

Appendix H - Summary of late representations

Representation Reference	Consultee/ Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Is the plan sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary	Changes Required	Officer Response
L1	Clr David Thompson (Shenstone Parish Council)	GTAA	Yes	Yes	Yes, No, Yes, Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Shenstone Parish Council has within its boundary a travellers site on land not originally designated as such. Shenstone Parish Council maintain that this result in Stonnall was in part a result of historic inadequate provision by LDC to provide sites in more appropriate locations. The 2007 accommodation assessment had identified the need for 19 pitches in the District Council area to 2026 and when the Gravelly Lane site was occupied initially without planning permission in 2017. At that time only 7 pitches were available in the District Council area. This is still the position, a shortfall of 12 pitches fourteen years after the needs assessment.</p> <p>Shenstone Parish Council challenges the Lichfield District Council Local Plan justification of only 7 additional pitches by 2040 is based on shortfalls in assessing need in the November 2019 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA). This follows the 2018 inspection at Gravelly Lane, where the Inspector highlighted that there has been a gross under provision over many years.</p> <p>There is no evidence of any consultation with existing landowners revealing their disposition to growth of the sites they own or explanation of existing owner/site extra land ownership potential. The previous policy sought to locate traveller sites around Key Rural Settlements as they contained the supportive amenities necessary to sustain traveller sites. In 2018 the Gravelly Lane Planning Inspector gave only "moderate weight" to the location in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The GTAA has primarily taken as evidence of need from the traveller households on existing sites. There is no evidence of consultation with organisations representing travellers regionally or nationally about needs. The GTAA states that "recent evidence suggests that Lichfield has a need for traveller transit provision. However, that transit need has not yet been delivered." The roadside and transit demand has not been engaged in forming the proposals. The transient demand may also point to the need for permanent pitches, this has not been considered. As site under provision has been a reality since 2007 the commitment to "consider all available delivery mechanisms" in 2024 in the event that additional provision has not been secured is weak as the commitment to "consideration" in 2024 could take several years further to be developed.</p>	No changes required.	Local Plan 2040 includes policies in relation to the provision of accommodation to meet the identified gypsy and traveller accommodation requirements. This is supported by a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) which forms part of the evidence to the Local Plan 2040 and updates previous evidence. The Local Plan 2040 acknowledges that insufficient deliverable sites have been identified to meet the requirements and proposes a criteria based policy in order to proactively provide for such needs.
L2	Tamworth and District Civic Society	SHA2	Unanswered	Unanswered	Unanswered	Unanswered	Unanswered	<p>Disappointed that LDC appears to be ignoring overwhelming opposition - on sound planning grounds - by local residents and organisations, and neighbouring authorities, to proposals for 800 houses at Mile Oak.</p> <p>The removal of land at Mile Oak from the Green Belt and proposal for 800 homes is unsustainable in terms of transport infrastructure and other services, including health and education.</p> <p>The impact and burden of the increased population will fall to Tamworth whilst all Council Tax income will go to Lichfield District. Ecological and environmental damage from loss of Green Belt, open land, flora and fauna and by association quality of life and physical and mental wellbeing will be affected. The development would destroy the rural character of Mile Oak and harm heritage and identity.</p> <p>Existing and proposed developments within LDC at Arkall Farm and land north of Browns Lane are removing any visual and Green Belt boundary between those areas and Tamworth.</p> <p>This will all lead to continued friction and discontent in the area and growing pressure for a local government boundary change in favour of Tamworth.</p>	No changes required.	Local Plan 2040 includes policies to ensure appropriate infrastructure is delivered across the plan period. The District Council works with neighbouring authorities including Tamworth Borough Council through the duty to cooperate. Local Plan 2040 includes policies to ensure appropriate infrastructure is delivered. Local Plan 2040 contains detailed policy in respect of heritage assets. Transport evidence is being undertaken having been postponed due to the coronavirus pandemic. Raw data has been collected to inform appropriate mitigation.
L3	Craig Alsbury (Avison Young) for Metacre Ltd	Whole Document	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>No Statements of Common Ground have been released with the Publication version Local Plan 2040, therefore it is unclear whether the Duty to Co-operate has been satisfied and how cross boundary issues have been addressed.</p> <p>Consider that the Plan is not sound, has significant concerns relating to certain aspects of the Plan and the technical evidence that underpins it. The approach the Council is taking in relation to Policy SP1: Spatial Strategy is at odds with the settlement hierarchy. There are two major soundness issues with this. Firstly, directing the least amount of development (4%) to the Districts second most sustainable settlement is not sustainable nor acceptable. It is noted that the 4% of growth directed to Burntwood is already committed by planning permission so the Local Plan is making no provision for growth at Burntwood at all. Secondly, directing almost a third of the growth that is required to the service villages is at odds with the settlement hierarchy and is equally not sustainable or supported by evidence.</p> <p>It cannot be right that Green Belt releases are justified adjacent to less sustainable settlements but that the existence of Green Belt around Burntwood is regarded as an insurmountable obstacle to its expansion. The plan fails to direct a level of growth to Burntwood that is consistent with its size, sustainability, credentials and position in the settlement hierarchy and relationship with conurbations.</p> <p>Policy SP1 states that the Local Plan addresses the District's local housing need which the Council has calculated to be 321 dwellings per annum, or 7,062 over the Plan period. However, the Council's HEDNA 2020 states that Lichfield's baseline housing need, applying the standard method, is 331 dwellings per annum. It is not clear from the Council's evidence why the Local Plan provides for less development than calculated by its advisers.</p> <p>Metacre welcomes the fact that the Council is proposing to address some of the unmet housing need that is arising elsewhere in the HMA. However, there are serious concerns about the lack of evidence underpinning the 2,655 dwelling figure quoted in Policy SP1. We cannot find any evidence that explains or justifies the figure that the Council has settled on. There is no explanation of the derivation of the figure in either housing need or land supply terms. In regards to flexibility, the Local Plan must be supported by appropriately detailed evidence on housing delivery in order for its assertions in respect of in-built flexibility to be tested. There are major concerns about the site selection process and these are compounded by the fact that the evidence base for this matter is incomplete.</p> <p>The Plan makes no provision for safeguarded land and there is no evidence of the Council having addressed itself to the question of what its development needs will be beyond the Plan period and whether, as a consequence of these, it is likely to have to alter its Green Belt boundaries at the end of the Plan period.</p>	No changes required.	<p>LDC can demonstrate extensive DTC work undertaken with neighbouring bodies and which will be made available for the plan submission and examination.</p> <p>Housing requirement within the Local Plan 2040 provides for the Local Housing Need (LHN) as established by the Standard Methodology and supported by evidence within the HEDNA. Local Plan 2040 provides contribution toward unmet needs arising from the GBBCHMA, contribution is considered to be appropriate and soundly based.</p> <p>A wide range of evidence base has been used when determining the spatial strategy and proposed allocations within the Local Plan 2040. The evidence base supporting the Local Plan 2040 is directly referenced within the explanatory text within the Local Plan 2040. The Site Selection Paper 2019 was prepared at the time of the assessment. Further evidence has been prepared and published in support of the Local Plan. The Local Plan 2040 seeks to deliver sufficient homes to meet the housing requirement of the plan in accordance with the spatial strategy.</p> <p>Local Plan 2040 makes clear that an area action plan for Burntwood will be progressed following the adoption of the Local Plan 2040.</p>
L4	Ian MacLeod (Birmingham City Council)	Unanswered	Unanswered	Unanswered	Unanswered	Unanswered	Unanswered	<p>Birmingham City Council has been fully engaged with Lichfield Council, alongside all other local authorities within the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area, since the Birmingham Development Plan (BDP) was adopted in 2017 and confirmed a housing shortfall of 37,900 homes up to 2031. The City Council is grateful for the help and co-operation received from Lichfield in making significant progress thus far towards reducing the HMA shortfall.</p> <p>The key strategic cross boundary issue for Birmingham is the unmet housing need for the Greater Birmingham and Black Country HMA. Birmingham City Council therefore welcomes the contents of the proposed Publication Document including the themes, issues, vision and objectives set out in Chapter 3. In particular, BCC supports the key issue identifying the need to meet strategic housing and employment requirements, not just for the District itself, but for the wider Housing Market area.</p> <p>In relation to the provision of housing Paragraph 4.22 stipulates that "a capped contribution of 2,000 is to be made for the Black Country authorities' needs starting after 2027 to assist with their identified shortfall up to 2040." We believe that the current splitting of the contribution does not reflect the functional relationship between Birmingham and Lichfield in terms of travel to work patterns and connectivity which is far stronger than the relationship between Lichfield and the Black Country in these terms.</p> <p>There is still a housing shortfall for Birmingham and this is likely to grow further up to, and beyond 2031 for the reasons stipulated. If a split is deemed to be necessary, then a numerical contribution should consider the functional relationships between Lichfield, Birmingham and the Black Country, and be apportioned based on evidence around travel to work areas and connectivity. It is considered that this evidence would lead to a split in favour of Birmingham or, at the very least, a 50/50 split between Birmingham and the Black Country.</p> <p>Welcomes the opportunity to discuss this matter in more detail with LDC and the Black Country authorities with a view to agreeing the split in a Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.6 refers to a buffer to provide flexibility in the housing supply across the plan period. Whilst BCC agree that some degree of a buffer is required for the purposes highlighted in paragraph 8.6, the buffer level identified (36.7%) seems excessive and the Local Plan does not signpost any evidence or provide any explanation as to how this buffer level has been derived. Given that there is an immediate housing shortfall within the HMA, there needs to be more explanation as to why a greater of this buffer could not be used to further offset these HMA housing shortfalls.</p>	No changes required.	Local Plan 2040 seeks to plan for the Councils established local housing need and contribute to unmet need from the wider housing market area in accordance with national policy and guidance and the plan's supporting evidence. Housing supply evidence from the Five Year Housing Land Supply and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment supports the Local Plan 2040.

Appendix H - Summary of late representations

Representation Reference	Consultee/ Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Is the plan sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary	Changes Required	Officer Response
L5	Mr and Mrs Moss	No	No	No	No	No	No	<p>LDC has not worked with other councils or the local community when selecting SHA2 at Mile Oak. The council have ignored hundreds of objections to SHA1 raised by the local community.</p> <p>SHA2 is located in Green Belt. The plan does not comply with NPPF policy on protecting the Green Belt. the Local Plan is unsound as exceptional reasons required to justify 800 homes in this location in the green belt are not set out in the local plan. SHA2 does not meet the objectives in the sustainability appraisal. The results of the 2019 Green Belt Review have not been interpreted correctly.</p> <p>Brownfield sites and sites not in the Green Belt should be chosen before SHA2, SHA2 should not have been chosen before gathering all evidence such as traffic assessment and impact on local infrastructure. SHA2 is too big when compared to existing Fazeley ward.</p> <p>The local plan is not effective or deliverable over the plan period as the infrastructure requirements of SHA2 have not been fully considered on traffic such as the A453. High school places haven't been considered. Allocation of SHA2 is not consistent with the NPPF: Section 5, Section 8. Section 13, Section 14, Section 15.</p>	No changes required.	<p>Council have worked with those authorities to whom the Duty to Cooperate applies throughout the progression of the Local Plan 2040.</p> <p>Local Plan 2040 includes policies to ensure appropriate infrastructure is delivered across the plan period. Local Plan 2040 includes policies to ensure appropriate infrastructure is delivered.</p> <p>LDC has worked with infrastructure providers to support the development. Site is selected having regard to evidence base in Green Belt study and because exceptional circumstances exist to meet identified housing need.</p>