

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

Monday, 14 January 2019

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 **TUESDAY, 22ND JANUARY, 2019 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), Ball (Vice-Chair), Warfield (Vice-Chair), Mrs Baker, Mrs Boyle, Drinkwater, Mrs Eagland, Mrs Fisher, Mrs Lax, Marshall, Smith 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 5 - 8
4. Work Programme 9 - 12
5. Local Plan and Related Spatial Policy Matters Update 13 - 18
6. Local Enterprise Partnerships Review 19 - 24
7. BRS Working Group Update 25 - 26



This page is intentionally left blank

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

12 NOVEMBER 2018

PRESENT:

Councillors Cox (Chairman), Ball (Vice-Chair), Warfield (Vice-Chair), Mrs Baker, Mrs Boyle, Mrs Lax, Marshall and Mrs Stanhope MBE.

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

31 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Drinkwater, Mrs Eagland, Mrs Fisher and Smith.

32 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were received.

33 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved and signed as a correct record. It was noted that the Environment Agency had, as yet, not come back to Members regarding their queries and it was agreed that Officers would follow this up.

34 WORK PROGRAMME

The work programme was considered by the Committee. When asked if there was scope to bring forward the review of the operation of the Planning Committee, it was noted that it was agreed to allow a full 12 months operation of the new structure before evaluating it.

RESOLVED: That the Work Programme be noted.

35 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN SPD APPENDIX A UPDATE

The Committee received a report proposing an update to Appendix A of the Sustainable Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It was noted that the document and the standards included in it have been used in determining planning applications since its adoption in 2015 but following comments received, had been reviewed and clarification added to ensure a more consistent and transparent approach. It was noted that the amendments proposed were minor and subject to consultation.

Members felt that the diagrams added were clear and helpful especially to non-technical readers.

There was concern that using the term adequate could lead to ambiguity however it was reported that a level of flexibility was required as developments and circumstances differ from case to case, plus the document and Appendix needs to be read as a whole. It was also felt that Officers and the Planning Committee would make subjective judgements on whether the standards had been adhered to and the acceptability of proposals.

It was noted that when considering use of obscure glazing that the level of obscure glazing should be clarified to ensure it is effective to neighbouring properties. The wording 'to appropriate level' to be included in the paragraph under the title 'overlooking' at page 19 (page 27 of SPD Appendix) after the words, "...they should be obscure glazed"

Also, clarification of the word affected rather than effected to be used at paragraph 15 page 19.

- RESOLVED:** (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That the updated Sustainable Design SPD Appendix A 'Space about Dwellings and Amenity Standards for all Developments' be referred to Cabinet for agreement to undertake public consultation as part of the review of this.

36 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT RESOURCE REVIEW

The Committee received a report advising the Committee of the current planning enforcement status (workload) and resource. It was reported that although a discretionary service, it was a vital part of planning.

Members were pleased to note how well the department was performing but had some concerns that the level of cases closed compared to the number received was reducing. It was reported that there were other factors involved including complexity of cases and some do take years to resolve and other cases are purposely kept open to allow for ongoing monitoring.

Clarification was sought as to why the number of Planning Contravention Notices from Lichfield District Council had dropped over the last two years and it was reported that these notices were for gathering information only and not imperative to the process and it may be that a different and more effective method of gaining the evidence was being used.

The Committee recognised that only with more resources could a proactive approach to enforcement take place and were reassured by the Cabinet Member that this was being considered. The Committee agreed to keep the monitoring of resources in the service under review.

- RESOLVED:** (1) That the current status and resource of the planning enforcement team be noted; and
- (2) That the implications of such resource in the context of the delivery of the Local Enforcement Plan and government policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework remain under review.

37 ENFORCEMENT PLAN UPDATE

The Committee received a report on an update to the Planning Enforcement Plan that was dated April 2013. It was reported that the update ensured it was in accordance with the updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and good practice guidance.

It was noted that a new target to close 80% of cases within 12 weeks of their registration had been set as this was a more achievable target, subject to adequate resources. It was agreed to monitor enforcement performance using the targets set within the revised document as the benchmark going forward.

It was asked if Environmental Health could also be included in paragraph 2.4 of the Plan and this was agreed.

Members questioned whether a note be included within the Plan to highlight the seriousness of flouting the planning rules and that action would be taken where necessary.

- RESOLVED:** (1) That the contents of the report be noted; and
- (2) That the proposed updated Local Planning Enforcement Plan be approved.

38 DESIGNATION OF A NEW CONSERVATION AREA FOR DRAYTON BASSETT

The Committee received a report on the results of the public consultation on the proposals to designate a new Conservation Area in Drayton Bassett.

Members were supportive of the proposal.

- RESOLVED:** (1) That the results of the consultation be noted and support be given to the designation of a new Conservation Area in Drayton Bassett and Cabinet and Full Council be recommended to approve;
- (2) That the results of the consultation and support be given to the final appraisal and management plans and Cabinet and Full Council be recommended to approve; and
- (3) That the properties proposed for addition to the Register of Buildings of Special Local Interest be noted and these additions be recommended to Cabinet and Full Council for approval.

39 CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS AND MANAGEMENT PLANS

The Committee received a report on the results of the public consultation on the draft Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for Wall Conservation Area and Wiggington Conservation Area.

The Committee were supportive of the proposals and pleased that Wall had been given status of 'special architectural or historic interest' due to its national historic importance.

- RESOLVED:** (1) That the results of the consultation and support be given to the final appraisal and management plans and Cabinet and Full Council be recommended to approve;
- (2) That the proposed boundary changes to the Conservation Areas be supported and recommended to Cabinet and Full Council for approval; and
- (3) That the properties proposed for addition to the Register of Buildings of Special Local Interest be noted and these additions be recommended to Cabinet and Full Council for approval.

40 ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE UPDATE

The Committee received a report providing an overview of Lichfield District's current economic development performance and the impact of the Council's Economic Development service's activities in this area. It was noted that economic growth was an important priority of the Strategic Plan and progress was being made due to dedicated Officer support.

It was noted and there was concern that failure of business were high but it was noted that further investigations as to why would be done with how the Council could help to prevent this. It was noted that Enterprise births were still greater than the county average. It was asked to look at the age profiles of people setting up businesses and the circumstances to why they have set them up as it is possible that they have been forced to due to redundancy and lack of jobs in their relevant field and support could be given better by reducing this issue.

It was asked if the data gathered took into account industrial development as there are problems in that sector too. It was reported that Officers were in discussions regularly with developers and were helping signpost businesses to opportunities.

It was recognised that there was a skills gap especially in the STEM sector but it was noted that it was a national problem not just a local one and jobs in these fields were not attractive to younger people and employees were not as willing to take on unskilled individuals and train them up.

RESOLVED: That the current performance of Lichfield District's economy and the actions being undertaken to support this and local business including by the District Council be noted.

41 BRS WORKING GROUP - NOTES OF MEETINGS

The notes of the recent BRS Working Group were circulated.

RESOLVED: That the information received be noted.

(The Meeting closed at 7.50 pm)

CHAIRMAN

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2018-19

Item	June	Sept	Nov	Jan	Mar	Details/Reasons	Officer	Member Lead
Policy Development								
Terms of Reference	✓						Christine Lewis	
Small Business Grant Scheme		✓					Jonathan Percival	Cllr Ian Pritchard
Environment Agency		✓				Presentation and discussion with EA regarding Planning application representations	Craig Jordan	Cllr Ian Pritchard
Conservation Area Appraisals			✓			To consider Wall and Wiggington (including changes to the CA boundaries) and the new CA is proposed for Drayton Bassett	Sean Coghlan	Cllr Ian Pritchard

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2018-19

Item	June	Sept	Nov	Jan	Mar	Details/Reasons	Officer	Member Lead
Economic Performance			✓				Craig Jordan	Cllr Ian Pritchard
Supplementary Planning Document on Sustainable Design Appendix A Update			✓				Sean Coghlan	Cllr Ian Pritchard
Conservation Area Appraisals			✓				Ashley Baldwin	Cllr Ian Pritchard
Festivals and Events					✓	This item will be led by LPWM to scope. EGED will consider tourism and economic matters	Lisa Clemson	Cllr Ian Pritchard
Building Control Shared Service						A briefing paper will be sent when information is ready	Ged Cooper	Cllr Ian Pritchard

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2018-19

Item	June	Sept	Nov	Jan	Mar	Details/Reasons	Officer	Member Lead
Local Plan Updates	✓	✓		✓	✓	Reports on progress with the Local Plan, neighbourhood plans	Ashley Baldwin	Cllr Ian Pritchard
BRS Working Group		✓	✓	✓	✓	Working group to be established	Craig Jordan	Cllr Ian Pritchard
Review of the operation of the new Planning Committee						Report likely in June 2019 to allow a full year of operation before review.	Sean Coghlan	Cllr Ian Pritchard
Briefing paper on Development Management performance		✓					Sean Coghlan	Cllr Ian Pritchard
Briefing paper on performance of self builds		✓						

ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2018-19

Item	June	Sept	Nov	Jan	Mar	Details/Reasons	Officer	Member Lead
Enforcement Plan Update			✓			To consider enforcement activity	Sean Coghlan	ClIr Ian Pritchard
Planning Enforcement Resources Review			✓				Sean Coghlan	ClIr Ian Pritchard
LEPs				✓		Item is dependent on outcome of Government proposals	Craig Jordan	ClIr Ian Pritchard

Local Plan and related spatial policy matters update

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



Date: 22 January 2019
 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 The Local Plan Allocations document has now been examined by the Planning Inspectorate. Following the public hearing sessions held in September 2018 the Council is now in receipt of the 'Main Modifications' which have been sent to the authority by the Planning Inspector who conducted the hearing sessions. Main modifications are provided following the hearing sessions to ensure that a Plan can be found sound. The District Council is currently consulting upon these main modifications until 6th February 2019. The responses received will be submitted to the Local Plan Inspector for his consideration.
- 1.2 Consultation on the Local Plan Review: Preferred Options & Policy Directions document will take place between 28th January 2019 and 18th March 2019. Following the close of the consultation officers will consider the responses received and report these to members in due course.
- 1.3 The Council is currently consulting upon the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) until the 1st February 2019. Following consultation officers will consider the responses received and report to members on the adoption of the SCI.
- 1.4 In respect of Neighbourhood Plan progress this is positive with three plans being 'made' and a referendum held for the Elford Neighbourhood Plan and a referendum scheduled to take place for the Fradley Neighbourhood Plan on 31st January 2019.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the progress associated with the Local Plan Allocations and Local Plan Review.
- 2.2 That the Committee note the progress associated with the Statement of Community Involvement.
- 2.3 The Committee notes the recent progress in relation to neighbourhood plans within Lichfield District.

3. Background

Local Plan Allocations

- 3.1 The Local Plan Allocations document has now been examined by the Planning Inspectorate. Members will recall that an update regarding the examination was provided to Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee on 19th September 2018. Following that update

and the examination hearing sessions which were held in September 2018, the Council is now in receipt of the Inspectors 'Main Modifications'. These Main Modifications can be [viewed here](#). The purpose of Main Modifications is to enable the Plan to be sound. In order for the Plan to progress to adoption the Council need to accept the proposed modifications and update the Plan accordingly. It is then necessary to undertake a period of public consultation for a minimum of six weeks. This consultation includes the schedule of minor modifications previously agreed by the Council in May 2018.

- 3.2 The Main Modifications were reported to members in November 2018 where it was determined by Cabinet that consultation on the modifications would take place between 19th December 2018 and 6th February 2019. This consultation is currently underway and is available to view via our [consultation portal](#). Alongside the modifications the Council has prepared an updated version of the Plan and its accompanying maps, Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment and Equality Impact Assessment which accompany the current consultation.
- 3.3 Following the consultation the Council will need to report the responses received back to the Planning Inspector who conducted the Examination. Following the Inspectors consideration the Council will then be issued with a report by the Inspector. This report will make clear the next steps the Authority needs to take. The objective following receipt of the Inspectors report will be to progress the Plan to adoption.

Local Plan Review

- 3.4 Members will recall that an update on the progress of the Local Plan Review was provided to Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee on 19th September 2018. At that time officers had been able to consider the responses which had been received to the Local Plan Review: Scope, Issues & Options document which had been subject to consultation between April and May 2018.
- 3.5 The next stage of the Plan review has been to prepare a Preferred Options and Policy Directions document for further public consultation. The Preferred Options and Policy Directions document will be reported to Cabinet on 15th January 2019. Subject to Cabinet approval the document will be published for public consultation between 28th January 2019 and 18th March 2019. The Preferred Options and Policy Directions document is important for the following reasons:
- The Council have committed to consult on this stage in its adopted Local Development Scheme (LDS);
 - The recently examined Local Plan Allocations includes a modification proposed by the Inspector that will require the Council to submit the Plan review in a timely manner;
 - Further evidence has been prepared and other evidence updated which has resulted in some policies and policy directions being drafted; and
 - It is important the Council obtain feedback on the proposed policies and policy directions to adequately inform the local plan review process.
- 3.6 Where possible the Preferred Options and Policy Directions document sets out the preferred planning policies which are suggested to be included within the Local Plan Review. These policies are based on the concluded evidence and/or the consultation responses which were received to the Scope, Issues and Options consultation. Where further work is required a preferred policy direction is identified which shows how such issues are being considered and how policies will be developed.

- 3.7 Following the consultation on this stage officers will need to consider the responses received. A report will then be produced for the EGED (O&S) Committee. In addition the evidence base listed in the consultation document will need to be completed. The intention is to bring a draft submission document to Cabinet for consultation in September 2019.

Statement of Community Involvement

- 3.8 Members will recall from a previous report that an update to the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is required. A Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is a statutory requirement and sets out how the Local Planning Authority will consult when undertaking its statutory planning functions such as the preparation of a Local Plan and the determination of planning applications.
- 3.9 Our current SCI was adopted in 2016. Since this time there have been a number of legislative changes which need to be considered and reflected in an amended SCI to keep it up to date and easy to use.
- 3.10 The SCI has been updated and a draft document was presented to Cabinet in November 2018 where it was determined that consultation on the draft document would take place between 2nd January 2019 and 1st February 2019. The consultation is currently underway and is available to view via our [consultation portal](#). This consultation will be followed by analysis of responses, and subject to the necessary changes a final draft will be developed which will be reported to this Committee prior to presentation to Cabinet for formal approval.

Neighbourhood Plans

- 3.11 There has been further progress on a number of Neighbourhood Plans which can be summarised as follows:
- The Alrewas, Armitage with Handsacre and Longdon Neighbourhood Plans were all 'made' and adopted on the 9th October 2018. These three neighbourhood plans now form part of the development plan within the District.
 - Elford Neighbourhood Plan will be made on the 15th January 2019 subject to ratification by Cabinet. Once made this will form part of the Districts development plan. This follows the successful referendum which was held on 29th November 2018.
 - Fradley Neighbourhood Plan was submitted for examination by Fradley Parish Council. The examination has been completed and the Independent Examiner concluded that subject to a number of modifications the Fradley Neighbourhood Plan could proceed to referendum. The referendum is scheduled to take place on 31st January 2019.
 - Burntwood Neighbourhood Plan and Hammerwich Neighbourhood Plan – both of these emerging neighbourhood plans are currently being progressed by the communities responsible for their production. It is anticipated that further drafts of these documents will be produced by the Town Council and Parish Council in the early part of 2019.
- 3.12 The 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.

Alternative Options	1. None. The contents of the report relates to items to be noted by the committee.
---------------------	--

Consultation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consultation is currently underway in relation to the Local Plan Allocations Main Modifications. 2. Consultation on the Preferred Options and Policy Directions document is scheduled to take place from 28th January 2019. 3. Consultation is currently underway in relation to the revised SCI.
---------------------	---

Financial Implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Officer time will be needed to undertake future the consultation on the Local Plan Review. 2. The costs of consultation will be met within approved budgets. 3. 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 accompanies the Local Plan Review 3. An Equality Impact Assessment accompanies the SCI
--	--

Crime & Safety Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None.
----------------------------------	--

GDPR/Privacy Impact Assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No privacy impact assessment has been undertaken.
---------------------------------------	--

	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.	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

Background documents:

Local Plan Allocations suggested main modifications
Schedule of Main modifications and other modifications
Local Plan Strategy 2015
Local Plan Review: Preferred Options & Policy Directions
Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2018
Local Development Scheme

Relevant web links:

[Local Plan Allocations suggested main modifications](#)
[Local Plan Allocations examination and main modifications](#)
[Local Plan Strategy 2015](#)
[Local Plan Review](#)
[Statement of Community Involvement](#)
[Local Development Scheme](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

Local Enterprise Partnerships Review

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



Date: 22 January 2019
Contact Officer: Craig Jordan
Tel Number: 01543 308202
Email: craig.jordan@lichfielddc.gov.uk

Key Decision?

Local Ward
Members

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

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP's) were introduced under the 2010 Coalition Government. They are the means by which sub-national economic development policy and delivery is developed and takes place and through which public monies are channelled to support local businesses and local economies. LEP's are intended to be business-led with respective Boards comprising representatives from the private and public sectors. When being set up Government allowed for local decisions to be made on the specific composition of Boards and their respective governance arrangements and the geography over which individual LEP's were effective. Lichfield District falls within two LEP's, that of the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP (GBSLEP) and the Stoke and Staffordshire LEP (SSLEP).
- 1.2 In 2018 and following a number of issues relating to operation of LEP's across the country being identified the Government announced a review of LEP's to ensure that they were fit for purpose and capable of implementing national policy emerging under the National Industrial Strategy. This report details the nature of the review and implications for Lichfield District and the GBSLEP and SSLEP.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the LEP Review and the progress made with this.
- 2.2 That the Committee notes the potential implications for Lichfield District of the decision to remove geographical overlaps between individual LEP's.

3. Background

Local Enterprise Partnerships

- 3.1 Prior to 2010 economic policy making and delivery at a sub-national/regional level was provided for by Regional Development Agencies eg, Advantage West Midlands. In 2010 the new Coalition Government disbanded the RDA's and put in place new arrangements intended to allow for more localised and business-led interventions to support business and local economies. Local Enterprise Partnerships was the name given to bodies which would come together formed of private and public sector interests to determine local economic priorities and how these should be addressed. Crucially, Government wished for LEP's to be the conduit for the allocation and spending of public monies on economic development matters.

- 3.2 There are currently 38 LEP's covering England. In the West Midlands there are 4 comprising the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP, the Black Country LEP, the Coventry and Warwickshire LEP and the Marches LEP.
- 3.3 When being developed the Government provided very little guidance on how LEP's should be defined or how they should operate. What the Government did say however was that in drawing up boundaries LEP's should as far as is possible reflect functional economic geographies ie. spatially how business and markets operate on a daily basis. Whilst economic geography was a key issue in the formation of LEP's other factors did also play a part and this led to a situation where in some cases LEP boundaries overlapped. In the West Midlands Lichfield District for example along with neighbours Tamworth and Cannock is a member of both the GBSLEP and SSLEP, Likewise Wyre Forest, Redditch and Bromsgrove Council's in north Worcestershire are members of the Worcestershire LEP and GBSLEP.
- 3.4 Since being introduced all LEP's and developed their own governance arrangements, agreed Board membership, formulated a set of local priorities and allocated funding to support business programmes and specific projects. One of the major initiatives that LEP's have worked with Government on is the setting up of Growth Hubs the basis for providing business support to local companies and those people who are considering establishing new businesses. LEP's have been responsible for allocating Regional Growth Fund monies and Growing Places Funds.
- 3.5 As a member of two LEP's Lichfield District Council has been party to the production of economic development strategies covering the GBSLEP and SSLEP; businesses in Lichfield District have access to two Growth Hubs; and, the area has also been successful in drawing down funding to support certain projects including the provision of a new road bridge over the West Coast Mainline in Lichfield to facilitate access to development land (SSLEP), the servicing of new employment land. Although the scheme was ultimately not carried forward funding from both LEP's would have assisted in bringing the former Friarsgate development forward together with public realm enhancements associated with this.

The LEP Review

- 3.6 The 2018 Local Plan Review is seeking to ensure that as the key vehicle for supporting national government in its ambitions all LEP's are properly set up and capable of delivering. Specifically, the Government wishes to see:
- LEP's which are suitably constituted – at present there are a range of arrangements in place. LEP's are legal entities and it is important that constitutionally they are properly set up to be open, transparent and accountable
 - LEP's which are genuinely business-led – membership proportions between the private and public/non-private sector varies across the country. Government believes business-led should mean just this and include a higher proportion of private sector leadership. In the same vein the review is suggesting that LEP's are clearly seen as separate from local government with LEP secretariats independent of such.
 - Improved Gender balance – as part of a review of membership the Government wishes to see a better gender balance on Boards of LEP's and better representation of those with protected characteristics
 - Better accountability – LEP's whilst separate from local government should ensure that they actively engage with local authority scrutiny arrangements
 - Improved consultation with stakeholders – LEP's need to engage with stakeholders and ensure their views help inform policy and decision making better
 - Clarity of geography – LEP's should have clear geographical boundaries with no overlaps and where relevant be coterminous with and reflect in working relationships Combined Authority boundaries

- 3.7 A number of milestones for implementing the Review have been set out as follows:
- Proposals for new geographies by 28 September 2018
 - Detailed plans for implementation of LEP's governance structures by 31st October 2018
 - First round of Local Industrial Strategies formulated by March 2019
 - LEP Delivery Plans (linked to economic priorities and LIS above) by April 2019
 - Legal entities confirmed in company formation by April 2019
 - Revised local assurance frameworks in place by April 2019
 - Local Industrial Strategies agreed by early 2020
 - Revised geographies to come into effect by Spring 2020
 - Improved gender balance of Boards by 2020 building towards equal representation by 2023
- 3.8 Following the instigation of the review LEP's have been undertaking their own review processes to determine the level of changes required to confirm with the Government's stated aims. For some LEP's this has required some major changes being proposed for others less so. Both the GBSLEP and SSLEP have taken proposals to their Boards with a view to responding to Government but to all intents and purposes both feel that they comply or don't need to undertake fundamental changes to be fit for purpose.
- 3.9 The key areas of debate which have emerged nationally and locally from the review are around the membership of LEP Boards, accountability and the removal of geographical overlaps. The latter of these is proving quite a controversial issue for some LEP's including those affecting Lichfield District.
- 3.10 A number of respondents to the Government's review have raised concerns at the proposals to strengthen the role of business in the leadership and governance of LEP's arguing that this effectively reduces the inputs and effectiveness of the public sector including local government. Questions have been posed as to whether given the desire for LEP's to be more accountable is there not a contradiction between increased private sector representation and better local accountability, particularly where links to local government would provide for better transparency.
- 3.11 The more contentious issue is that of the wish to remove geographical overlaps. The government believes that this would help address confusion as to which LEP a business or area is in and make it easier and clearer as to where public monies are being allocated and spent. In terms of the latter the Government is proposing to bring forward a UK Shared Prosperity Fund associated with Local Industrial Strategies – this will be the main fund by which LEP's will be able to assist in realising their locally-defined economic ambitions.
- 3.12 There are currently 19 overlaps across the 38 LEP's involving about 70 local authorities. Until the instigation of the current review the issue of overlaps had not seemingly been a matter of interest or concern for any party, Government, business or local communities. The response from many LEP's has been one of questioning why any changes are required to geographies other than making things cleaner and simpler to understand. It has been pointed out that many benefits have accrued from the current arrangements including:
- The establishment of new and positive working relationships between partners including local authorities
 - The strengthening of ties between adjoining LEP's where overlaps exist so that working relationships benefit both those areas within and outwith overlap portions

- An opportunity for those areas within overlaps to maximise the benefits from joint-membership including working with the relevant LEP's to see how proposed business support programmes and/or projects could be supported.

3.13 Likewise a number of dis-benefits have been put forward if overlaps were to be removed:

- Opens up the possibility of good working relations between partners being undermined
- Could create tensions and competition between adjoining LEP's
- Depending on the drawing of boundaries areas could find themselves in a LEP which does not suitably reflect their functioning economic geography or maintains the same economic ambitions or priorities.

3.14 In the case of the GBSLEP the Board of the LEP has indicated in its representations to Government that it would wish to see the status quo maintained. It argues that it is a LEP of significant size and scale and of national importance; it has developed building upon a strong working relationship with its 9 local authority partners, the private sector, the voluntary sector and academia; it has a strong record of delivery and; has the support of business and other stakeholders. Importantly, it recognises the value of good working relationships with the neighbouring LEP's.

3.15 The Stoke and Staffordshire LEP and Worcestershire LEP are not supportive of maintaining the status quo and would like the geography of the LEP's to be re-drawn on county boundaries – effectively meaning Lichfield District, Tamworth, East Staffordshire and Cannock leaving the GBSLEP and likewise Wyre Forest, Redditch and Bromsgrove doing the same.

3.16 The argument over LEP geographies has come to dominate the review process and to the degree that whilst Government has invited individual LEP's and partners to resolve matters and agree in the context of the stated objectives suitable positions in reality this has not happened. The level and nature of debate over this subject indicates the importance that at least some LEP's and their membership places on the issue and the belief that changes are not required or would be appropriate. In this respect it should be noted that this Council along with other Council's within the GBSLEP met with key civil servants at a meeting just before Christmas to again emphasise their wish to retain the present position without any geographical changes.

3.17 As a result of the above, the Government's stated deadline of agreeing new geographies by 28th September 2018 was missed and other future deadlines are likely to be missed too. Government has now to decide how it wants to progress on this issue.

3.18 The LEP Review is an important exercise reflecting as it does the desire on the part of Government to see LEP's as a key plank in delivering economic growth across England. The review itself identifies a range of themes which have emerged over the lifetime of the 38 LEP's which exist currently. Some of these themes are aimed at ensuring LEP's are properly constituted, have the right governance arrangements in place and are open and transparent in what they do and the decisions they make. There are issue here about the role of the public sector and the means by which decision making will be clear and seen as democratic. It is argued by many that reducing the proportions of public sector participants in LEP's will have a negative effect in this respect. The seemingly controversial issue appears to be that around geography and the arguments for and against removing overlaps and what this could mean for individual LEP's and partners.

Alternative Options	1. None. The contents of the report relates to items to be noted by the committee.
Consultation	1. The report provides details of an on-going review of Local Enterprise

	Partnership arrangements in England. The District Council as a member of two LEP's has been involved in discussions on the issues raised by the review.
Financial Implications	1. These will only be known after the completion of the review.
Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	1. The District Council's membership of two LEP's and Lichfield District being covered by the same designations provides a mechanism for attracting support for business and the local economy. A key objective of the Council's Strategic Plan is that it seeks to support the priority of a vibrant and prosperous economy.
Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	1. By providing for a strong healthy economy which allows for jobs and wealth creation the interests of all sectors of the community should be met.
Crime & Safety Issues	1. None.
GDPR/Privacy Impact Assessment	1. No privacy impact assessment has been undertaken.

	Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
A	The review adversely affects Lichfield District's interests	The District Council has communicated its view to the respective LEP's and also fed into responses back to Government by the LEP's.	Yellow

Background documents:
Strengthened Local Enterprise Partnerships – July 2018 MHCLG

Relevant web links:
None

This page is intentionally left blank

Birmingham Road Site Task Group

10th December 2018

Note of meeting

Attending

Cllr Tom Marshall – Chair

Cllr Jon O’Hagan

Support

Ged Bowles – IEWM

Craig Jordan – LDC

1. Apologies and non-attendance

Cllr Colin Ball

Cllr Paul Ray

Cllr Andrew Smith

Not attending

Cllr Gwynth Boyle

Cllr Mark Warfield

Cllr Robert Strachan

2. Feedback from SWOT analysis

Ged Bowles provided a summary of the SWOT analysis undertaken by the Group at its previous meeting identifying the key points raised under each of the relevant headings. The Group was reminded that the purpose of the SWOT exercise was to help understand better how the current city centre operates and what its strengths and weaknesses are and to highlight opportunities and threats going forward. The outputs from this could then be used to develop a brief for considering the types of development and uses of existing property that would be appropriate in the city centre including on the Birmingham Road site.

The salient points were:

- Recognition that Lichfield lacks a cinema
- There is a need for better public realm
- Quality streetscape is essential in whatever development proposals come forward
- Residents would benefit from more and better leisure and recreational facilities
- Younger peoples requirements for city centre facilities need to be met
- Transport and movement considerations need to be factored in to any plans including cycling and walking.
- Open spaces, their appearance and accessibility are very important

- The history and culture of Lichfield City should play a major part in defining future development plans
- Linked to the above, promoting the city to non-residents and encouraging short and longer term stays should be a key plank of tourism strategies and supported by the provision of appropriate facilities

It was suggested that in terms of threats and risks, outside of understanding the importance of affordability and deliverability there were no such barriers holding back the Council from being aspirational and wanting the best for the city.

Action: It was agreed that the results of the SWOT analysis produced by Ged Bowles be circulated to the members of the Task Group.

3. Going Forward

Due to the low attendance at the meeting the Chairman felt that it was not possible to undertake a full appraisal of the information needed to inform the next stage of the process, that of defining a brief for a 'master planning' exercise. However the feedback summary provided by Ged Bowles was a good start as were comments received by some Task Group members on the back of the last meeting including from Cllr Ball. There followed a brief discussion as to the matters which could be considered at the next meeting of the Task Group.

Aspirations:

- Public spaces serving different purposes need to be designed into development plans eg. amenity, performance etc
- Leisure provision: in addition to a cinema what other kinds of leisure and recreational facilities would be appropriate and how would these relate to the desire to support the night time economy?
- Housing should be a key component of any plans: what kinds of housing are needed and what would be appropriate particularly on a site like Birmingham Road?
- Is there a desire for retail and if so, what kind of retail provision would be suitable?

It was agreed that the Task Group should now focus on the specific requirements of the city and how sites including Birmingham Road could contribute to delivering this.

The chairman thanked Cllr O'Hagan for his contributions to the meeting and for Ged Bowles for his feedback and help in leading the discussions.

It was agreed that a meeting of the Task Group would be called for the new year to address the issues that had emerged from the SWOT analysis and to develop a masterplanning brief based on the city's requirements. The Task Group's ideas and thoughts would then be shared with stakeholder groups.

Action: The Chairman to facilitate a meeting of the Task Group in the new year.

The meeting concluded at 7.50pm