

Lichfield District Council
Lichfield District Local Plan Allocations DPD
Schedule of proposed modifications
October 2018

Key to schedule of Modifications:

Text to be deleted – strikethrough

Text to be added – bold

Text to remain unmodified – plain text

*Explanatory text for modification – italics***Schedule of main modifications**

Modification number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
MM1	LDC & Inspectors modifications	11	<p><i>Add section to include the following policy relating to the local plan review, within section incorporate the text of MM2 (below):</i></p> <p>Policy LPR: Local Plan Review</p> <p>Lichfield District Council shall carry out an early review of the Local Plan for Lichfield that will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination in accordance with the latest Local Development Scheme or no later than the end of December 2021. This review shall replace the adopted Local Plan Strategy (LPS) 2008-2029 in all aspects and therefore be a comprehensive review. This Plan will extend the existing plan period to at least 5 years beyond the end of the current LPS and it shall review as a minimum the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing requirement for Lichfield and the potential for housing land supply to meet this need. • Any unmet housing need arising from the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area (GBBCHMA), inclusive of any unmet need arising from Tamworth Borough, and the appropriate level of contribution which the District of Lichfield in 	To include a commitment within policy to undertake a local plan review and set the timescales for this.

Modification number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
			<p>line with ongoing technical work ad the requirements of policy TP48 of the adopted Birmingham Development Plan (BDP).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment land requirements for Lichfield as identified through a comprehensive evidence base. • Lichfield's potential role on meeting any wider unmet employment needs through the Duty to Co-operate (DtC). • The appropriateness of the existing settlement hierarchy and the strategic distribution of growth in light of new housing, employment and other service/infrastructure needs. • Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (GTTS) provision. • A comprehensive Green Belt Review either in partnership with relevant neighbouring authorities or in close consultation with these authorities through the DtC, to inform any further Green Belt release to accommodate new development within the District. 	
MM2	LDC & Inspectors modifications	11	<p><i>Addition of supporting text before and after the policy proposed through MM1 as follows:</i></p> <p>Introduction: Local Plan Review</p> <p>The Council is aware, and is committed to reviewing its Plan in full to assist in addressing strategic issues which cross local authority boundaries. The Council continues to work proactively with partners to identify the appropriate amount of growth to be accommodated within the boundaries of Lichfield District. In addition, as part of this review the Council will continue work with other Neighbouring Authorities through the Duty to Co-operate, as well as undertaking a comprehensive review of its evidence base.</p>	To provide explanatory text for MM1 which provides a commitment in policy to undertake a local plan review.

Modification number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
			<p>The Local Plan Review has already commenced with the publication of and consultation on a Scope, Issues and Options document in April 2018. Through a Local Plan Review, changes to the spatial strategy, policies and proposals within the current local plan may be required in response to emerging evidence or to reflect strategic issues being dealt with through the Duty to Co-operate. It is through this review process that consideration of such strategic matters, including the spatial strategy are most appropriately considered.</p> <p>Policy LPR: Local Plan Review sets a review mechanism for the Lichfield District Local Plan.</p> <p><i>Insert Policy LPR as proposed by MM1.</i></p> <p>Explanation</p> <p>The Local Plan Strategy identified that following on from discussions falling under the Duty to Cooperate (DtC) it had been identified through evidence emerging at that time that indicated Birmingham would not be able to accommodate its housing requirement within its administrative boundary and that a similar situation applied to Tamworth although on a much reduced scale. The Local Plan Strategy recognised that, in the event of further evidence which identified that further housing provision would be needed within Lichfield District, such issues could be addressed through a review of the Lichfield District Local Plan.</p> <p>It has been established through the examination and adoption of the Birmingham Development Plan that there is a significant unmet housing need arising from Birmingham and the wider Housing Market Area within</p>	

Modification number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
			<p>which it sits. Policy PG1 of the Birmingham Development Plan identifies an unmet need of approximately 37,900 dwellings in the period to 2021. It should be noted that further consideration of this need has been undertaken and it is considered to be a lower need than established within the Birmingham Development Plan. Lichfield District is part of the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area along with Birmingham, the Black Country authorities, South Staffordshire, Cannock Chase, Tamworth, North Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon, Solihull, Bromsgrove and Redditch.</p> <p>Additionally, Tamworth Borough Council's adopted Local Plan notes that it cannot meet its housing requirement within its own administrative area and requires a further 825 dwellings to be accommodated outside of the Borough. Tamworth is located within the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area and this additional shortfall of 825 dwellings is part of the overall shortfall within the Housing Market Area. It is considered most appropriate to consider how to address such shortfall as part of the wider HMA shortfall through the review of the Local Plan. Furthermore since the above shortfall was identified, the early stages of the review of the Black Country Core Strategy indicate a further shortfall of approximately 22,000 dwellings.</p> <p>To assist with discussion between the authorities within the HMA a significant evidence base has been produced by the authorities. This includes the Strategic Housing Needs Study (stage 2 and stage 3) and the Strategic Growth Study (2018). These studies provide a number of strategic recommendations and examine a number of strategic locations for housing growth which could assist in meeting unmet needs. Ultimately the study sets out a range of options which it concludes could be</p>	

Modification number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
			<p>considered through the review of authorities respective local plans. At this time no decisions upon the apportionment of such unmet need have made. A recommendation of the Strategic Housing Needs Studies was that there needed to be a consistent evidence base across the HMA authorities in relation to the Green Belt. The Strategic Growth Study includes a high level strategic green belt review all of which assists in providing a consistent evidence base for the authorities to base discussions and upon which future memorandums of understanding and/or statements of common ground apportioning unmet growth can be based.</p> <p>Alongside the strategic Green Belt Review within the Strategic Growth Study Lichfield District will prepare a comprehensive Green Belt Review to assess, in further detail, the capacity of the Green Belt across the authority as part of the evidence base supporting the review of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Although unmet housing need remains the largest scale cross-boundary issue, there are other associated issues which may need consideration including provision of accommodation for Gypsy and Travelers and employment land provision.</p> <p>The Council will continue work with other Neighbouring Authorities through the Duty to Co-operate, as well as undertaking a comprehensive review of its evidence base. The District Council is committed to working positively with its partners to address these strategic issues and where appropriate prepare Memorandums of Understanding or Statements of Common Ground with respect of the issues above.</p>	

Modification number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
MM3	LDC & Inspectors modifications	64	<p><i>Add the following text as a second paragraph to Policy NT1: North of Tamworth Housing Land Allocations:</i></p> <p>Within the Arkall Farm Housing Land Allocation, as identified in the inset map attached to policy NT1, the approved Masterplan identifies a range of land uses, open spaces and transport routes and their relationship both to each other and to the existing development in the vicinity of the site. Proposals should accord with the approved Masterplan, including the key development considerations.</p>	To ensure the development of the allocation is carried out in accordance with an approved masterplan.
MM4	LDC & Inspectors modifications	66	<p><i>Add the following text as a second paragraph to Policy R1: East of Rugeley Housing Land Allocations:</i></p> <p>Within the East of Rugeley Housing Land Allocation, as identified in the inset map attached to policy R1, the approved Masterplan identifies a range of land uses, open spaces and transport routes and their relationship both to each other and to the existing development in the vicinity of the site. Proposals should accord with the approved Masterplan, including the key development considerations.</p>	To ensure the development of the allocation is carried out in accordance with an approved masterplan.
MM5	LDC & Inspectors modifications	84	<p><i>Add the following text as a second paragraph to Policy OR1: 'Other Rural' Housing Land Allocations:</i></p> <p>Within the Watery Lane Housing Land Allocation, as identified in the inset map attached to policy OR7, the approved Masterplan identifies a range of land uses, open spaces and transport routes and their relationship both to each other and to the existing development in the vicinity of the site. Proposals should accord with the approved Masterplan, including the key development considerations.</p>	To ensure the development of the allocation is carried out in accordance with an approved masterplan.

Modification number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
MM6	LDC & Inspectors modifications	18	<p><i>Add the following to Policy EMP1: Employment Areas & Allocations:</i></p> <p>Development proposals outside the traditional employment use classes (B1, B2 and B8) will be supported on existing and allocated employment sites, where the development proposals clearly demonstrate the potential job creation on these sites, and provided that they do not undermine or constrain the main purpose of the employment allocation. Proposals for retail or leisure uses on existing or allocated employment sites will be permitted providing they are related in scale and use to the primary employment focus of the site and would have no adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the employment area.</p> <p>Development proposals outside the traditional employment uses classes (B1, B2 and B8) for non-employment generating uses will be supported on existing and allocated employment sites, if it is demonstrated that the continued use of a site, or its development for employment for employment uses, is not viable, through the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) details of comprehensive marketing of the site for at least 12 months and appropriate to the prevailing market conditions; and (ii) a financial appraisal that demonstrates that the development of any employment generating use is unviable. <p>Development proposals outside the traditional employment uses classes (B1, B2 and B8) for non-employment generating uses will be supported on existing and allocated employment sites, if it is demonstrated that the continued use of a site, or its development for employment for employment uses causes/or would lead to site-specific, environmental problems, such as noise, pollution of traffic generation, recognising the</p>	<p>To provide additional guidance with the policy in terms of proposals where alternative uses are proposed falling outside the traditional use classes.</p>

Modification number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
			environmental benefits to be gained by redeveloping these sites for non-employment generating uses.	
MM7	LDC & Inspectors modifications	19	<p><i>Add the following to the explanatory text after policy EMP1:</i></p> <p>Policy EMP1 seeks to ensure that compatible uses are provided on the existing employment sites within the District. The policy provides detail in relation to the level and type of evidence that is required to justify any loss of employment land. This evidence will assist the decision maker in coming to an evidence based decision. The policy should be read alongside other relevant development plan policies.</p>	To provide explanatory text to MM6.

Schedule of other modifications

Modification Number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
Section 4: Homes for the Future				
	LDC	15	<p><i>Correction of typographical error to second sentence of paragraph 4.3 as follows:</i></p> <p>This is illustrated through the Housing Housing Trajectory at Appendix D.</p>	To correct typographical error.

Modification Number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
Section 5: Economic Development & Enterprise				
	LDC	18	<p><i>Correction of typographical error to first sentence of policy EMP1 and replace a full stop with a comma as follows:</i></p> <p>...will contribute to the delivery of 79.1 hectares of employment land (Use classes B1-, B2, B8) drawn from the employment portfolio.</p>	To correct typographical error.
Section 7: Built & Historic Environment				
	LDC & Ruben Bellamy (Rep FC102), Gladman (FC133), JVH Planning (FC144, FC151, FC161, FC164, FC169, FC175, FC176, FC176)	24	<p><i>Propose minor modification to the text of the final paragraph of Policy BE2: Heritage Assets as follows:</i></p> <p>The loss of, or harm to, a heritage asset will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the ensuing harm and loss of significance of the heritage asset is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss in accordance with the NPPF.</p>	Too add clarity to the policy and to reflect the NPPF.
	Historic England (Rep FC257) & LDC	24	<p><i>Propose minor modification to the final sentence of Policy BE2: Heritage Assets as follows:</i></p> <p>In this case the areas affected should be recorded and the information submitted to the Staffordshire County Council's Historic Environment Record as a minimum.</p>	Too accord with the NPPF.
	LDC	24	<i>Correction of grammatical error to second sentence of paragraph 7.1 as follows:</i>	To correct grammatical error.

Modification Number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
			...registered parks and gardens and conservations areas.	
	LDC	24	<p><i>Correction of grammatical error to fourth sentence of paragraph 7.2 as follows:</i></p> <p>It may be beneficial to obtain the advice of a suitably qualified professional to put together the assessment of significance, the assessment of the impact of the development on that the significance, the design of the proposals and relevant documentation.</p>	To correct grammatical error.
Section 8: Lichfield City				
	LDC	26	<i>Remove web address from third paragraph of Policy Lichfield 3: Lichfield Economy.</i>	To remove text which has been incorrectly incorporated within the text of the policy.
	LDC	28	<p><i>Change name of site L2 in the table within the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>East of Lichfield, (Streethay) SDA extension land north of Roman Heights</p>	<i>To reflect the current name of the site.</i>
	LDC	30	<p><i>Change name of site L26 in the table within the policy as follows:</i></p> <p>Friarsgate Land at Birmingham Road</p>	<i>To reflect the current name of the site.</i>
	Historic England (Rep FC257) & LDC	31, 33, 34, 37, 48	<i>Correction of terminology used for scheduled monuments within the 'Key development considerations' for Sites L1, L4, L6, L9 and L29:</i>	To use the correct terminology as suggested by Historic England.

Modification Number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason				
			Design and scale of redevelopment must be considered in the context of the buildings location within the conservation area and proximity to heritage assets including scheduled ancient monument(s)					
	LDC	32	<i>Change name of site L2 within the site description as follows: East of Lichfield, (Streethay) SDA-extension land north of Roman Heights</i>	To reflect the current name of the site.				
	LDC	46	<i>Change name of site 26 within the site description as follows: Friarsgate Land at Birmingham Road</i>	To reflect the current name of the site.				
	LDC & Rep FC126	49	<i>Change typology of floorspace within the site information for Site L30 from B1a to B1 to reflect the permitted scheme as secured through planning permission.</i> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Site Area (Ha)</td> <td>4.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Floorspace (m²)</td> <td>12,500 (B1)</td> </tr> </table>	Site Area (Ha)	4.4	Floorspace (m ²)	12,500 (B1)	For consistency with permitted scheme for the site.
Site Area (Ha)	4.4							
Floorspace (m ²)	12,500 (B1)							
Section 9: Burntwood								
	LDC	54	<i>Correction to paragraph 9.8 to correctly total the approximate dwelling capacity of the proposed allocations within Policy B1 and Policy B2.</i> As illustrated by table 4.1 sufficient allocations have been identified to meet the housing requirements for Burntwood. These allocations provide for approximately 728 383 dwellings (including a number of already committed sites) within and adjacent to Burntwood to ensure that the requirements as set out within the Local Plan Strategy are met.	To correctly total the allocations within Policy B1 and Policy B2. As drafted this is currently incorrect.				

Modification Number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
Policies Map				
Lichfield & Hatherton Canal Restoration Trust (Rep 209-210)	Lichfield District Policies Map, Inset 1: Lichfield City	<p><i>Line illustrating the safeguarded route of the Lichfield Canal does not correctly show at inset map scale. Route requires minor change to ensure the route is drawn around an electricity pylon to the south of the A38.</i></p> <p><i>Updated maps included at Appendix A of this schedule.</i></p>	<p>To correct route to that agreed between LDC and the canal restoration trust. Correction is minor and does not relate to any area where the change would impact upon development, other consultation responses or any other designation or allocation. It should be noted that this change can only be viewed at a localised map i.e. not the Proposals map. This change is not considered to materially impact the Plan.</p>	
LDC	Lichfield District Policies Map, Inset 7 Colton, Inset 10 Elford, Inset 12 Fradley, Inset 13 Hamstall	<p><i>Replace Conservation Area boundaries (Colton, Elford, Fradley Junction, Hamstall Ridware, Harlaston, Haunton, Hints, and Mavesyn Ridware) with correct adopted Conservation Area boundaries.</i></p> <p><i>Change is factual to include the adopted Conservation Area boundaries for the identified settlements (Colton, Elford, Fradley junction, Hamstall Ridware, Harlaston, Hints, and Mavesyn Ridware). Conservation Area legislation is covered elsewhere and the policies maps are an expression of this legislation.</i></p> <p><i>Updated maps included at Appendix A of this schedule.</i></p>	<p>Incorrect Conservation Area boundaries have been shown for the settlements noted on the Policies Maps and respective insets. At the time of drafting proposed alterations to Conservation Area boundaries were being considered by the District Council. These boundaries were identified on the Council's base map and were pulled through when the Policies maps were developed. However because</p>	

Modification Number	Source of Modification	Page number	Proposed change	Reason
		Ridware , Inset 14 Harlaston		changes were not adopted it is recommended that the policies maps should show the currently adopted Conservation Area boundaries. As with recommended change M11 the change is factual and does not materially alter the Plan.

Appendix A – Schedule of Modifications to policies maps: