the Baseline Data section, there are areas of Lichfield that suffer from low water resources and as such restrictions are in place to protect availability. Growth will need to take this into account, and early consultation with utility providers will be even more important to inform development proposals. The Local Plan Review will need to be supported by an up to date Water Cycle Study to further assess this.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Reference to low water resources and its influence on growth has been included in the Landscape and Ecology section of the Baseline Data section.</p>
<p><u>Chapter 5 Sustainability Objectives</u> We welcome objectives 7 and 9 in relation to flooding and pollution. We support the indicators relating to corresponding planning decisions contrary to our advice, and can provide data in relation to this here (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environment-agency-objections-to-planning-on-the-basis-of-flood-risk).</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation None</p>
<p>We recommend that Objective 7 is revised however to reflect pressure on availability of water resources. This should read <i>“To manage availability of water resources, and to reduce water and air pollution”</i>.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Objective 7 has been revised to read <i>‘To manage availability of water resources, and to reduce water and air pollution’</i>.</p>
<p><u>Appendix A</u> Page 53, Flood & Water Management Act 2010 (5th bullet point) – This is factually incorrect as Schedule 3 of the FWMA has not been commenced. Instead the government has focussed on using the planning system for increasing the installation of SuDS in new developments. The DCLG ministerial statement released in December 2014 states that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) should “ensure that through the use of planning conditions or planning obligations that there are clear arrangements in place for ongoing maintenance over the lifetime of the development.” Defra has also published non-statutory technical standards for the design, maintenance and operation of SuDS to drain surface water.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation The fifth bullet point has been deleted and replaced by the sentence <i>‘Local authority should ensure that through the use of planning consideration or planning obligations that there are clear arrangements in place for ongoing maintenance over the lifetime of the development’</i> in Appendix A under the ‘Flood & Water Management Act 2010’.</p>
<p>The Humber <u>Flood Risk Management Plan 2016</u> should be included in the list of relevant plans</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation The following documents will be included in the review of Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Humber Flood Risk Management Plan 2016
<p><u>Appendix B</u> Page 98, Fluvial Flood Risk - The Bourne Brook, Fotherley Brook, Mare Brook and Curborough Brook should be added to the list of rivers.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation The following have been added to the list of rivers in the Fluvial Flood Risk Section in Appendix B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bourne Brook • Fotherley Brook • Mare Brook • Curborough Brook
Cannock Chase AONB Joint Committee	
<p>1 - The inclusion of the AONB Management Plan (2014-19) in the consideration of relevant policies, plans and programmes (section 2) is very welcome. You should note that this is to be reviewed over the next year or so.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation None</p>
<p>2 – The brief reference to the AONB (and the Cannock Chase SAC) on page 19 under Landscape and Ecology is acknowledged, but I wonder if the importance of the AONB as a nationally designated landscape is understated? In addition, it would be helpful to see a map showing the AONB boundary included.</p>	<p>Duly noted. The Landscape ecology section of the Baseline section of the report does not provide a visual identification of the geographical location of any of the Districts natural assets, it would be difficult to provide a full and comprehensive picture at a readable scale. The AONB features within the Baseline data presented with the Scoping Report. Recommendation None</p>
<p>3 – In Section 4 (Sustainability Issues), reference could be made (under Landscape & Ecology) to the unique character of the AONB in terms of the extent of the built-up areas around it and the pressures that this brings.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Add the following to Table 4.1 in the Landscape and Ecology section in the Likely evolution without the plan column <i>“Unmitigated impact on the unique character of the AONB”</i>.</p>
<p>4 – In Section 5 (SA framework), the need to protect the landscape, scenic beauty and quiet enjoyment of the AONB (as specified in the NPPF and the CROW act) could be included as an additional sustainability objective with specific indicators included under Landscape on page 30.</p>	<p>Duly noted Objective 11 and in particular Objective 13 will enable such an assessment to be considered. Recommendation None</p>

<p>Taking into account the above, I am satisfied that the process for the remaining stages and intended consultation, as described on pages 32, 33 and 34 are comprehensive and robust.</p>	
<p>5 – In terms of the Appendices, we welcome the reference to the CRoW Act and the AONB on page 46 but I feel that a specific reference to the recognition of the importance of AONBs (and National Parks in the NPPF – paras. 115/116) could be included in the section on page55/56. We welcome the reference to the current AONB Management Plan and the SAC Access Management Measures on pages 68 & 69.</p>	<p>Duly Noted The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is included within the Relevant policies, plans and programmes section of the Scoping Report and is considered as a whole document. Recommendation None</p>
<p>Birmingham City Council</p>	
<p>Thank you for consulting Birmingham City Council on the Lichfield District Council Local Plan Review Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.</p> <p>We have no comments to make on the report.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation None</p>
<p>Harborough District Council</p>	
<p>Many thanks for you recent email. I confirm that Harborough District Council does not have any comments to make on Lichfield District Council Local Plan Review SA/SEA Scoping Report.</p> <p>For future reference correspondence concerning planning policy matters can be sent directly to the Council’s Strategic Planning Team using the following email address planningpolicy@harborough.gov.uk.</p>	<p>Duly Noted Recommendation None</p>
<p>Highways England</p>	
<p>Section 2 defines all relevant documents which will or have informed the SA process. It is important to recognise that Circular 02/2013 ‘The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development’ is highly material, as this sets out the Government’s approach to new development impacting on the SRN and how the network will be safeguarded and protected, in order to deliver sustainable economic growth.</p> <p>It also includes guidance on when new accesses to the SRN will be acceptable, the implications of traffic growth for plan making and policies for specific activities, including roadside facilities. Given the relevance of these policies to development</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation The following documents will be included in the review of Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development.

plan decisions in Lichfield, it is therefore recommended that this is a key policy document which should be referenced in section 2.	
Section 3 considers baseline transport conditions, but does not acknowledge that there are existing issues of highway safety and capacity in the District. It is recommended that the SA acknowledges the extant issues (for example at the A5 Muckley Corner, A38 Wall Island, A38 Swinfen, A38 Hilliard's Cross and A38 Fradley junctions) and gives a commitment to considering the impact of development scenarios on key congestion points and the opportunities to mitigate and manage these effectively (drawing on robust transport evidence). This is a key consideration in the assessment of sustainable development.	Duly noted. Consideration will be given to the impact on referenced junctions as part of the assessment of Sites and policies. Further, Transport studies will inform the Local Plan Strategy review and be considered where necessary by the District during the review. The Local Plan review will be supported by an Infrastructure Development Plan Recommendation Section 3 Baseline Information will be amended to include reference to the Strategic Road Network located within in the District including the junctions identified within the representation.
Section 4 considers the key sustainability issues for the District. Under the 'transport and movement' section, it is important to recognise the inherent links between traffic congestion and not attaining sustainable economic growth and for this to be recorded as a risk. In the absence of a Plan and an associated strategy for infrastructure delivery, there is a real risk to business growth and productivity in the District arising from an inefficient or congested road network.	Duly noted. These effects will be captured through Sustainability Objective 6. Recommendation None
Section 5 defines a range of mechanisms for measuring and reviewing development options and scenarios against development plan objectives. It is recommended that robust transport modelling also be cited as an appropriate means (e.g. up to date traffic modelling) of testing performance against these objectives and that this is expected to be an integral part of the Local Plan review process.	Duly noted Recommendation None
National Grid	
We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.	Duly noted Recommendation None
Wardell Armstrong on behalf of the Leavesley Group	
The Report in its introduction correctly avers to 'assisting with the Greater Birmingham HMA shortfall'. In this context the Scoping Report should encompass all the evidence being brought forward through relevant reports as part of this process,	Duly noted Evidence that informs cumulative effects will be considered as part of the assessment of effect.

<p>in that whilst they may be wider based than the Lichfield District they are setting the context for 'cross boundary matters' (fourth bullet point of Review considerations).</p> <p>It is suggested that this Scope, as well as quantum and location should also include type of development in that Governmental priorities included specific provision of housing for the elderly and custom and self-build.</p>	<p>Further, Sustainability Objective 1 will be used to assess housing and local need.</p> <p>Recommendation None</p>
<p>It is noted that there is only passing reference to Green Belt at page 9, and also the matter of rural growth restraint. There is however no reference to baseline studies that were undertaken to form the basis of the Local Plan Strategy 2015. These include Green Belt Studies (two reports); Landscape character / capacity, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and housing studies including the SHMA and SHLAA. It is recommended that these are relevant to the Plan Review.</p>	<p>Duly noted The evidence base of the Local Plan Strategy will be reviewed as part of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Recommendation None</p>
<p>Section 5 infers that the Sustainability objectives are fixed. It is conversely recommended that these be reviewed to include broader consideration of housing provision, including for the elderly, and custom and self-build.</p> <p>There is also a lack of an objective related to the provision of suitable facilities to serve local needs in accessible locations.</p>	<p>Duly noted Further, Sustainability Objective 1 will be used to assess housing and local need.</p> <p>Sustainability Objectives 13 and 14 feature townscape and accessibility.</p> <p>Recommendation None</p>
<p>Staffordshire County Council</p>	
<p><u>Ecology and Landscape</u> <i>Section 2 Relevant policies, plans and programmes</i> Consideration could be given to referring to the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping carried out for the District by Natural England. In addition there is work being carried out in regard of Cannock Chase to Sutton Park and Connecting Cannock Chase related to mapping and analysis of opportunities for heathland and other habitat creation to enhance connectivity.</p>	<p>Duly noted Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping is carried out by the District Council which is referred to in the Biodiversity and Development SPD, Dec 2016 as well as in Policy NR3: Biodiversity Protected Species and their Habitats</p> <p>Recommendation Include reference to the Connecting Cannock Chase – Lowland Heath Project and the Cannock Chase to Sutton Park Biodiversity Enhancement Area within Section 2- Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies and Appendix B.</p>
<p><i>Section 3. Baseline Information</i></p>	<p>Duly noted</p>

<p>In listing landscape scale initiatives for biodiversity enhancement the Landscape and Ecology section could refer to the Transforming the Trent Valley Partnership project which recently achieved Heritage Lottery funding see http://www.staffs-wildlife.org.uk/TTTTV .</p>	<p>Recommendation Include reference to Transforming the Trent Valley Partnership project within the Landscape and Ecology section of the Baseline Information.</p>
<p>In regard of the Staffordshire Minerals Plan Land to the west of the A38 within Alrewas Parish has been identified as an area of search rather than as a potential new sand and gravel site.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Amend sentence on page 19 to read '<i>Land to the West of the A38 within Alrewas Parish has been identified as an areas of search within Policy 1: Provision for Sand and Gravel</i>'.</p>
<p>There is a typographical error – wildlife sites of County importance are Sites of Biological <u>Importance</u> (not Interest).</p> <p>You might wish to refer to Ancient Woodland area especially as this will be impacted by HS2.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Amend typographical error on page 19 to read '<i>Sites of Biological Importance</i>'. Reference to Ancient Woodland has been included within the Landscape and Ecology section of the Baseline Information.</p>
<p><i>Section 4. Identifying Sustainability Issues</i> Table 4.1 Clarity is needed under Landscape and Ecology: Natural England has designated Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), 'to conserve and enhance its natural beauty'. Although factors such as ecology and natural heritage contribute to the decision to designate the area an AONB, landscape and scenic quality are of prime importance in order that it meets the 'natural beauty criterion'. The Local Authority needs to ensure that all decisions have regard for the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB, and decisions and activities must consider the potential effect both within the AONB and on the setting of the AONB.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation None, see comment from the AONB Joint Committee regarding Section 4 of the report.</p>
<p>In regard of Table 4.1 Likely Evolution without the Plan, impacts could be adverse effects on the integrity of Cannock Chase SAC and of the River Mease SAC due to unmitigated development.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation '<i>Adverse effects on the integrity of Cannock Chase SAC and of the River Mease SAC due to unmitigated development</i>' has been</p>

	added within Table 4.1 in the Likely Evolution without a Plan related to Landscape and Ecology.
<p><i>Section 5. Sustainability Appraisal Framework</i> Table 5.1 It is suggested that for objective 11, to promote biodiversity protection enhancement and management of species and habitats, an indicator could <i>condition of internationally/ nationally designated sites</i>. Rather than <i>number and type of internationally/ nationally designated sites</i>, which the Local Plan cannot influence, but Plan policies can influence the suggested indicator.</p>	Duly noted Recommendation Amend Indicator to read ' <i>Condition of internationally/ nationally designated sites</i> '.
Number of species relevant to the District which have achieved BAP is not a meaningful indicator. In regard of species, any indicator needs to be related to Plan policies. Measuring and monitoring species indicators can be challenging and resource intensive. A meaningful and measurable indicator could be % of planning consents that include enhancement for species.	Duly noted Recommendation Remove indicator 'Number of species relevant to the District which have achieved BAP' and replace with: ' <i>Number of planning permission granted where no net gain in biodiversity was able to be achieved</i> '.
It is suggested under Objective 13 reference is made to the need to conserve and enhance the AONB and its setting.	Duly noted Objective 13 is inclusive of all landscape and townscapes and therefore specific reference to sites are not necessary. Recommendation None
<p><u>Historic Environment</u> <i>Section 2 Relevant policies, plans and programmes</i></p> <p>Consideration could also be given to including the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979) and the three Extensive Urban Surveys (EUS) undertaken for Lichfield, Alrewas and Colton within the SEA. The three EUS studies were chosen as having originated as medieval market towns and include an assessment of the significance of their historic character and heritage assets.</p>	Duly noted Recommendation The following documents will be included in the review of Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979) • Extensive Urban Surveys (EUS) for Lichfield, Alrewas and Colton https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/eLand/planners-developers/HistoricEnvironment/Extensive-Urban-Survey/Staffordshire-Extensive-Urban-Survey-Project.aspx

<p><i>Section 3 Baseline Information: Townscape and Historic Environment</i></p> <p>The paragraph does not make any reference to the wealth of undesignated heritage assets present within the District, which includes archaeological sites and monuments, unlisted buildings, historic farmsteads and the historic landscape character. It is noted that under the Landscape and Ecology section there is a passing reference to the depth of history within the District (first paragraph; second and third sentences). This could also be reflected within the Townscape and Historic Environment paragraph. Archaeological sites within the District include Neolithic and Bronze Age ceremonial landscapes, particularly within the Trent Valley; Roman military activity as well as late Prehistoric, Roman and later evidence for settlement, agriculture and infrastructure.</p>	<p>Duly noted Please see comment above from Historic England</p> <p>Recommendation Information on local list heritage assets and likely non-designated archaeology resource within the District will be added to the baseline information section of the Scoping Report.</p>
<p><i>Section 4 Identifying Sustainability Issues: Table 4.1 Townscape and Historic Environment</i></p> <p><i>Sustainability Issues Column:</i> The table could consider referencing the undesignated heritage assets as noted above. There are isolated historic farmsteads and smaller settlements which also contribute to the historic landscape of the District alongside the villages noted within the table.</p>	<p>Duly noted</p> <p>Recommendation Reference to historic farmsteads will be included within the Townscape and Historic Environment section of the Baseline Section of the Scoping Report and in Table 4.1 within the Townscape and Historic Landscape section.</p>
<p><i>Likely evolution without the plan column:</i> For clarity the first section may wish to include 'harm to...' as well as 'loss of' heritage assets.</p> <p>There is inevitably a degree of cross-over between the Historic Environment and Townscape section and the Landscape and Ecology section. To identify the specific issues within the Historic Environment and Townscape section it may be beneficial to specify that the harm to character specifically relates to historic landscape and townscape.</p>	<p>Duly noted</p> <p>Recommendation Amend sentence to read '<i>Harm to and loss of heritage assets due to a less co-ordinated approach to housing and delivery</i>'.</p>

<p><i>Section 5: Sustainability Appraisal Framework: Table 5.1 SEA Directive Topic (k) Cultural Heritage 12. To ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment and its setting</i></p> <p>Indicator: there is no reference to Scheduled Monuments or the Registered Park and Garden within the table. It is further advised that the 'Number, or % or area of historic buildings, sites and areas and their settings (both designated and non-designated) damaged' include reference to archaeological sites.</p>	<p>Duly noted Objective 12 is fully inclusive of all historic environments, therefore no mention of a specific site is necessary. Recommendation Indicator 'Number, or % or area of historic buildings, sites and areas and their settings (both designated and non-designated) damaged' to be removed as it is not something that the Council monitors.</p>
<p><u>Rights of Way</u> Whilst we understand that rights of way are not one of the key topics, they do provide linkages into a number of the specified areas namely human health, landscape, population and cultural heritage. As such it is suggested that consideration for their inclusion in the report is given.</p>	<p>Duly noted The Countryside Rights of Way Act (2000) is included within the Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies section in Section 2 and can be found in Appendix A. Recommendation None</p>
<p><u>Health and Care</u> Sustainability Objective 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended the indicators specifically refer to older people's needs within the housing mix in order to demonstrate it meets the needs of the largest growing population group in terms of numbers of lifetime homes / retirement housing accommodation completions. 	<p>Duly noted Older peoples housing needs within the District is addressed in Sustainability Objective 1 as it is fully inclusive of all needs within the community Recommendation Number of lifetime homes/ retirement housing accommodation completions to be added as an indicator within Sustainability Objective 1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialist housing provision rather than just extra care needs to be included in the indicator (to include care homes and both short term and long term supported housing accommodation supporting vulnerable people). 	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Amend indicator to read 'Number of extra care homes <u>and supported housing accommodation for vulnerable people</u> delivered in the District annually.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both affordable and social housing completions are recommended to be included on the indicator here. 	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Amend indicator to read 'Net affordable <u>and social</u> housing completions.</p>
<p>Sustainability Objective 3</p>	<p>Duly noted</p>

<p>It is suggested that the indicators need more specificity to encompass safe and independent accessibility. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wheelchair access • Access for mobility impaired individuals into and around sites on foot (considering lighting, quality of footpaths / pavements and road crossings etc.). • Access using public transport (based on reasonable distance assessments) to the site • Availability of subsidised public transport to the site • Co-location of complementary services / facilities to facilitate easier access (e.g. GP surgeries and pharmacies) and proximity to existing complementary services / facilities <p>It is also recommended consideration of access to green space, leisure facilities etc. are also considered here. In addition indicators reflecting social cohesion are considered: creation of mixed-use and socially mixed areas – and sufficient provision of vibrant public spaces that facilitate inter-ethnic and intergenerational encounters.</p>	<p>Detailed design is addressed through policy. The policy review will address such matters.</p> <p>Recommendation None</p>
<p>Sustainability Objective 4 The indicators need to extend beyond a working population to consider the wider mobile and mobility impaired population (as per row above).</p>	<p>Duly noted Sustainability Objective 5 is fully inclusive of the working age mobile and mobility impaired population.</p> <p>Recommendation None</p>
<p>Lichfield District Housing Strategy (p77-78) It is recommended some of the key messages, indicators, targets etc. are better reflected in the objectives for this document (these link well with statements we have made above).e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the housing options for people in need • Ensure new housing developments include a mix of homes to meet identified housing needs 	<p>Duly noted Recommendation</p>
<p>Community Safety Delivery Plan (p80)</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation</p>

<p>It is recommended some of the key messages, indicators, targets etc. are better reflected in the objectives for this document (these link well with statements made above) e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing feelings of safety • Support vulnerable members of the community 	
<p>Lichfield District Council Strategic Plan (p80-81) It is recommended some of the key messages, indicators, targets etc. are better reflected in the objectives for this document (these link well with statements made above) e.g. More people will be living independently at home.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation</p>
<p><u>Transport</u> Pg. 20 Table 3.8 and accompanying text relating to 2011 Census method of travel to work. It is not very helpful to include population classed as ‘not in employment’ within the analysis as it is inconsistent with the text analysis taken from Lichfield District Integrated Transport Strategy.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation The Not in Employment section of Table 3.8 has been removed.</p>
<p>Pg. 20 para. 4 – Service changes since this figure was produced now mean that only 75% of address points in Lichfield City are within 350m of a half hourly or better weekday service (November 2017 data). Also, since the information was produced Colton, Longdon and Upper Longdon have no scheduled bus service at all as well as the Ridwares, their only service is now the Lichfield and Rugeley Village Connect (Longdon and Upper Longdon) or Needwood Forest Connect (Colton).</p> <p>Note that in all cases of % households within 350m of a half hourly or better weekday service this could change again in April 2018 pending the outcome of the subsidised local service review.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Amend sentence to reflect the loss of scheduled bus services to Colton, Longdon and Upper Longdon and their only service available to the settlements.</p>
<p>Pg. 21 – the map is no longer up to date based on changes to services in 2017, and will change further in 2018 based on the outcome of the review of subsidised local bus services.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Remove Map.</p>
<p>Pg. 26 Table 4.1 Transport and Movement – change 83% of households to 75%.</p>	<p>Duly noted Recommendation Change 83% to 75%.</p>

Pg. 77 Plans and policies – the latest Lichfield district Integrated Transport Strategy 2015 to 2029 should be referenced and summarised (Please note we are likely to refresh this document in the next 12 months)	Duly noted Recommendation The following documents will be included in the review of Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lichfield district Integrated Transport Strategy 2015- 2029
Pg. 106 Appendix B Transport Issues – in Commuter Trips, change 83% of households to 75%.	Duly noted Recommendation Change 83% to 75%.
Pg. 106 Appendix B Transport Issues – sentence relating to Burntwood enhanced bus services to support housing. Keep this under review as SAD focused changes consultation proposes the removal of two residential sites in Burntwood.	Duly noted Recommendation None
Pg. 106 Appendix B Transport Issues – in Traffic Congestion to amend rail section to say ‘Lichfield Trent Valley rail station disabled access to allow access to Cross City platform and London bound platform’.	Duly noted Recommendation Amend sentence to read ‘Lichfield Trent Valley rail station disabled access to allow access to Cross City platform and London bound platform’.
Pg. 107 Appendix B Bus and Rail – amend 83% of households to 75%. Description of Lichfield and Rugeley Village Connect is required following the description of Needwood Forest Connect as this service has replaced a number of infrequent local services. Colton, Longdon and Upper Longdon now have no scheduled bus services so amend the text in the local trend column. In the rail text amend to say ‘Lichfield Trent Valley rail station disabled access improvements are required to allow access to the Cross City and London bound platforms’.	Duly noted Recommendation Change 83% to 75%. Add a description of the Lichfield and Rugeley Connect service to be added to Appendix B: Bus and Rail Amend sentence to read ‘Lichfield Trent Valley rail station disabled access to allow access to Cross City platform and London bound platform’.
Under the Floods and Water Management Act entry on page 53, your last paragraph states that local authorities have a duty to adopt Sustainable Drainage systems, once completed. In fact this part of the Act has never been empowered so I would remove that last paragraph.	Duly noted Recommendation Please see comment from the Environment Agency above. The following documents will be included in the review of Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies:

You may also want to refer to SCC's Suds Handbook which gives specific advice to developers on the kind of Sustainable Drainage systems we would like to see. Follow the link below to access this. We are asking LPA's whether they would like to adopt the Handbook as a Supplementary Planning Document within their Local Plans. We have already consulted the public on the Handbook. Good quality Sustainable Drainage also feeds into many of the other issues you are looking to address such as water quality and reducing flooding.

<https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/Flood-Risk-Management/Information-for-Planners-and-Developers.aspx>

- Staffordshire County Councils SUDs Handbook

This page is intentionally left blank

Buildings at Risk Update

CLlr Ian Pritchard

Date: 14th March 2018

Contact Officer: Claire Hines

Tel Number: (01543) 308188

Email: Claire.hines@lichfielddc.gov.uk

Key Decision? **NO**

Local Ward Members All wards have the potential to be affected.



Overview & Scrutiny

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 A register is kept of all the listed buildings within the district that are considered to be at risk. This report will update members on the register and the work being carried out to get assets repaired and off the register.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That members note the contents of this report.

3. Background

- 3.1 The owners of listed buildings are under no legal obligation to maintain their property in a good state of repair; even though it is in their interests to do so. Therefore it is considered best practise for Local Planning Authorities to monitor the condition of their listed buildings and take action where appropriate to ensure they are adequately maintained.
- 3.2 Lichfield District currently includes 762 listed structures, 21 conservation areas and 16 Scheduled Ancient Monuments. It is considered best practise to monitor the condition of all heritage assets, to maintain an 'At Risk' Register and to work towards finding a long term future for these assets.
- 3.3 Historic England publish an annual Heritage at Risk (HAR) register which includes all Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments. The latest HAR register has 8 entries for Lichfield District, this includes 1 Conservation Area (Fazeley and Bonehill), 4 Listed Buildings (Church of St John the Baptist, Edingale, Angel Croft Hotel, Beacon Street, Lichfield, Church Tower north of Church of St John, St Johns Hill, Shenstone and Manor House, Hamstall Ridware). The other 3 sites are Scheduled Ancient Monuments and are outside the control of the District Council.
- 3.4 The following table gives some background to the sites in the Historic England's Heritage at Risk Register;

Site	Present situation February 2018
Church of St John the Baptist, Edingale	The church of St John the Baptist has C13 origins and consists of a nave with a west tower and a chancel with a north side organ chamber. Several phases of past repairs, remodelling and rebuilding are clearly evident but works to renew roof coverings, high level stonework and rainwater goods are urgently required. A Listed Places of Worship Roof Repairs Grant awarded in June 2016 has facilitated the renewal of the tower, nave and chancel roof coverings, parapet gutter linings, rainwater goods and new surface water drainage but extensive high level masonry repairs remain outstanding.

Manor House, Hamstall Ridware	Porch, walls and gatehouse to timber framed C15 country house, substantially altered in C16 and C18 with brick hall, tower and courtyard walls. The site is privately owned and is considered to be in very poor condition. The tower remains as a prominent garden folly with considerable structural issues. The house is still in use, but the tower is derelict and in very bad condition. The owner is working with Historic England to manage vegetation and a detailed recording survey has been completed. Further structural assessment of the site is needed.
Angel Croft Hotel, Beacon Street, Lichfield	A fine three storey hotel, built c1750 in brick with ashlar dressings. The railings and gates are included in its listing. The building has been empty for some time and is owned by Friel Homes. Permission was granted for conversion to apartments with an agreement to secure the repair of the gates and railings. Works commenced in 2017 and are ongoing. Railings have been removed for specialist repairs and will be returned in early 2018. Works to make the building fully weathertight should be completed in 2018.
Church Tower north of Church of St John, St Johns Hill, Shenstone	This is a C13 derelict church tower with later alterations. It is owned by the Church of England and there are no current plans for future use of the tower. The site is considered to be in very poor condition. The building was recently inspected and a detailed schedule of repairs has been carried out. A very positive meeting was held recently and Historic England are looking to fund repairs to the building although this is not likely to take place until 2020-2021.

3.5 Historic buildings are at their most vulnerable when they are neglected, left empty and start to deteriorate. The visual evidence of disuse can itself begin the downward spiral because it advertises the building as an easy target for vandals and thieves. Prompt action will prevent repair costs escalating and avoid the loss of historic fabric.

3.6 For comparison the total number of Grade I and II* listed buildings on the Historic England HAR in Staffordshire is 31 giving an average of 3.1 buildings over the 10 local authorities. However, the various authorities have different numbers of Grade I and II* buildings so for a more accurate comparison, as a percentage of our Grade I and II* listed buildings this is 5.3%. This compares favourably with the range of percentages for the other districts which are outlined in the table below.

District	Number of Grade I and II*	Number at Risk	%
Cannock Chase	8	0	0
East Staffordshire	78	2	2.6
Lichfield	75	4	5.3
Newcastle-under-	27	3	11.1

Lyme			
Peak District	22	1	4.5
South Staffordshire	57	1	1.8
Stafford	92	2	2.2
Staffordshire Moorlands	85	8	9.4
Tamworth	8	1	12.5
City of Stoke-on-Trent (UA)	19	9	47.7

3.7 In addition to this, Lichfield District Council maintain a register of the Grade II listed buildings that are considered to be at risk. The entries are below with brief updates, as can be seen positive progress is being made with 3 of these sites. The register is reviewed annually and data provided as part of the AMR.

Site	Present situation February 2018
115 Main Street, Alrewas	One of a pair of houses incorporating a shop. C17th. LBC was granted in 2016 for the re-building of the gable end. Repairs are in progress and are nearly complete. This building is likely to be removed from the register in 2018.
Armitage URC, Armitage	Congregational Chapel. 1820 extended later C19th. This property has been vacant for a number of years. An application to convert it to a house was refused in 2007. No suitable new use has yet been found.
Stonehouse Cottages, Armitage	Pair of houses. Late C17th with early C18 and C19th alterations. These houses are in the ownership of Ideal Standard (UK) and have been vacant for a number of years.
Remains of Bellamour Old Hall, Colton	Remains of early C17 house. Attic storey was removed c1840 and partly demolished in 1960's. Building is in very poor condition.
Bonehill Mill, Fazeley	Early C19th Watermill with later additions. This building was badly fire damaged in 2010. It was scaffolded but no the site has no roof and so is open to the elements. In same ownership as and forms a historic grouping with 122 Lichfield Street which is also on this list and 116-120 Lichfield Street.
Fazeley Mill (Tolsons), Fazeley	Textile Factory 1886. Site previously had planning permission for conversion of historic mill to residential apartments and new build residential use on rest of the site. This permission

	lapsed and a new planning application has been submitted for a similar scheme. Buildings is still partly in use but it is not weathertight and so it continues to slowly deteriorate.
122 Lichfield Street, Fazeley	Early C19th Mill House. Property has been vacant for many years. In very poor condition and not weathertight. In the same ownership as and forms a historic grouping with Bonehill Mill (also on the register) and 116-120 Lichfield Street which are also Grade II listed.
L-shaped out buildings, Bucks Head Farm, Hints	Farm outbuildings comprising barns and former smithy. Mid to late C18th with C19th Additions. Under threat from HS2, they will be retained but other buildings on the site are being demolished for HS2 so the route will run very close. LDC is seeking re-assurances from HS2 that the buildings will be adequately maintained.
Kings Bromley Manor Garden walls and pavilion, Kings Bromley	Walls and pavilions C18th. In multiple ownerships. Repairs needed, at risk of further deterioration.
25 St John Street, Lichfield	Two storey retail property. In private ownership. Roof repairs were carried out in 2012 shortly after the property became vacant. Property was going through probate.
Tithe Barn, Church Lane, Mavesyn Ridware	Barn and stables, late C17th. In private ownership. Within grounds of The Old Rectory which is also Grade II listed but not at risk. Used as domestic storage.
Packington Hall, Swinfen & Packington	Country House, mid-C18th. Site previously had planning permission for conversion of the Hall to residential apartments with new build residential development to the rear of the site. Site is in new ownership and they have submitted a new application for a similar scheme. Building has recently been scaffolded and a temporary roof is now in place which will prevent the building deteriorating any further. LDC is working closely with the owners and is making regular site visits. Still concern over antisocial behaviour.

3.8 Buildings are surveyed over a rolling 5 year period. It is important to note that the number of buildings on the register can increase as well as decrease and that this is not necessarily a negative. Survey work may reveal buildings to be at risk that we were not previously aware of, but their inclusion on the register means that we can target resources at them. We also class buildings as vulnerable, these are not published on the list but are monitored more closely.

3.9 The Council has a small grant fund available of £10,000 per year. This is used to fund repairs to historic buildings at a rate of 25% of the total cost up to a maximum of £5,000. This is targeted at buildings either at risk or likely to become at risk and is a useful tool in encouraging timely and appropriate repairs to be carried out to important historic buildings.

- 3.10 If a building is considered to be at risk, in the first instance the local planning authority will make contact with owners as early as possible to draw their attention to the risks to their property, to suggest appropriate measures and find out their own plans for maintenance and reuse.
- 3.11 Most situations where a building is considered to be at risk can be resolved by negotiation. When negotiation fails, local authorities have a range of statutory enforcement powers at their disposal including section 215 Notices, Urgent Works Notices, Repairs Notices and other statutory enforcement tools and powers under the various Housing, Planning and Building Acts, to secure the future of historic buildings. At their lightest level they involve no more than the serving of formal warnings of action, but in the last resort they can lead to enforced repairs or compulsory purchase.

Alternative Options	1. The alternative option is not to monitor the condition of the Districts listed buildings and not to compile a Buildings at Risk Register. This would not allow the local planning authority to be proactive in its work to conserve the historic environment.
Consultation	1. No consultation has taken place.
Financial Implications	1. The cost of surveying the listed buildings and compiling the Building at Risk Register and of any action taken, either preventative or remedial will be met from existing budgets. 2. Historic Buildings Grant is an existing part of the budget for the Conservation and Urban Design Team.
Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	1. These proposals support the aims of the District Council's Strategic Plan 2016 -20 to be a clean, green and welcoming place to live and specifically to maintain and enhance our heritage.
Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	1. In monitoring the condition of listed buildings and by working towards preventing them from becoming vacant and at risk and by returning vacant buildings into use the Council is seeking to preserve and enhance its designated heritage assets for all future generations.
Crime & Safety Issues	1. The recommendations will have a positive impact on our duty to prevent crime and disorder within the District (Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1988). By preventing historic buildings from becoming vacant and at risk and by returning vacant buildings into use there will be less opportunity for crime and disorder.

	Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
A	Do not monitor the condition of the Districts listed buildings.	Work would only be reactive rather than proactive and the ability to conserve the Districts listed buildings would be diminished.	Yellow
B			
C			

D			
E			

Background documents

Relevant web links

REVIEW OF 2017 FESTIVALS AND EVENTS PROGRAMME AND PREVIEW OF 2018 PROGRAMME

CLlr Ian Pritchard, Cabinet Member for Economic Growth, Environment and Development,
CLlr Iain Eadie Cabinet Member for Operational Services, Leisure & Waste and
CLlr Doug Pullen Cabinet Member for Regulatory Services, Housing and Well-being



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

Date:	14 March 2018
Contact Officer:	Lisa Clemson
Tel Number:	01543 308708
Email:	Lisa.clemson@lichfielddc.gov.uk
Key Decision?	No
Local Ward Members	N/a

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide to the committee details of the events and festivals programme delivered in 2017 and those planned for the forthcoming year.
- 1.2 Lichfield District traditionally boasts an extensive and enviable programme of events and festivals which attract thousands of visitors to the city and the district, boost local businesses and support local jobs.
- 1.3 A wide range of events and festivals took place across the District in 2017, attracting thousands of extra visitors to the area. Highlights included Lichfield Proms in Beacon Park, The Cathedral Illuminated, The Lichfield Food Festival and a range of Christmas events and promotions.
- 1.4 Events and festivals contribute to help make Lichfield a vibrant place to visit, they attract extra visitors to our district and help increase spend in our local economy. In addition they encourage overnight stays.
- 1.5 Whilst Lichfield District Council delivers and supports a small number of these events, the majority of events that take place in the district are delivered and funded by partner organisations.
- 1.6 In addition to reviewing what happened in 2017, the report highlights the key events taking place across the District in 2018, as well as new initiatives in terms of marketing, promotion and creating a new strong, brand and identity for Lichfield.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 It is recommended that Members consider and note the contents of the report including the planned 2018 programme.

3. Background

Context

- 3.1 A key theme of Lichfield District Council's Strategic Plan 2016-2020 is that we will help 'create a vibrant and prosperous economy' by encouraging increased visitors to our district, increased spend in our local economy and more overnight stays.
- 3.2 Events and festivals are recognised as a key part of this, as an engaging events programme helps us build on our heritage, tourism and cultural offer and encourages more footfall, both to the events and afterwards as events help to showcase the city/district for future visits.
- 3.3 Annually, the district boasts an enviable year-long programme of events and festivals, which encourage local residents, as well as visitors, to appreciate the very best the district can offer. Traditional, centuries-old events like the Lichfield Greenhill Bower and the Burntwood Wakes are complemented by more recent innovations like the Lichfield Festival, Lichfield Proms in Beacon Park and the Lichfield Food Festival.

- 3.4 Key events that took place in 2017 - please see **Appendix 1**, included the **Lichfield Food Festival** in August. We are advised this event attracted around 100,000 visitors to the city over the three days, bringing in an estimated £4 million to the local economy, the weather was glorious over this weekend, which certainly added to the atmosphere and attracted extra visitors. Four cash points in the city ran out of money over this weekend. BID businesses advised that they benefited from the event as it brought extra footfall through their doors, and extra spend in their tills.
- 3.5 **Lichfield Festival** now in its 37th year, held in July attracts over 50,000 visitors from across the West Midlands and further afield, bringing in an estimated £2 million into the local economy.
- 3.6 **The Cathedral Illuminated** held for a week in December on the lead up to Christmas, was another highly successful event, attracting 16,500 visitors into the city in 2017. This event was featured on the local television news. Hugely popular events like this help put Lichfield on the map. The evening economy felt the benefit of this event as the shows took place from 6pm to 10pm most evenings.
- 3.7 **How events are delivered and supported**
- 3.8 The vast majority of the district's events are delivered by our partners, including voluntary organisations. Our Strategic Plan recognises the important role the council's partner's play in continuing to support and develop our thriving arts and cultural offer, and furthermore recognises the Lichfield BID, Lichfield City Centre Development Partnership and Burntwood Business Community in this respect.
- 3.9 A small number of events are directly staged by the council. These include Lichfield Proms in the Park and a range of smaller Lichfield Historic Parks events, which are delivered in line with the Parks and Opens Spaces Service Plan (part of the council's HLF grant funding obligations), and align with the council's new Physical Activity and Sports Strategy (PASS). We also provide support to a number of events organisers who hire our parks for key events, such as the Fuse Festival and Cars in the Park
- 3.10 Other events, such as the annual Heritage Weekend Festival & Christmas Festival support the district council's tourism objectives, and the Lichfield City Centre Development Strategy. These are organised through a marketing partnership with local attractions, trade organisations, shops and businesses, including the Lichfield BID and Lichfield Chamber of Trade & Commerce. These partnerships see the district council delivering the marketing support for the events, in recognition of the footfall these events bring to the city and district, the boost to car park income, and the way in which they support the council's own economic development/tourism ambitions.
- 3.11 The district council also supports/has supported a number of events through the range of grant funding programmes the council delivers. For 2018 the council is supporting The Lichfield Festival, through the Lichfield City Art Fund, the festival is a 9 day event that takes place across various venues in the city.
- 3.12 The council provides a lot of assistance and advice to event organisers through the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) process, a cross section of LDC service areas support this group, including officers from Regulatory Services, Licensing, Parks, Health and Safety and Tourism. Along with representatives from the Police, Staffordshire County Council and the Fire service which meet with event organisers to ensure a collaborative approach is taken with the major events.
- 3.13 The increasing number of events and festivals that are taking place across the city are creating a significant increase in the large amount of work required for regulatory services. In 2017, 931 street traders applied for street trading consent, over 800 were granted. The street trading fee of £33 per day is currently being waived by LDC. In 2017, a number of SAGs were held to discuss events. The total amount of hours attributed to SAGs last year for Regulatory Services was 73 hours and an estimated cost of £3,340. For 2018, we anticipate this figure to increase dramatically as the SAG is proving to be invaluable.
- 3.14 In 2017 Regulatory Services received 931 applications for Street Trading Consent. Out of those we issued consent for 811. Some of these will have been for more than one day depending on the event so we have estimated that we would have generated somewhere in the region of £34,000. As you are aware the fee for these was waived, so in effect this was a cost to LDC last year. Members may want to consider whether this approach is appropriate.

- 3.15 Enforcement work would normally be covered in the costs for Street Trading applications and as such the waiving of the fees has meant that we did not generate any income to offset this. In effect this would normally be covered out of the £34,000 above. However, the Regulatory Services team delivered approximately 130 hours on food safety visits the cost of which comes to a little over £3,000.
- 3.16 We are dependent on event organisers providing us with visitor numbers to enable us to calculate the economic impact, events and festivals add to the local economy. The calculation we make is based on the information supplied to us in an annual Tourism Economic Impact Assessment, provided to us from Destination Staffordshire. Currently we have very little data on the economic impact the various events and festivals have on the local economy, it is recommended that the council undertakes further research to establish some key metrics, which will enable us to evaluate the economic impact of the events programme for local businesses and the economy. Working with event organisers at the SAG meetings will assist with this work.
- 3.17 A new Events and Festivals collaboration group has recently been set up by The Leader of The Council, which is made up of key partners and event's organisers across the City, as well as LDC officers. The aim of this group is to ensure a joined up working approach is taken when it comes to events and festivals, initial feedback from partners is that the group is extremely useful providing as it does a platform to keep all informed of what's going on and when, as well as idea sharing and best practice.
- 3.18 In addition an officers group has been set up to consider how best LDC can promote and support the various events and festivals via its many different roles. Officers from Leisure, Regulatory Services and Tourism are part of the group.
- 3.19 In late 2017, The Lichfield City Centre Development Partnership (LCCDP) commissioned a brand and marketing review for the city with the results presented to the LCCDP Board in February. The key findings of the report showed that outside of Lichfield, there is very little awareness of where Lichfield is and what the city has to offer. It also highlighted that Lichfield as a place, did not have a strong brand or identity. Whilst feedback was a little disappointing, it did confirm what many of the partnership suspected, however, it has provided the LCCDP the platform to move forward with creating a brand and an identity for the city, as well as marketing campaign, to raise awareness of Lichfield and what the city has to offer.
- 3.17 The first stage of this project is to address the **branding and identity** of Lichfield.
- 3.18 A brief has been created by the LCCDP marketing group that has been circulated to 4 local graphic design companies, asking for ideas and designs for a new logo - based on Visit Lichfield, a strapline for the city and a new colour palette. It has been stressed that the new logo/strapline needs to travel and be suitable to use on various marketing platforms, both print and digital. The cost to do this stage of the work has been funded by 4 partners. The designers will be presenting their designs to the LCCDP marketing group at the end of March, when a design will be chosen.
- 3.19 The next stage of the project will be to deliver the **Marketing Campaign**, there will be 2 elements to this :
- A - Attracting Visitors to Lichfield**, targeting a regional and national audience
- B - Events Calendar**
- Initial ideas to do this include - advertising at Birmingham Airport, Railway Stations - cross city line and west coast mainline, west coast train panels, bus sides and regional websites. These offer both print and digital options. A partnership approach will be taken to fund and deliver these campaigns.
- The key events and festivals will be promoted through a poster campaign around the city and local wards, posters will be displayed in the Tourism Information Boards around the city (which are being replaced as they are in a very poor state and do not create a good impression of the city). We would like to circulate A4/A3 versions of these posters to ward members, and ask if you would help by displaying these on parish notice boards and in any local newsletters you may be involved with. It is the intention these event calendars are updated 3 times a year.
- 3.20 **Visit Lichfield website** - The official website for Lichfield is currently being updated and refreshed, it will also be mobile compatible. There is a very comprehensive events calendar on the website, event organisers are asked to add their own events to the calendar, which provides a "one stop" place to go to see what's going on in Lichfield District. The new website will adopt the new logo, strapline and colour palette being created by the LCCDP.

3.21 For information only, please find attached **Appendix 2** an **Events Calendar** - highlighting the key events that are taking place in Lichfield District in 2018. It is not a full line-up of events that take place across the district; for a full line up visit www.visitlichfield.co.uk/events

Benefit of events

3.22 It is widely recognised that shops, businesses and attractions feel the economic benefit of the events and festivals that take place. This underpins and aligns with the strategic ambitions of the council.

3.23 In addition, markets-based events such as the Lichfield Food Festival offer opportunities to support new and embryonic businesses, via market stall opportunities.

3.24 In terms of district council income, city based events (where car parks are chargeable) help to boost parking figures and have a positive impact on parking income.

3.25 It is also recognised that visitors to events often return to the city/district for future visits and hence events help to showcase the city/district to future visitors as well as boost its reputation through word of mouth.

Alternative Options	As this is a summary report focusing on a wide variety of events, alternative options are not considered as part of this report.
---------------------	--

Consultation	As this is a summary report focusing on a wide variety of events, consultation has not formed part of the preparation of this report.
--------------	---

Financial Implications	Budgets for LDC activities to deliver and support events are contained within relevant service departments.
------------------------	---

Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A key theme of Lichfield District Council’s Strategic Plan 2016 - 2020 is that we will help ‘create a vibrant and prosperous economy’ by encouraging increased visitors to our district, increased spend in our local economy and more overnight stays. 2. Events and festivals are recognised as a key part of this, as an engaging events programme helps us build on our heritage, tourism and cultural offer and encourages more footfall, both to the events and afterwards as events help to showcase the city/district for future visits.
--	--

Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no identified equality, diversity and human rights implications.
---	---

Crime & Safety Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no identified crime and disorder issues.
-----------------------	---

	Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
A	LDC decides not to support or deliver events.	This would negatively impact on the council’s ability to support its Strategic Plan ambitions, the PASS, the Parks and Opens Spaces Service Plan and the Lichfield City Centre Development Strategy. It would also impact negatively on car park income and partnership working.	Yellow

Background documents N/A

Relevant web links WWW.Visitlichfield.co.uk

Events directly organised by LDC

Event	Organiser	Dates	Strategic purpose for LDC events
Victorian May Day	Lichfield District Council	2 May	Supports Parks and Opens Spaces Service Plan.
Beacon Park Fun Day	Lichfield District Council	10 August	Supports Parks and Opens Spaces Service Plan.
Lichfield Proms in Beacon Park	Lichfield District Council	3 September	Supports Parks and Opens Spaces Service Plan.

Events supported by LDC - Support can include funding, street trading and/or promotional support

Event	Organiser	Dates	Strategic purpose for LDC events
Lichfield Greenhill Bower	Lichfield Greenhill Bower Committee	30 May	Independent event. Identified as a special event in line with Street Trading Policy approved by Regulatory & Licensing Committee, due to economic impact on city in line with Street Trading Policy. Street Trading Policy set for review in early 2017. The Bower also receives the benefit of the use of the Bird Street Car Park in line with an historic agreement.
Lichfield Festival - Florette Festival Market	The Lichfield Festival	2 July	Independent event. Identified as a special event in line with Street Trading Policy approved by Regulatory & Licensing Committee, due to economic impact on city in line with Street Trading Policy. Street Trading Policy set for review in early 2017. Lichfield Festival also receives a share of Locality Commissioning funding – see 3.7.
Fuse Festival	Lichfield Arts	8 – 10 July	Independent event. Lichfield Arts also receives a share of Locality Commissioning funding – see 3.7
Lichfield Food Festival	Lichfield BID (including Lichfield District Council in a tourism/marketing capacity)	27 & 28 August	Independent event. Identified as a special event in line with Street Trading Policy approved by Regulatory & Licensing Committee, due to economic impact on city in line with Street Trading Policy. Street Trading Policy set for review in early 2017.
Lichfield Georgian Festival – part of the Heritage Weekend Celebrations	City attractions (including Lichfield District Council in a tourism/marketing capacity)	16 – 18 September	Supported Parks and Opens Spaces Service Plan. Identified in Tourism Service Plan as key event and supports Lichfield City Centre Development Strategy.
Lichfield Christmas Festival and Festival Weekends (including Santa Run)	City and district attractions (From 2017 – the Lichfield BID is set to take on board the organisation of this event)	12 November – 26 December	Independent event. Identified as a special event in line with Street Trading Policy approved by Regulatory & Licensing Committee, due to economic impact on city in line with Street Trading Policy. Street Trading Policy set for review in early 2017. Identified in Tourism Service Plan as key event and supports Lichfield City Centre Development Strategy.

Events that take place on LDC land - Supported by officer time, as per booking requirements. Bookings are income generating.

Event	Key organiser	Dates	Strategic purpose for LDC events
St Giles Fun Run	St Giles Hospice	20 March	Independent park booking.
Lichfield Half Marathon	KP Events	1 May	Independent park booking.
Virgin Active's World's Smallest Fun Run	KP Events	2 May	Independent park booking (no fee).
Tom Jones in Beacon Park	Tiny Cow	12 June	Independent park booking.
Cars in the Park	Cars in the Park Committee	2 & 3 July	Independent park booking.
Burntwood Wakes	Burntwood Town Council	Various dates	Independent booking.
Lichfield Georgian Festival – part of the Heritage Weekend Celebrations	City attractions	23 & 24 September	Provide marketing support as per 2015 – an event on the scale of 2016 is not planned again
Lichfield Christmas Festival Weekends	City and district attractions	December	Main marketing function is set to move to the BID in 2017. LDC will provide secondary marketing support

Appendix 2 - Events and Festivals, 2018 Lichfield Events Calendar

Date	Event	Location	Organiser
Tues 13 Feb	Pancake Race	City Centre	Lichfield City Council
Thurs 1 March – Sun 4 March	Lichfield Literature Festival	City Centre	Lichfield Festival
Sat 24 March	Lichfield Cathedral Chorus	The Cathedral	
April	Consequence of War - Exhibition	The Cathedral	The Cathedral
Sun 8 April	Cathedral to Castle Run	Cathedral – Castle	Tamworth & Lichfield Rotary
Sun 6 May	Lichfield Half Marathon	Lichfield	K P Events
Mon 7 May	Victorian May Day	Beacon Park	Lichfield District Council
Sat 12 May	Drive-in Movie – The Italian Job	Beacon Park	Lichfield District Council
Sat 12- Sun 13 May	Lichfield Home and Garden Festival	City Centre	Cooker hoop Creative and Lichfield BID
Mon 28 May	Lichfield Greenhill Bower	Lichfield City and Beacon Park	Lichfield Greenhill Bower Committee
Fri 1 June – Sun 3 June	Lichfield Blues and Jazz Festival	City Centre Venues	Lichfield Arts
Sat 2-Sun 3 June	Lichfield Gin, Ale and Cheese Festival		Cooker hoop Creative and Lichfield BID
Sat 2 June	Lichfield Cathedral Chorus	The Cathedral	
Wed 20- Sat 23 June	Shakespeare in the Park		
Sat 30 June	Burntwood Wakes Festival 18	Burntwood Leisure Centre	Burntwood Town Council
Fri 6 th – Sat 14 th July	The Lichfield Festival	Various locations	Lichfield Festival
Sat 7- Sun 8 July	Cars in the Park	Beacon Park	Lichfield Rotary
Fri 13- Sun 15 July	Fuse Festival	Beacon Park	Lichfield Arts
Sat 21- Sun 22 July	Carters Steam Fair	Beacon Park	Carters Steam Fair
August	Film Festival Week	The Cathedral	The Cathedral
Fri 10 August	Drive-in Movie – Top Gun	Beacon Park	Lichfield District Council
Sat 11 August	Drive-in Movie – Pretty Woman	Beacon Park	Lichfield District Council
Sat 25 – Mon 27 August	Lichfield Food Festival	City Centre	Cooker hoop Creative and Lichfield BID
Sat 1 Sept	Lichfield Proms in Beacon Park	Beacon Park	Lichfield District Council
Sat 8 Sept	The Sheriff's Ride	Lichfield City boundary	Lichfield City Council
Sat 22 – Sun 23 Sept	Heritage Weekend	Various city locations	Various organisations
Sat 29 – Sun 30 Sept	Lichfield District Community Games	Beacon Park	Dennis Kennedy
19 Oct – 21 Oct	L2F The Lichfield Festival of Folk	City Centre Venues	Lichfield Arts

November	The month of Remembrancetide	Lichfield Cathedral	Lichfield Cathedral
Sun 25 Nov	Christmas Lights Switch-On	City Centre	City Council
Thurs 29 Nov - Thurs 31 Dec	Dick Whittington Pantomime	Garrick Theatre	Garrick Theatre
Sat 8 – Sun 9 Dec	Lichfield Christmas Food and Drink Festival	City Centre	Cooker Hoop Creative and Lichfield BID
December	The Cathedral Illuminated	The Cathedral	The Cathedral
December	Advent and Christmas Programme	The Cathedral	The Cathedral
December	Lichfield Cathedral Chorus	The Cathedral	