

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1	Lesley Edgley	1	Issue 8 - people will always use cars. You can encourage people to walk but Lichfield and its surrounding villages are very restricted on walking and the local bus system is pretty poor. Should try and encourage car drives to travel as little as possible and at the least inconvenience to the area. We have a train line which with a bit of upgrading on times anc carriages would benefit all. There is a problem with commuter parking. Long term solution is to work with the rail company to provide a Park and Ride facility at Wall. Long term it could be expanded to encourage tourism.	Noted
POPD2	Lesley Edgley	8	People will always use cars. You can encourage people to walk but Lichfield and its surrounding villages are very restricted on walking and the local bus system is pretty poor. Should try and encourage car drives to travel as little as possible and at the least inconvenience to the area. We have a train line which with a bit of upgrading on times anc carriages would benefit all. There is a problem with commuter parking. Long term solution is to work with the rail company to provide a Park and Ride facility at Wall. Long term it could be expanded to encourage tourism.	The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility. Note that Preferred policy : High quality design bullet 7 relates to Sustainable Travel in regard to housing locations and detailed design elements.
POPD3	Lesley Edgley	13	Private builders will always want to build the biggest and most profitable they can. To ensure Lichfield builds what is required would it not be possible to join forces with Staffordshire Council and fund the land purchase. Councils could then build what is required, selling at a small profit. Sale proceeds could then be returned to Council's coffers. It would ensure council building requirements are met.	Comments and preferred approach noted.
POPD4	Neil Cranfield	Whole Document	Do not support the preferred spatial strategy as it has been written to nullify the importance of existing Green Belt land and thus enable LDC to reclassify Green Belt for development of new settlements. Want this strategy to be replaced with a strategy that has any new development of new settlements being located outside of any Green Belt. This is more greener and sustainable.	Comments and preferences noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD5	Ben Adams	22	Green belt should only be used for residential or employment development when all other options have been exhausted. Options for new settlements exist outside the green belt, notably along the A38 which have good road and rail access.	Noted. See responses to chapter 21-23.
POPD6	Ben Adams	Whole Document	Support using employment land in villages and Burntwood which is not attractive to business for housing. Employment land should be adjacent to main arterial routes where possible. Green belt should only be used for residential or employment development when all other options have been exhausted. Options for new settlements exist outside the green belt, notably along the A38 which have good road and rail access and these should be developed before the unique nature of the district is compromised.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered by the Local Plan Review.LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing and employment needs.The evidence base is being updated to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD7	Thomas	11	The policy direction for housing density seems reasonable overall, providing it is qualified by the points made in item 14.39. Want existing residents to input to the additional work on areas and densities, will Neighbourhood Plans have a role in concluding areas/densities?	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD8	Mr I Badhams	3	(no comment made)	Noted
POPD9	Thomas	3	RSSS doesn't take account of limited availability to services for Little Aston, eg public transport. Bus services doesn't pass train station. Score should be reduced.	Noted.
POPD10	Thomas	9	When carrying out the testing referred to in 14.26 the higher figure of 4500 would further increase the proportion from outside need to 40% of 11160 - about 2 houses in 5. Care should be taken not to exceed an acceptable ratio of outside instigated houses. The 1 in 3 from Option 4 already sounds too high! It is reasonable to assume that occupants of a house based on an unmet need from outside Lichfield will have a greater chance of working and/or have social contacts outside Lichfield. This can lead to a significant increase in travel movements, including car journeys. New demand for services may be funded from extra council tax, but may require capital investment and it would not be reasonable to ask existing residents to contribute.	Comments noted.
POPD11	Major Aly Hulme	1	New housing development should be kept to a minimum to protect Shenstone and its residents from crime, house burglaries, congestion and pollution from cars and waste.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues.
POPD12	Mr Colin Birch	Whole Document	Not an appropriate strategy as we are building houses with no infrastructure in Burntwood, Chase Terrace and Chasetown e.g health care, with poor shopping facilities. Not utilised all available space without building on Green Belt e.g at Mount Road. Continuing sprawl will impinge on populations health and well being. No justification for building in Burntwood, should be planning new settlement on A38 with rail station to serve NMA. Burntwood /Chase Terrace /Chasetown area cannot support more large housing developments. We are not providing the facilities that are required for new housing and the facilities we already have are inadequate for the population already living in the area.	Noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and urban capacity assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD13	Miss EL Blackburn	Whole Document	Do not agree with plans to use Green Belt for new housing. Burntwood should not be allowed tosprawl further, all countryside and Green Belt should be protected, these spaces are important for mental well being. Burntwood's current infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable. Facilities are poor and have to travel out of the town to access them. Roads are poor, public transport deteriorated. Unless all Mount Road designated there is insufficient PDL to provide a significant number of houses. No faith in any new Green Belt review. I can visualise no exceptional circumstances in which Burntwood's Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt land have been put forward should be planning for new settlements on the A38 east and west and Packington Hall Farm, Tamworth Road and any other suitable and sustainable locations outside of Green Belt land. We must all work together to protect our countryside and Green Belt to keep them healthy and happy places to live in now and for generations to come, Council should listen to the people who live and work here and deserve to have our voices heard about what is the best way to move forward for our town and our lives.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and urban capcity assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD14	Mr S Wadlow	1	Housing growth within the defined areas needs to be for locals only to keep our strong sense of community.	Noted. The local plan review cannot define areas for locals only new housing development.
POPD15	Mr S Wadlow	2	Disagree	Noted. But no justification / suggestions provided
POPD16	Mr S Wadlow	3	Disagree, better areas available with more services and access than Shenstone.	Comments noted.
POPD17	Mr S Wadlow	8	Agreed as it ticks many boxes.	Duly Noted, No Further Action
POPD18	Mr S Wadlow	9	The plan is not detailed enough.	Noted
POPD19	Mr S Wadlow	10	A mix of all levels of housing is needed.	Comments noted.
POPD20	Mr S Wadlow	11	No	Noted
POPD21	Mr S Wadlow	12	Yes a list of such suitable sites should be available.	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD22	Mr S Wadlow	13	As a community we are required to make available sites for travellers this should be done, but the document does not commit how.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD23	Mr S Wadlow	14	We need industrial areas for survival, and need to take in to consideration what these areas do for our local communities, the income for local business's from workers allows shops catering etc, and the rates they pay is crucial.	Duly Noted, The Preferred policy direction; Our employment and ecominc development "seeks to maintain and enhance a diverse local econmoy and ensiurage opportunities for inward investment."
POPD24	Mrs H Branch	2	(no comment made)	Noted
POPD25	Mrs H Branch	3	(no comment made)	Noted.
POPD26	Mrs H Branch	6	(no comment made)	Noted
POPD27	Mrs H Branch	11	(no comment made)	Noted
POPD28	Mrs H Branch	16	(no comment made)	Noted
POPD29	Mrs H Branch	17	(no comment made)	No comment made
POPD30	Mrs H Branch	22	(no comment made)	Noted.
POPD31	Mrs H Branch	Chapter 14	(no comment made)	No comment made.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD32	Thomas	3	Present hierarchy doesn't differentiate sufficiently between the services available in settlements and is misleading. Little Aston does not have the same level of services and facilities as the other level 3 settlements e.g drs, pub and public transport is remote and not easily accessible and should be lower.	Comments noted. The settlement hierarchy has been informed by the findings of the Settlement Sustainability Study which identifies Little Aston as Level 3 - Larger Service Villages. The Settlement Study defines Level 3 tier settlements as having common attributes including meeting the day to day needs of the community and acting as hubs for the wider rural areas.
POPD33	Janet Davies	Whole Document	Object to further development Burntwood by building on the sites indicated in the Local Plan Review. Burntwood's infrastructure would not be able to cope. Urban sprawl of continuous development is depleting the area of areas of countryside beneficial to health and well being. Urban development between Burntwood and Lichfield is detrimental to Lichfield's charm.	Duly noted
POPD34	Christopher Fitzpatrick	Whole Document	Would like to own my first home in this area. I have found very few houses in the area suitable for first time buyers. Properties in Whittington are either too expensive or very dated and not suitable for first time buyers. Would love to see new properties developed in the area which would attract a wealth of new residents to sustain and grow Whittington.	Comments noted. Any site specific proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review and updated evidence base including in relation to housing need
POPD35	Lichfield Rail Promotion Group (John Adams)	8	<p>Suggest the policy direction is not sufficiently precise and is inconsistent with the proposed commitment to sustainable transport. There is little indication to how the Council will 'continue to work with partners to improve accessibility by enhancing sustainable transport opportunities.'</p> <p>Preferred policy direction is to undertake additional additional evidence base work. What does focuses on identifying sustainable transport opportunities in line with national regional and local priorities mean.</p> <p>There is a policy to improve the road network and consider parking provision - is this sustainable transport? There is no mention of the improvements needed in public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There is little in the policy to recognise the need for people to commute into Lichfield by train or bus from outlying districts because housing in Lichfield is becoming less affordable for many young people of workinh age.</p> <p>Ask that a commitment is made to work with partners in SCC, train operating companies, network rail and where appropriate West Midlands Rail Executive.</p>	<p>Duly Noted: Policy Direction is taken from the National Planning Policy Framework Chapter 9 promoting sustainble transport.</p> <p>Considerations relating to patterns of movement and parking is a requirement of the NPPF.</p> <p>The preferred policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.</p> <p>Housing balance in the District is considered in Our Spatial Strategy</p>
POPD36	Savills (Jessica Graham) on behalf of The Crown Estate	3	<p>Promotes 5 parcels of land to the west of Lichfield</p> <p>Support Lichfield being identified as a Level 1 Strategic Centre. Consider Lichfield is the most sustainable settlement in the District and therefore strategic residential growth should be directed to this area.</p> <p>Acknowledge bullet point 1 of the strategy - consider there is not enough land within settlements to accommodate growth or contribute to meeting the GBHMA shortfall and therefore sustainable extensions wil be required.</p> <p>Bullet point 2 - examined the Housing Delivery Trest and LDCs calculated score is 102% which indicates no action is required. However, the Housing Delivery Test only measures authorities Local Housing Need over a small time period of 3 year and does not account for assisting neighbouring local authoritieis housing needs under the DtC which was introduced in the revised NPPF of July 2018.</p> <p>Bullet point 7 - Lichfields Green Belt should be reviewed around the most sustainable settlements. Following the GBHMA study, consider special circumstances exist to justify the release of land from Green Belt within the District</p>	Comments and preferences noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and an Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD37	Savills (Jessica Graham) on behalf of The Crown Estate	8	<p>Promotes 5 parcels of land to the west of Lichfield</p> <p>Acknowledge a transport assessment will be commenced to inform the requirements for a sustainable strategy. Appendix A does not provide the date of expected publication for the Transport Modelling Evidence base. Recommend that this is publised as soon as possible to ensure the plan is justified by appropraite evidence.</p> <p>Consider housing has a direct relationship to the IDP requirement and as the final housing figure is yet to be agree the infrastructure that may be needed to support sustainable transport is unknown. However, supportive of LDC approach to encourage future development on the most sustainable locations to reduce the need to travel.</p>	Duly Noted. Infastructure requirements for the District will be articulated within the Infastructure Delivery Plan.
POPD38	Savills (Jessica Graham) on behalf of The Crown Estate	9	<p>Promotes 5 parcels of land to the west of Lichfield</p> <p>Recommend LDC stick to the timescales for the evidence base listed in Appendix A to facilitate a comprehensive review. SHMA should be added to the list in Appendix A.</p> <p>Acknowledge the resultant Standard Methodology figure of 333 dwellings, however this does not include the contribution LDC will have to make the GBHMA shortfall. LDC needs to show a commitment to meet any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring area and should take this into account when establishing their housing provision. Consider before a policy on housing provision is finalised the distribution of housing across the GBHMA should be agreed in a Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>Consider Option 5 (11,160 dwellings for the plan period to 2036) is the most appropraite and realistic housing target.</p>	Comments and support for option 5 noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD39	Savills (Jessica Graham) on behalf of The Crown Estate	10	<p>Promotes 5 parcels of land to the west of Lichfield</p> <p>Consider a strategic policy on housing mix needs to be informed by an up to date SHMA.</p> <p>Consider that a policy proposing a specific housing mix may have implications for housing delivery in LDC. The housing market differs across Lichfield's administrative area and if a prescriptive housing mix is applied than the policy may not reflect market demand.</p> <p>A housing mix policy should recognise that a specific housing mix is influenced by market demand and location. Suggest LDC should set out housing mix requirements in an Evidence Base document rather than it be a fixed strategic policy. Each site should be considered independently based on site characteristics and locality. This will ensure that LDC adopts a flexible approach which can respond to market fluctuations and demographic changes over the plan period.</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD40	Savills (Jessica Graham) on behalf of The Crown Estate	Chapter 22	<p>Promotes 5 parcels of land to the west of Lichfield</p> <p>Support Residential Growth Option 1. Consider Lichfield City is the most sustainable settlement and therefore future residential growth should primarily be directed to this area. As such, sites within and adjacent to Lichfield should be prioritised as potential residential options.</p> <p>The western side of Lichfield City is greenbelt, however it is considered that there is already significant growth identified within the current plan on land the north and east of the City. In order to reliver pressure off existing infrastructure, residential growth should be dispersed and land to the West of Lichfield should be released from Green Belt.</p>	Comments and preferences noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD41	Tetlow King (Julie O'Rouke) on behalf of West Midlands HARP	9	Revised NPPF has a commitment to 'boost significantly the supply of housing', the review is an opportunity to reflect this key aspect of the NPPF by optimising the number of suitable, available and achievable sites for residential development. This should lead to a higher overall provision of affordable housing across the district.	Comments noted.
POPD42	Tetlow King (Julie O'Rouke) on behalf of West Midlands HARP	10	<p>The timing of the new Local Plan indicates a significant opportunity to be both proactive and imaginative in securing the delivery of affordable housing in the district. Standard practice of securing and maximising affordable housing through s106 planning oblaigions should be set at an appropraite level in accordance with a robust viability appraisal.</p> <p>GBHMA Strategic Growth Study evidence evidence a significant increase in need for all housing tenures, of all sizes. In translating these needs into suitable policies, the Council should look to involve HA as far as possible in setting a local definition of affordable housing that will encourage delivery of the full range of affordable housing types to meet local needs. The preference for early engagement with HA should be emphasised in Plan policies.</p> <p>Note the Council's intention to publish a HEDNA however the commitment to develop an Affordable Housing Viability Assessment has been deleted. This is necessary to ensure that affordable housing policies are deliverable in line with the tests of soundness.</p>	Comments noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD43	Tetlow King (Julie O'Rouke) on behalf of West Midlands HARP	11	Support the Council's commitment to support development that makes efficient use of land. It would be helpful for the review to identify areas where higher density development can be delivered across the district, so long as policy contains an element of flexibility to respond to individual site circumstances. The implementation of National Space Standards is problematic where this is not applied across all tenures of new C3 residential development. Recommend the Council implements this across all tenures. This should be thoroughly reviewed through direct discussion with local developers including HAs and with a rigorous viability appraisal to ensure that the policy will help deliver better quality housing and more of it without reducing the overall delivery of affordable housing.	Comments relating to space standards noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD44	Tetlow King (Julie O'Rouke) on behalf of West Midlands HARP	12	Any self build policy requirement should not be in place of traditional affordable housing requirements. Self build have complex funding requirements and as such are out of reach of most households who seek affordable housing. Self build is not within the NPPF affordable housing definition. Any policy requirement should be fully tested in terms of its viability when assessed alongside other policy requirement to ensure that any requirement will not result in affordable housing being reduced on viability grounds.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a plan-wide viability assessment.
POPD45	Tetlow King (Julie O'Rouke) on behalf of West Midlands HARP	14	Encourage the Council to consider the wording of paragraph 121 of the NPPF. Employment land should not be designated in perpetuity if suitable or more practical uses are available. This should be taken into consideration in reviewing the existing employment land allocations and new policies and allocations should be drafted with flexibility as set out in para 121.	Duly Noted The Employment Land availability assessment (ELAA) will direct policy direction.
POPD46	Tetlow King (Julie O'Rouke) on behalf of West Midlands HARP	22	Do not support the requirement for masterplans on small and medium scale developments. Masterplans can be prepared for any site or any however it is generally recognised that masterplanning is more suitable for areas of large scale change. Masterplans are required to stay in place for a long period of time and must be flexible enough to adapt to changing circumstances. The requirement for masterplans on small and medium sites will add an additional level of complexity and expense for developers at a time when the need to more building housing to meet local needs is critical. This policy could negatively impact on the delivery of affordable housing.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process.
POPD47	Julie Hanstock	Whole Document	Do not consider the spatial strategy to be appropriate for Burntwood and Chasetown. The infrastructure is suffering with all the change over the past 20 years. The Green Belt review 2013 was flawed and used incorrect methodology in the way the questions were asked and that some areas of land were classified as not providing an important contribution to the green belt. There are suitable sites outside the green belt which should be looked at and considered first and foremost.	Duly Noted. A Green Belt Review will be completed and Urban Capacity Assessment will be completed as part of the Local Plan review process
POPD48	Mr R Nicholls	21	The sale of the Friary building is a retrograde step with regard to identifying as being a Lichfield resident. Friarsgate development is likely to be another if not developed sensitively. As mentioned before, Lichfield is an historic cathedral city and should look and feel like one. Having beautiful historic buildings that we own. That would make me identify more as Lichfield resident.	The Local Plan is not the mechanism for Council policy on the sale or purchase of land/buildings. Further consideration will be given to the development of areas based policies as exists in the current Local Plan in future iterations of the document, the District has a wider historic environment than Lichfield City.
POPD49	Mr R Nicholls	22	Not sure about a masterplan, but a strategy surely. Plans will change, but strategies shouldn't. Because this is not addressing large scale developments, local communities should be more involved and to an extent have been, through their Neighbourhood Plans. So as mentioned several times previously, Neighbourhood Plans should be referred to.	The Plan will eventually provide the strategy for the District and large scale development sites. It is not compulsory for a neighbourhood plan to be prepared and as not all areas have a neighbourhood plan. It is inappropriate for a neighbourhood plan to consider the strategic locations for development, associated infrastructure and cross boundary implications that will be considered through the Local Plan. Residents and parishes are included within the preparation of the Local Plan through consultation exercises in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement and through the updating and preparation of Neighbourhood Plans.
POPD50	Mr R Nicholls	23	Agreed but assessments should be independent and taken account of.	Evidence is prepared and assessments such as the sustainability appraisal undertaken to enable informed decisions to be made.
POPD51	Mr R Nicholls	1	Support.	Noted
POPD52	Mr R Nicholls	2	Focussing on sustainable communities for growth is an economic decision and not always in the best interests of local residents, services are not always retained even if further housing is built e.g Stonnall. Priority 2 Rural Communities and locally relevant employment opportunities don't sit well together. Rural communities need reliable public transport. Priority 3 should be bolder windfarms should be built in green belt to maintain the green corridors and provide environmentally friendly energy.	Comments noted. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy to seek to deliver sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
POPD53	Mr R Nicholls	4	Neighbourhood plans from Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone should be taken to account.	Comments noted.
POPD54	Mr R Nicholls	9	Understanding the requirements for gypsy and traveller provision is too vague.	Chapter 14 sets out the preferred policy direction in relation to provision for gypsies and travellers.
POPD55	Mr R Nicholls	11	Should include reference to neighbourhood plans.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD56	Mr R Nicholls	12	Agreed.	Support noted.
POPD57	Mr R Nicholls	15	Ability for Stonnall to attract more business is overstated. Rural settlements are where people live, not work.	Duly Noted
POPD58	Mr R Nicholls	20	Should include reference to neighbourhood plans.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD59	Mr R Nicholls	21	The sale of the Friary building is a retrograde step with regard to identifying as being a Lichfield resident. Friarsgate development is likely to be another if not developed sensitively. As mentioned before, Lichfield is an historic cathedral city and should look and feel like one. Having beautiful historic buildings that we own. That would make me identify more as Lichfield resident.	The Local Plan is not the mechanism for Council policy on the sale or purchase of land/buildings. Further consideration will be given to the development of areas based policies as exists in the current Local Plan in future iterations of the document, the District has a wider historic environment than Lichfield City.
POPD60	Mr R Nicholls	3	Can Stonnall, Kings Bromley and Hopwas exist in level 4 and level 5 hierarchy. Lots of people from outside Shenstone use the railway station and car park.	Comments noted.
POPD61	Mr R Nicholls	5	Wind farms on green belt should be prioritised to protect green corridors.	Comments and preferences noted
POPD62	Mr R Nicholls	6	FRA done for Stonnall, Little Aston, Shenstone Neighbourhood Plans these should be consulted.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD63	Mr R Nicholls	7	More housing will give more traffic and more air pollution, this is not a problem in rural areas, but will be where traffic congregates e.g. at Shenstone Rail station. Park and ride schemes should be considered or perhaps a further station.	Comments noted.
POPD64	Mr R Nicholls	8	Undeliverable, bus services cut through Stonnall and serve only the elderly. Road safety is not in the Council's gift it is the responsibility of the County. More parking required at Shenstone rail station.	The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD65	Mr R Nicholls	10	Disagree, 1 and 2 bed bungalows in safe zones should be provided in rural areas to allow older persons to downsize and stay in the same area and free up larger houses for younger families.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD66	Mr R Nicholls	13	No support for sites within settlement but support sites adjacent to settlements. Unsure why first bullet then mentions A38 and A5 corridor as travellers either need sustainable settlement or they don't?	Noted
POPD67	Mr R Nicholls	14	Employment and economic development would benefit greatly in the major sustainable areas of Lichfield if business rates were low, to attract business, and car parking was free to attract customers.	Duly Noted Not relevant to the Local Plan review No Further Action
POPD68	Mr R Nicholls	16	A day in Lichfield would be enough for most visitors. We don't need hotels, we need to recognise what visitors want. An historic centre that looks and feels historic. Most of those mentioned are not in the district.	Duly Noted Preferred Policy: Historic and built environment chapter addresses these concerns.
POPD69	Mr R Nicholls	17	Obesity not the only thing that should be considered. Open space and recreational facilities offer well being to all, old and young and should be encouraged.	Noted
POPD70	Mr R Nicholls	18	More should be done to communicate the arts offer.	Noted
POPD71	Mr R Nicholls	19	Lichfield City should have a stand alone policy given the importance of it as an historic cathedral city.	Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD72	Mr R Nicholls	22	Not sure about a masterplan, but a strategy surely. Plans will change, but strategies shouldn't. Because this is not addressing large scale developments, local communities should be more involved and to an extent have been, through their Neighbourhood Plans. So as mentioned several times previously, Neighbourhood Plans should be referred to. (DUPLICATE REP POPD49)	The Plan will eventually provide the strategy for the District and large scale development sites. It is not compulsory for a neighbourhood plan to be prepared and as not all areas have a neighbourhood plan. It is inappropriate for a neighbourhood plan to consider the strategic locations for development, associated infrastructure and cross boundary implications that will be considered through the Local Plan. Residents and parishes are included within the preparation of the Local Plan through consultation exercises in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement and through the updating and preparation of Neighbourhood Plans.
POPD73	Mr R Nicholls	23	Agreed but assessments should be independent and taken account of. (DUPLICATE POPD50)	Evidence is prepared and assessments such as the sustainability appraisal undertaken to enable informed decisions to be made.
POPD74	Mr J Punch	1	Ignores local plans. Vision is contrary to statements about housing growth. If Stonnall, Shenstone and Little Aston are to remain strong communities there needs to be recognition that this is impossible without improved transport links, drainage, schools, medical needs and road improvements. Vision ignores the greater west midlands growth in housing and better location for housing growth near transport and good infrastructure.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. Neighbourhood plans are subject to review over time and are required to implement the strategic policies of the local plan.
POPD75	Mr K Mayou	3	Disagree, Burntwood infrastructure inadequate, especially roads in peak times. Redevelopment of Sankey's corner unlikely to be sufficient to provide amenities needed. Brownfield land should be maximised, little opportunity in Burntwood unless all Mount Road becomes available. Further expansion into the green belt should be restricted and limited for special cases. Other sites outside green belt should be utilised and should be proposing a new settlement on previously used land and using resources in Lichfield City e.g W of A38 (Brookhay) and E of A38 at Alrewas and areas outside of green belt.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Infrastructure Capacity Study which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD76	Mr C Hilson	1	(no comment made)	Noted
POPD77	Mr C Hilson	4	(no comment made)	Noted.
POPD78	Mr C Hilson	2	(no comment made)	Noted
POPD79	Mr C Hilson	3	(no comment made)	Noted
POPD80	Miss H Kibble	Whole Document	Plan needs brownfield site assessment and green belt review, should not be based upon towns that have local rail networks.	A Green Belt Review will be completed and Urban Capacity Assessment will be completed as part of the Local Plan review process
POPD81	Mr J Flowith	Whole Document	Preferred options support NE of Lichfield City and North of Tamworth. Consider both sustainable locations not in the green belt. NE Lichfield has sufficient capacity to address LDC and HMA mid-range housing requirement without green belt release. Green belt boundaries should only be released in exceptional circumstances and LDC cannot demonstrate these if large site available. NE Lichfield would support historic city and would prevent loss of Sutton Coldfield/Little Aston to Shenstone green belt strategic gap. Settlements outside the green belt must be considered first. Shenstone and Little Aston are within a critically important and sensitive green belt corridor and should be protected from further development in the green belt with the exception of redeveloping brownfield sites.	Comments and preferences noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD82	Mr J Flowith	22	Good design is critical. Masterplans are only suitable for larger scale developments. Well designed, lower density housing will assist in creating developments we can be proud of and allow us to not repeat the mistakes of the 1950's.	Noted.
POPD83	Mr J Flowith	20	The countryside of Lichfield District is valued as an asset in its own right and will be protected. Sites that receive statutory protection as part of their designation including Green Belt and Local Green Spaces will be protected. Housing growth on Green Belt land around Little Aston or Shenstone would be contrary to this policy and their Neighbourhood Plans in the most sensitive Green Belt corridor in the whole HMA.	Comments are noted. Any change to the Green Belt boundary to release land for housing will be informed by further evidence which includes the Neighbourhood Plans.
POPD84	Mr J Flowith	11	Difficulty in building in flexibility. Should not be afraid of building dwellings at 30dw/ha to achieve vision.	Comments noted
POPD85	Mr J Flowith	9	Need to take account of viability and the effect of releasing land from the green belt in certain locations. Building in Shenstone and Little Aston would undermine and delay delivery of development in lower value areas that are in much more sustainable locations.	Comments noted.
POPD86	Mr J Flowith	3	Using Little Aston green belt will not deliver sustainable development. Housing growth on Green Belt land around Little Aston or Shenstone would be contrary to this policy and their Neighbourhood Plans in the most sensitive Green Belt corridor in the whole HMA. Cannot justify releasing green belt as sustainable development area NE of Lichfield which is not in green belt.	Comments and preferences noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD87	Mr J Flowith	2	Suggestion that Little Aston requires consolidation is wrong, having a railway doesn't make it a sustainable location. It is in the most sensitive green belt corridor in the HMA. Development at Little Aston is contrary to SO 1,12,13 and 14.	Proposed levels of growth will have regard to the settlement hierarchy and the evidence base behind it which is being assembled and updated. Any development proposals will need to have regard to all of the strategic policies and proposals and provide an appropriate balance.
POPD88	Mr J Flowith	1	Vision contrary to neighbourhood plans of Little Aston and Shenstone and in the most sensitive green belt corridor in the HMA. Cannot justify releasing green belt as sustainable development area NE of Lichfield which is not in green belt.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate regarding Green Belt review and meeting housing needs. Site specific suggestions and concerns received will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. Neighbourhood plans are subject to review over time and are required to implement the strategic policies of the local plan.
POPD89	Mrs M Jones	1	Housing growth at Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston dependent on scale of development could be contrary to vision. Needs form wider HMA not justified in this document.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD90	Mrs M Jones	2	SO 1 not justified in relation to Shenstone. It has railway connections along the length of a cross city line only and no actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Shenstone are identified.	Noted. Shenstone is identified as a level 3 settlement in the settlement hierarchy having regard to its attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy having regard to addressing any growth needs
POPD91	Mrs M Jones	3	Table 20.2 confirms strong evidence of the inappropriateness of selecting Shenstone for growth.	Comments noted.
POPD92	Mrs M Jones	4	acceptable as seeks to protect our natural environment. SHLAA not developable seen as positive classification by Little Aston and Stonnall residents. Role of Neighbourhood Plans should be made clear.	Comments noted. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis and will inform the local plan review process. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD93	Mrs M Jones	6	FRA done for Shenstone Neighbourhood Plans which places limits on where development can go and should continue to be acknowledged for future housing proposals.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD94	Mrs M Jones	9	Preferred policy direction is not comprehensive as doesn't: i) identify levels of growth needed from HMA for Lichfield, ii) green belt review, iii) only commits to understanding traveller requirements not responding to them, iv) brownfield land analysis not completed	Comments noted. Chapter 14 of the consultation documents sets out the methodology for the proposed housing scenarios. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review, Urban Capacity Assessment and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD95	Mrs M Jones	10	The recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying affordable and market needs at the neighbourhood level with agreed housing sizes and bedroom mix ratios should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of any new preferred policy direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD96	Mrs M Jones	11	Recognition of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan in identifying the appropriate density of housing should be acknowledged. This has been an area of particular importance to Shenstone, where before the Neighbourhood Plan the area was subject to planning application exhibiting new build over intensification.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD97	Mrs M Jones	13	Lichfield District Council has not met current targets for pitch provision. This gap in planning and provision has had direct implications for the Stonnall area. It is important that the new criteria identified in the consultation document in respect of the A5 and A38 corridors for travellers, do actually enable a more proactive approach to provision. The consultation document does not identify how the new criteria will do this. Given the history in this area this needs to be significantly clarified.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD98	Mrs M Jones	14	The Shenstone industrial estate already causes problems due to HGV's and other traffic travelling through the village. The development of incentives is required for those users who wish to relocate to other economic development areas in the region, this would free up ideally located housing development land within the village.	Duly Noted The Employment Land availability assessment (ELAA) will direct policy direction in additional the Our Spatial strategy will consider future housing locations.
POPD99	Mrs M Jones	17	Green field amenity land adding to overall well-being should not be considered for housing.	Noted
POPD100	Mrs M Jones	22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan. This should be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD101	Mr K Leadbeater	Chapter 22	The disadvantages cannot be argued with: All Burntwood's green belt is highly valued by residents and there is limited public transport. It is barely sustainable.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD102	Mr K Leadbeater	21	Significant long-distance views which help identify Burntwood: View NNW from Christchurch, Church Rd, Burntwood. View from Gentleshaw Common over Burntwood to Hammerwich church. View south from Lichfield Road near the lams to the water reclamation works. View towards Lichfield Cathedral from Pipehill. View over the whole vale of Lichfield from the hill half way along the public footpath from Abnalls Lane to Pipehill.	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD103	Mr K Leadbeater	1	Too wordy. Suggest reduce word count.	Noted, but no justification / suggestions provided
POPD104	Mr K Leadbeater	2	Commendable, but need policies. Priority 3 - Will LDC introduce building regulations so CO2 can be offset?	Comments noted. Objectives, priorities and policies will be developed further through the Local Plan review process. Building Regulations is dealt with under a separate regulatory process.
POPD105	Mr K Leadbeater	3	Does not consider the Spatial Strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development. Burntwood's infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable; Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated; Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey's corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires; Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes.; Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents.; Has no faith in any new Green Belt review as the 2013 used terms, and questions which prejudiced answers and statements resukltng in parcels of land not being considered as important to the Green Belt. Alternative strategy – New Settlements Considers there are no 'exceptional circumstances' in which Burntwood's Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward. LDC should be planning for new settlements at: • West of the A38, Brookhay; Alrewas Quarry, east of A38; Packington Hall Farm, Tamworth Road; Anyother suitable and sustainable locations outside the Green Belt.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD106	Mr K Leadbeater	4	Agree. However building on Burntwoods Green Belt would violate many of the principles. Allowing a large number of windfalls in Burntwood without any CIL and not counting towards Burntwood's housing allocation is unsustainable. They should be counted.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a wide range of evidence which will inform the next stages of the plan making process including a Green Belt Review. Lichfield District Council commenced charging CIL in 2016 and any CIL liable development within the District is required to pay CIL.
POPD107	Mr K Leadbeater	5	General agreement. Would welcome LDC looking for a viable standard above the national minimum.	Comments noted
POPD108	Mr K Leadbeater	6	Support	Support noted
POPD109	Mr K Leadbeater	7	Should be specific policy. Action plan should have actions in it and should be more monitoring stations.	Comments and suggestions noted. In accordance with national policy local planning authorities are required to monitor the outputs from policies.
POPD110	Mr K Leadbeater	Chapter 12	Concerned recent planning permissions at Burntwood will not result in coherent, attractive town centre. Urge a plan be commissioned which incorporates: a pedestrianised zone with regular market; outdoor event space; cycleways and footpath links to nearby supermarkets; new small affordable retail/workshop rental premises with affordable accommodation above; additional CCTV cameras and monitoring to increase security. A feasibility study creating alink from the town centre to Chasewater Heaths railway station. Should add to preferred policy direction for sustainable transport 'produce a plan for the relocation of industrial premise from within residential areas to outlying industrial sites which have better road links for heavy vehicles.' Incorporate the following quote from the integrated transport strategy into the overall plan for the area: "The economic regeneration and town centre growth at Burntwood, as encouraged by the District Council, will be supported by enhanced transport infrastructure funded by developers and, if necessary, public funds, as resources permit. The priority will be environmental enhancements and an improved bus interchange."	Comments noted.
POPD111	Mr K Leadbeater	9	Agree further work required. Cannot support spatial strategy which continues to focus the majority of new housing on Burntwood and Lichfield, could support if changed to focus the majority of new housing on new settlements. Support focus housing delivery on brownfield sites before greenfield sites.	Comments noted. The Council will prepare a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD112	Mr K Leadbeater	10	Sensible approach until further evidence produced.	Comments noted.
POPD113	Mr K Leadbeater	11	Pragmatic approach	Comments noted
POPD114	Mr K Leadbeater	13	Pragmatic approach	Noted
POPD115	Mr K Leadbeater	14	Agree, suggest addition: "Where an old outdated industrial site involves heavy traffic having to negotiate narrow roads in residential areas the council will make every effort to re-locate businesses to more suitable premises in sustainable locations on the periphery of settlements."	Duly Noted The Employment Land availability assessment (ELAA) will direct policy direction in additional the Our Spatial strategy will consider future housing locations.
POPD116	Mr K Leadbeater	15	General support, but would like clear intention to create action plan. Insufficient information in the IDP to facilitate progress need an action plan paid for with CIL money.	Duly Noted. IDP will be reviewed to reflect current need following the completion of evidance base and policy direction confirmation.
POPD117	Mr K Leadbeater	16	Acceptable but should be more ambitious e.g "Plans to open the disused railway line between Lichfield and Brownhills as a cycleway and footpath and link it to the canal and onwards to Chasewater will be supported. The various voluntary groups involved in that project will receive every encouragement from the council."	Duly Noted Preferred Policy direction; sustainble transport chapter offers support for this.
POPD118	Mr K Leadbeater	17	Suggest additions: to POPD Healthy and Safe communities: "The green surroundings of built up areas will be valued and access routes into the countryside will be secured to allow residents to walk into the countryside without having to use any other form of transport. Allotments will be provided, wherever possible, within or on the edges of built up areas." p83 "The protection of open space (including the green surroundings of built up areas), sports and recreational". Qu 17: Policy needs more definition and teeth to make it more meaningful, suggest: "LDC, developers and those involved in producing Neighbourhood plans will be required to prioritise the planning and commissioning of viable cycleways and footpaths which link all residential areas to amenities and the countryside."	Comments noted .Aspirations will also be considered through chapter 13 and chapter 18.
POPD119	Mr K Leadbeater	18	Not aware of any evidence supporting arts and culture provision and there appears to be little provision for artistic and cultural activities beyond schools in Burntwood. Hopefully something could be incorporated within the town centre development which would foster an appreciation of arts and culture.	Noted
POPD120	Mr K Leadbeater	19	Convinced that a significant proportion of the population of Lichfield District value the arts and culture and LDC should produce a separate policy statement indicating how they are catered for and supported in the District.	Noted
POPD121	Mr K Leadbeater	20	The proposed approach towards natural resources has our support as long as the evidence provided by local residents is fed into the analysis of the importance of particular green spaces.	Opportunities for local residents to contribute to identifying the importance of particular green spaces are through consultations such as this and through Neighbourhood Plans.
POPD122	Mr K Leadbeater	22	Burntwood residents would certainly benefit from improvements to our built environment, particularly Sankeys Corner shopping centre but also many other shabby or poorly designed areas.	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations.
POPD123	Mr K Leadbeater	23	Appears sound.	Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD124	Mr K Leadbeater	Chapter 22	Plans for employment growth at Burntwood sound. Burntwood’s infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable; Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated; Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey’s corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires; Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes.; Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents.; Consider Green Belt review 2013 as dubious. If LDC agrees to accommodate a large number of homes from the GBHMA it must seriously consider new settlements.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated in respect of of housing need, employment need and comprehensive Green Belt Review to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy. Site specific suggestions will be considered as part of the local plan review.
POPD125	D Galt	Chapter 20	Over use of the word sustainability and not in accordance with UN definition. Options 1 and 2 which target green belt not sustainable as green belt of high importance to the impact of CO2. Decisions on location is purely based on money - that landowners want to profit. If loss of green belt everywhere then not protecting the ability of the next generation to sustain themselves. Not averse to housing growth in Shenstone - using parts of the business park that lie empty and should explore how many properties we could fit onto the brownfield sites. Should use sustainability to promote the City to attract the brightest minds so it becomes a leader with clever designs, protecting the green environment and promoting quality of life.	Comments noted. Sustainable Development is defined in the Glossary
POPD126	D Galt	Chapter 20	Graph doesn't make sense as no key.	Comments noted
POPD127	D Galt	Whole Document	Do the decision makers understand the use of the word sustainability throughout, together with the use of greenbelt land for residential development? Could you clarify on Sec.20.45 – when you say the sustainability appraisal states that this option scored negatively (what is the definition of sustainability appraisal here – is this relating to definition one above or two?	Comments noted. Sustainability is defined in the Glossary section and is being implemented having regard to the requirements on sustainability as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and other national government advice.
POPD128	Mrs L Psyllides	23	Response as for qu 22.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment.A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD129	Mrs L Psyllides	1	As per the vision people in Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston are proud of their communities have a strong sense of local community and belonging the Local Plan housing growth proposals for these areas could adversely affect this vision. Any housing need to be met by LDC from the wider West Midlands Housing Market area need to be fully justified and identified.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD130	Mrs L Psyllides	2	Do not agree with Strategic Priority 1 . Shenstone has high scores for housing growth potential because of its access to a bus service or railway station “serving 5 main centres”. Three of the five centres identified are Bromsgrove, Longbridge and Redditch. These are simply railway connections along the length of a cross city line at a considerable distance to Shenstone. No actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Shenstone are identified.	Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD131	Mrs L Psyllides	3	Do not agree there is evidence for Shenstone’s capacity for growth as in the Green Belt and there are alternative brownfield sites, existing urban areas with good established services, 2 new growth settlements - NE Lichfield and north of Tamworth. No brownfield assessment has been completed or a green belt review or the other WMHMA authorities indicating they will accommodate additional growth. So data is incomplete.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD132	Mrs L Psyllides	4	No comment	Noted
POPD133	Mrs L Psyllides	5	Identification of sustainability standards is important, and the Local Plan should identify where the best potential housing growth exists using this criteria. Electrification of the underused railway line running NE of Lichfield Trent Valley station would strengthen the case for A38 corridor strategic housing growth option, which is outside the Green Belt. This would reduce the volume of car traffic from the proposed new A38 corridor settlement, which should be complemented by a new park and ride station south of Lichfield and North of Wall, which would reduce car traffic through south Staffordshire villages as they enter North Birmingham.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out the preferred settlement hierarchy and growth options. Locations for growth will be considered as the local plan progresses.
POPD134	Mrs L Psyllides	6	Flood risk assessment data was obtained for Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall during their Neighbourhood Plan preparation periods. The data places limits on what can be housing development built without risk. This needs to be continued to be acknowledged in any future housing development proposals	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD135	Mrs L Psyllides	7	housing growth proposals should not increase pollution. Shenstone awaits any meaningful enhancement to rail travel times or quality from the new train franchise.A new rail station would be required for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option NE of Lichfield to limit the impact of more traffic from that proposal.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD136	Mrs L Psyllides	8	Electrification of the railway line NE of Lichfield is the transport with the best sustainable potential	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities.
POPD137	Mrs L Psyllides	9	It proposes a way forward for housing provision in Lichfield District without: 1.Identifying the Lichfield requirement to grow, or not, from the West Midlands Housing Market Renewal Area. 2. Any Green Belt review 3. Only commits to understanding traveller requirement, not to responding to same 4. any Brownfield analysis having been completed.	Comments noted. Chapter 14 of the consultation documents sets out the methodology for the proposed housing scenarios. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review, Urban Capacity Assessment and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD138	Mrs L Psyllides	10	It seeks to meet all the housing needs of the District through all levels of affordable and market housing options. All Neighbourhood Plans have looked at these issues, and should be recognised in identifying affordable and market housing needs at neighbourhood level with agreed housing sizes and bedroom mix ratios in any future policy direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD139	Mrs L Psyllides	11	Neighbourhood plans should be used to identify local densities. This has been particularly important to Shenstone, where before the Neighbourhood Plan the area was subject to planning application exhibiting new build over intensification.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD140	Mrs L Psyllides	12	A register of sites suitable for self-builders in the whole of Lichfield District would assist those who wish to build their new home.	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD141	Mrs L Psyllides	13	No comment	Noted
POPD142	Mrs L Psyllides	14	The employment and economic development focus on Lichfield City, Burntwood and Fradley is good. The LDC employment should further enhanced by identifying what LDC will do to support the older employment area which have larger industrial uses with location and site viability features that challenge their long term future. Shenstone industrial estate has examples her. The industrial estate user vacancy rate, short term user churn and traffic impact on Shenstone village centre require the development of incentives for those users who wish to relocate to the economic development areas above. This could be as straightforward as LDC identifying the changes of use from industrial to residential development that will be considered.	Duly Noted The Employment Land availability assessment (ELAA) will direct policy direction in additional the Our Spatial strategy will consider future housing locations. The Preferred policy direction; Our employment and economic development "seeks to maintain and enhance a diverse local economy and ensure opportunities for inward investment."
POPD143	Mrs L Psyllides	15	Shenstone, along with Stonnall and Little Aston, are classified in the preferred options report as "Rural Centres" catering for the day to day needs of the village and the wider rural area around. While this may be currently true it does not automatically justify any future growth capacity.	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD144	Mrs L Psyllides	16	No comment	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD145	Mrs L Psyllides	17	The policy refers to the importance of protecting open space for recreation and overall well-being. Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston have several protected spaces which are actively used within their Neighbourhood plans. Shenstone recently had one of these areas come under consideration for housing in the recent District Council review of the Land Allocation plan, and the proposal was withdrawn. Green field amenity land contributing to overall well-being should not be considered for housing.	Noted
POPD146	Mrs L Psyllides	18	No comment	No comment made
POPD147	Mrs L Psyllides	19	No comment	No comment made
POPD148	Mrs L Psyllides	19	No comment	No comment made
POPD149	Mrs L Psyllides	20	Any area of special environment merit has been identified in the Neighbourhood plans of Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston. The strategy should recognise the contribution of the Neighbourhood plans.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD150	Mrs L Psyllides	21	The provision of high quality housing development is being reduced by the introduction of CIL in that: 1. The consultation on what the Lichfield CIL strategy is to invest in is not open to broad, regular consultation about quality priorities and 2. The CIL introduction has limited the developers resources left for Section 106 contributions to add quality improvements when a specific housing development is approved.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process. Consultation on the CIL process will be in accordance with the Adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD151	Mrs L Psyllides	22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future plan. This should be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment.A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD152	Mrs L Psyllides	Chapter 22	The stated advantages/disadvantages of this option are contradictory - at least in relation to Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone. In the case of the latter two villages, they have good transport links so the need for improvements in them is irrelevant as a disadvantage. Nor do these villages need services and facilities which are relatively well developed already. In the case of Shenstone, the facility which needs sorting above all is a proper solution to the parking problem and to minimising car trips into and through the village before any further growth is allocated, beyond what is already in the current plan. Just because the village has a station, does not mean it is a preferable place for development. The 'carrot' of improved facilities, for the reasons above does not apply - even if new housing in the village means car trips are not necessary to the station itself. Major disadvantage in releasing Green Belt land around these three villages as Green Belt is part of the green corridors and the environment of the district which LDC envisions as being very important to sustaining the character of the area. No information that indicates that brownfield options have been assessed, not just in LDC area but in West Midlands area as a whole. If the Green Belt is sacrificed in the areas of the district closest to Birmingham, the District may as well become a suburb of Birmingham, because it is the thin end of a wedge designed for expediency. SHLAA shows much of the area adjacent to Birmingham as not developable. Uphold that. A belt is designed to go tightly round the middle and the existing Green Belt needs to be maintained as tightly as it can to Birmingham. At the outer edges of the Green Belt, the effect of minor land releases may have less effect, but I understand there is no pre-disposition on the part of LDC to prioritise Green Belt releases closer to or further away from Birmingham, should such allocation be deemed essential necause all other options have been explored first.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD153	Mr J Bass	8	Providing further transport opportunities should not be based on improvements within existing villages. Use of the existing railway line to Burton with a new station out of town close to the A38 should be coupled with park-and ride facilities eg to the centre of Lichfield (good for both travel to places of employment, sustaining access to the town centre and as convenient for tourists). It would also reduce car trips to the centres identified as having stations.	Duly Noted: Policy Direction is taken from the National Planning Policy Framework Chapter 9 promoting sustainable transport. The additional evidence base will identify future priorities.
POPD154	Mr J Bass	3	Cannot establish new Green Belt in the areas of the district next to Birmingham. If adding to the Green Belt further away is suggested as some sort of quid pro quo for releasing the belt in those adjacent areas to Sutton Coldfield, this is entirely wrong - see my comments on section 22. There is plenty of the district not in the Green Belt and you have identified two areas of interest NE of Lichfield and North of Tamworth. Inclusion of Shenstone os inappropriate as SHLAA identifies much of the land around Shenstone as undevelopable and chart at 20.2 shows more negatives than positives for growth. Insufficient information therefore as to why these villages remain as part of residential growth option 2. Shenstone nothing in common with Fazeley/Bonehill which is contiguous withTamworth already, nor Alrewas and Fradley not in the Green Belt.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD155	Mr R Smith	1	Key part of vision is 'green welcoming places to live' One of key differentiator of Lichfield District are special green spaces adjacent to settlements. South of District is green belt a special place between Lichfield and sprawl of West Midlands. Should put greater emphasis on Green characteristics to ensure area is a welcoming happy and healthy place to live and not enveloped as a densely populated suburb of Greater Birmingham. As per the vision people in Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston are proud of their communities have a strong sense of local community and belonging the Local Plan housing growth proposals for these areas could adversely affect this vision. Any housing need to be met by LDC from the wider West Midlands Housing Market area need to be fully justified and identified.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD156	Mr R Smith	2	The justification for Strategic objective & priority 1. “Communities capable of growth” is flawed.Little Aston and Shenstone have very high scores for housing growth potential because of their access to a bus service or railway station “serving 5 main centres”. Three of the five centres identified as benefitting Little Aston and Shenstone are Bromsgrove, Longbridge and Redditch. These are simply railway connections along the length of a cross city line only and no actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Little Aston and Shenstone are identified.Strategic Priority 11 – Healthy lifestyle and Strategic Priority 12 – Countryside character should be higher up the priority list.	Comments noted. The wording "capable of growth" is not referenced in the strategic priorities and policies chapter but is referenced in chapter 20 in relation to the settlement sustainability study. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD157	Mr R Smith	3	The evidence for Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone having capacity for growth is considered on pages 101 and 102 of the Lichfield District Council preferred options report including Table 20.2. This section, introduced as “what the evidence tells us” shows that Shenstone has more growth potential negatives than positives in that it has many more red and amber judgements on Table 20.2 than green judgements. Stonnall is shown as having a balance of negative and positive and Little Aston more positive than negative however in the case of Little Aston and Stonnall the SHLAA interest in land designations are significantly shown as “non developable”. This is strong evidence of the inappropriateness of selecting Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone for growth. The Lichfield District Council strategy for housing based on a settlement hierarchy of communities such as Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone which are primarily in the Green Belt should be revised. The priorities below should be based on unused existing industrial land, existing urban areas and the two new growth settlements. Therefore, Lichfield District Council housing growth should be focussed on the alternative areas that are identified in the proposed spatial strategy (i) Brownfield sites that are no longer viable (ii) Existing urban areas with a good range of established services (ii) The two potential strategic growth communities north east of Lichfield and north of Tamworth. The preferred options for housing growth have been published without a Brownfield Site assessment having been completed or a Green Belt Review having been completed or the other West Midland Housing Market Area authorities indicating they will accommodate additional growth, so the data platform for the preferred options spatial strategy assumptions is also incomplete.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process. The SHLAA is a living document and reviewed and updated on an annual basis.
POPD158	Mr R Smith	1	Key part of vision is 'green welcoming places to live' One of key differentiator of Lichfield District are special green spaces adjacent to settlements. South of District is green belt a special place between Lichfield and sprawl of West Midlands. Should put greater emphasis on Green characteristics to ensure area is a welcoming happy and healthy place to live and not enveloped as a densely populated suburb of Greater Birmingham. As per the vision people in Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston are proud of their communities have a strong sense of local community and belonging the Local Plan housing growth proposals for these areas could adversely affect this vision. Any housing need to be met by LDC from the wider West Midlands Housing Market area need to be fully justified and identified.(DUPLICATE POPD155)	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD159	Mr R Smith	23	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan. This should be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD160	Mr R Smith	2	The justification for Strategic objective & priority 1. “Communities capable of growth” is flawed.Little Aston and Shenstone have very high scores for housing growth potential because of their access to a bus service or railway station “serving 5 main centres”. Three of the five centres identified as benefitting Little Aston and Shenstone are Bromsgrove, Longbridge and Redditch. These are simply railway connections along the length of a cross city line only and no actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Little Aston and Shenstone are identified.Strategic Priority 11 – Healthy lifestyle and Strategic Priority 12 – Countryside character should be higher up the priority list.	Comments noted. The wording "capable of growth" is not referenced in the strategic priorities and policies chapter but is referenced in chapter 20 in relation to the settlement sustainability study. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD161	Mr R Smith	3	The evidence for Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone having capacity for growth is considered on pages 101 and 102 of the Lichfield District Council preferred options report including Table 20.2. This section, introduced as “what the evidence tells us” shows that Shenstone has more growth potential negatives than positives in that it has many more red and amber judgements on Table 20.2 than green judgements. Stonnall is shown as having a balance of negative and positive and Little Aston more positive than negative however in the case of Little Aston and Stonnall the SHLAA interest in land designations are significantly shown as “non developable”. This is strong evidence of the inappropriateness of selecting Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone for growth. The Lichfield District Council strategy for housing based on a settlement hierarchy of communities such as Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone which are primarily in the Green Belt should be revised. The priorities below should be based on unused existing industrial land, existing urban areas and the two new growth settlements. Therefore, Lichfield District Council housing growth should be focussed on the alternative areas that are identified in the proposed spatial strategy (i) Brownfield sites that are no longer viable (ii) Existing urban areas with a good range of established services (ii) The two potential strategic growth communities north east of Lichfield and north of Tamworth. The preferred options for housing growth have been published without a Brownfield Site assessment having been completed or a Green Belt Review having been completed or the other West Midland Housing Market Area authorities indicating they will accommodate additional growth, so the data platform for the preferred options spatial strategy assumptions is also incomplete.	The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD162	Mr R Smith	4	The Lichfield District Council preferred policy towards sustainable development is acceptable in that it seeks to protect our natural environment which is the Districts greatest asset combined with its heritage assets.	Comments noted.
POPD163	Mr R Smith	Chapter 22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan. This should be a stated recommendation.	Noted. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for policies. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD164	Mr R Smith	5	The identification of sustainability standards is important. The Local Plan preferred options should identify where the best potential housing growth exists using this criteria. Electrification of the underused railway line running north east of Lichfield Trent Valley station would further strengthen the case for the A38 - Fradley and Alrewas - corridor strategic housing growth option which is outside the Green Belt. This proposal would reduce the volumes of car movements from the proposed new A38 corridor settlement and should be complemented with a new park and ride rail station south of near the Wall Island Business Park. This would reduce the car movements through south Staffordshire villages along the A5127 as they head to/from north Birmingham/Sutton Coldfield.	Comments noted
POPD165	Mr R Smith	6	Flood risk assessment data was obtained for Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall during their Neighbourhood Plan preparation periods. The data places limits on what level of housing development can be built without increasing the flooding risk. This needs to be continued to be acknowledged in any future housing development proposals.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD166	Mr R Smith	8	The sustainable transport with the greatest potential that provides the greatest opportunity is to electrify the railway line to the north east of Lichfield and adding a new station with car parking near the Wall Island Business Park.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities.
POPD167	Mr R Smith	7	Any housing growth proposals should not increase pollution. As a regular user of the train Shenstone and Little Aston have not seen any improvement to rail travel times or quality. As identified above a new rail station would be required for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option north east of Lichfield to reduce the impact of increased vehicle movements coming from that strategic housing proposal.	Comments noted.
POPD168	Mr R Smith	9	Approach not comprehensive as it proposes a way forward for housing provision in Lichfield District without: 1.Identifying the Lichfield requirement to grow, or not, from the West Midlands Housing Market Renewal Area. 2. Any Green Belt review 3. Only commits to understanding traveller requirement, not to responding to same 4. any Brownfield analysis having been completed.	Comments noted. Chapter 14 of the consultation documents sets out the methodology for the proposed housing scenarios. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review, Urban Capacity Assessment and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD169	Mr R Smith	10	This policy direction seeks to meet all the housing needs of the District through all levels of affordable and market housing options. All Neighbourhood Plans have considered these issues. The recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying affordable and market needs at the neighbourhood level with agreed housing sizes and bedroom mix ratios should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of any new preferred policy direction.E.g recent application to develop land on the industrial estate in Shenstone on the other side of the railway line, opposite Shenstone station. The Neighbourhood Plan identified this as the area for development of a range/mix of housing in Shenstone.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD170	Mr R Smith	11	Recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying the appropriate density at the neighbourhood plan level should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of the policy direction. This has been an area of particular importance to Shenstone, where before the Neighbourhood Plan the area was subject to planning application exhibiting new build over intensification.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD171	Mr R Smith	22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan. This should be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment.A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD172	Mr R Smith	21	The provision of high quality housing development is being reduced by the introduction of CIL in that: 1. The consultation on what the Lichfield CIL strategy is to invest I is not open to broad, regular consultation about quality priorities and 2. The CIL introduction has limited the developers resources left for Section 106 contributions to add quality improvements when a specific housing development is approved.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process. Consultation on the CIL process will be in accordance with the Adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
POPD173	Mr R Smith	20	Any area of special environmental merit / community Green Space has been identified in the Neighbourhood Plans of Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston.The strategy must recognise the contribution of Neighbourhood Plans.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD174	Mr R Smith	19	Integration of requirements within one or a number of other strategic policies e.g. Healthy and Safe Communities alongside Tourism.	Noted
POPD175	Mr R Smith	18	I believe the Council’s strategy to support arts and cultural provision is very good especially within Lichfield City where various food and community based events are supported along with The Garrick theatre and Guild Hall venues.	Noted
POPD176	Mr R Smith	12	A register of sites suitable for self-builders in the whole of Lichfield District would assist those who wish to build their own home.	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD177	Mr R Smith	17	Green space amenity adjoining the villages within the district must be maintained so that residents can go for a walk without the need to drive to a location. It is right that the policy highlights the importance of protecting open space for recreation and overall well-being. Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have several protected green spaces which are actively used by the community as detailed within their Neighbourhood Plans. Shenstone has recently had one of these areas of land come under consideration for housing in the recent District Council review of the Land Allocation Plan. This proposal was withdrawn. Green field amenity land which clearly adds to overall community well-being should not be considered for housing. They should be preserved for future generations to enjoy.	Noted
POPD178	Mr R Smith	16	Yes I agree.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD179	Mr R Smith	15	Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall are classified in the preferred options report as “Rural Centres” catering for the day to day needs of the village and the wider rural area around. Whilst this may be currently true this does not automatically justify any future growth capacity in the villages. The loss of Shenstone Post Office and anticipated loss of the Village Store are testament to this.	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD180	Mr R Smith	14	The employment and economic development focus on Lichfield City, Burntwood and Fradley Park is welcome.	Duly Noted
POPD181	Mr R Smith	13	Lichfield District Council has not met current targets for pitch provision. This gap in planning and provision has had direct implications for the Stonnall area. It is important that the new criteria identified in the consultation document in respect of the A5 and A38 corridors for travellers, do actually enable a more proactive approach to provision. The consultation document does not identify how the new criteria will do this. Given the history in this area this needs to be significantly clarified.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD182	Mr T Snowden	1	It contradicts the local plan vision.	Noted but no justification / suggestions provided.
POPD183	Mr T Snowden	2	No. Extending housing will affect the 'sense of community '	Noted. But no justification / suggestions provided
POPD184	Mr T Snowden	3	The SHLAA interest in land designations are significantly shown as non developable. It is strong evidence of the inappropriateness of selecting Stonnall for growth.	Comments noted. The SHLAA is a living document and reviewed and updated on an annual basis.
POPD185	Mr T Snowden	4	No	Noted
POPD186	Mr T Snowden	6	Recent data from risk assessments shows that building new houses is not without risk.	Comments noted
POPD187	Mr T Snowden	7	The new train franchise will affect air quality.	Noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD188	Mr T Snowden	8	Stonnall needs a bus service on a Saturday.	Duly Noted. Infrastructure requirements for the District will be articulated within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan following
POPD189	Mr T Snowden	9	The current proposals are not comprehensive and detrimental to the greenbelt land of which there has been no review.	Comments noted. The Council will prepare a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD190	Mr T Snowden	10	No	Noted.
POPD191	Mr T Snowden	11	No	Noted
POPD192	Mr T Snowden	12	No	Noted
POPD193	Mr T Snowden	13	No. no account of the views of the area particularly Stonnall, nor have they updated their consultation document looking at how it detrimentally affects the area and the village.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD194	Mr T Snowden	14	Greenfield amenity land which adds to the overall well being and health of the area should definitely not be considered for housing. The health of our community depends on these spaces and they should be protected.	Not a employment question. Duly Noted
POPD195	Mr T Snowden	21	We dont need more housing developments.	The Local Plan will help guide new development to deliver sustainable development.
POPD196	Mr T Snowden	22	Neighbourhood pland are mechanism for the protecton of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in future option plan.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD197	Theatres Trust	Chapter 8	(no comment made)	noted
POPD198	Theatres Trust	19	(no comment made)	No comment made
POPD199	Mr R Godwin	Whole Document	Not support. Infrastructure and amenities poor in Burntwood for a town of this size. Countryside around Burntwood very important in maintaining health and well being. Loss would be very detrimental to the character of the area. Green belt contantly under attack and again with a further green belt review. Need better town centre facilities. Housing development should be within existing urban areas and on brownfield sites and not on any Green belt land.All local SSSIs, AONBs and conservation areas should be preserved and properly looked after. Document difficult to follow.	Noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and urban capacity assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD200	Mr M Shelley	1	The Local Plan housing growth proposals for Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston contradict the proposed Local Plan Vision which states that LDCouncil want to see residents ‘proud of their communities’ with a ‘strong sense of local community....and belonging. Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have these strong characteristics. However,the proposals for housing growth, dependant on the scale of the growth, location and type of growth could put the vision completely at risk. Major concerns over building on Greenbelt, particularly the size and scale suggested in the proposals, which would see Shenstone link up with Fotherly and Fotherly linking up with Little Aston, all of which goes against the ‘strong sense of local community....and belonging’ and whilst Shenstone was designed as a sustainable village, this would be lost. Additionally it is noted that the consultation document review of housing is not comprehensively assessed. Lichfields needs are assessed in detail but no needs from outside Lichfield are assessed. The external needs should be quantified. Any housing need to be met by Lichfield District Council arising from the wider West Midlands HMA needs to be fully justified.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD201	Mr M Shelley	2	The justification for Strategic objective & priority 1. “Communities capable of growth” is flawed.Little Aston and Shenstone have very high scores for housing growth potential because of their access to a bus service or railway station “serving 5 main centres”. Three of the five centres identified as benefitting Little Aston and Shenstone are Bromsgrove, Longbridge and Redditch. These are simply railway connections along the length of a cross city line only and no actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Little Aston and Shenstone are identified.It is also important to note that I would also suggest that the train from Shenstone to Birmingham is already at maximum capacity with standing room only at peak times. The station car park at Shenstone is already over flowing with commuters having to park on nearby streets, which is causing problems for local residents. Whilst I understand an overflow car park is being considered, the most recent plans suggest this will include 16 car parking spaces, which will do nothing to ease the current parking problem (which will only get worse should additional housing be developed).	Comments noted. The wording "capable of growth" is not referenced in the strategic priorities and policies chapter but is referenced in chapter 20 in relation to the settlement sustainability study. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD202	Mr M Shelley	3	The evidence for Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone having capacity for growth is considered on pages 101 and 102 of the Lichfield District Council preferred options report including Table 20.2. This section, introduced as “what the evidence tells us” shows that Shenstone has more growth potential negatives than positives in that it has many more red and amber judgements on Table 20.2 than green judgements. Stonnall is shown as having a balance of negative and positive and Little Aston more positive than negative however in the case of Little Aston and Stonnall the SHLAA interest in land designations are significantly shown as “non developable”. This is strong evidence of the inappropriateness of selecting Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone for growth. The Lichfield District Council strategy for housing based on a settlement hierarchy of communities such as Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone which are primarily in the Green Belt should be revised. The priorities below should be based on unused existing industrial land, existing urban areas and the two new growth settlements. Therefore, Lichfield District Council housing growth should be focussed on the alternative areas that are identified in the proposed spatial strategy (i) Brownfield sites that are no longer viable (ii) Existing urban areas with a good range of established services (ii) The two potential strategic growth communities north east of Lichfield and north of Tamworth. The preferred options for housing growth have been published without a Brownfield Site assessment having been completed or a Green Belt Review having been completed or the other West Midland Housing Market Area authorities indicating they will accommodate additional growth, so the data platform for the preferred options spatial strategy assumptions is also incomplete.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process. The SHLAA is a living document and reviewed and updated on an annual basis.
POPD203	Mr M Shelley	4	The policy towards sustainable development is acceptable in that it seeks to protect our natural environment. However, the District Council already have a published Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment known as the SHLAA which for Little Aston and Stonnall shows very significant numbers of land owner enquiries adjacent to Stonnall and Little Aston as “not developable”. This SHLAA designation of “not developable” is considered positive classification by Little Aston and Stonnall residents. The considerations included in any existing “not developable” judgement should also be made clear in any future decision making particularly if they are based on sustainable development criteria. The role of the Neighbourhood Plan in the identification and upholding of sustainable development should be made clear as is not identified. The Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone Neighbourhood Plans have all been used effectively to date in challenging non sustainable development in recent years.	Comments noted. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis and will inform the local plan review process.
POPD204	Mr M Shelley	5	Identification of sustainability standards is important, and the Local Plan should identify where the best potential housing growth exists using this criteria. Electrification of the underused railway line running NE of Lichfield Trent Valley station would strengthen the case for A38 corridor strategic housing growth option, which is outside the Green Belt. This would reduce the volume of car traffic from the proposed new A38 corridor settlement, which should be complemented by a new park and ride station south of Lichfield and North of Wall, which would reduce car traffic through south Staffordshire villages as they enter North Birmingham.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out the preferred settlement hierarchy and growth option. Locations for growth will be considered as the local plan progresses.
POPD205	Mr M Shelley	6	It is important to note that Flood Risk Assessments change over time, and should current Green Belt land be built on, this could affect the assessments in other areas.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA and Water Cycle Study. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD206	Mr M Shelley	7	Any housing growth should not increase pollution. As identified above a new rail station would be required for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option north east of Lichfield to reduce the impact of increased vehicle movements coming from that strategic housing proposal.	Comments noted.
POPD207	Mr M Shelley	8	As identified in previous responses to the growth preferred options. The sustainable transport with the greatest potential is to electrify the railway line to the north east of Lichfield.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities.
POPD208	Mr M Shelley	9	Policy is not comprehensive,as it proposes a way forward for housing provision in Lichfield District without: (i) identifying the Lichfield requirements to grow or not grow from the West Midlands Housing Market Renewal Area and (ii) any Green Belt Review (iii) Brownfield analysis (iii) only commits to understanding traveller requirements, not to responding as with other categories of need.	Comments noted. Chapter 14 of the consultation documents sets out the methodology for the proposed housing scenarios. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review, Urban Capacity Assessment and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD209	Mr M Shelley	10	The policy direction seeks to meet all the housing needs of the District through all levels of affordable and market housing options. All Neighbourhood Plans have considered these issues. The recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying affordable and market housing needs at the neighbourhood level with agreed housing sizes and bedroom mix ratios should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of any new preferred policy direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD210	Mr M Shelley	11	Recognition of the Neighbourhood Plan in identifying appropriate density and mix at the neighbourhood level should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of any new preferred policy direction. This has been an area of particular importance to Shenstone, where before the Neighbourhood Plan the area was subject to planning application exhibiting new build over intensification.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD211	Mr M Shelley	13	Lichfield District Council has not met current targets for pitch provision and has not for many years refreshed its needs assessments in this area. This gap in planning and provision has had direct implications for the Stonnall area. It is important that the new criteria identified in the consultation document in respect of the A5 and A38 corridors for travellers, do actually enable a more proactive approach to provision. The consultation document does not actually identify how the new criteria will do this. Given the history in this area this needs to be significantly clarified.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD212	Mr M Shelley	15	Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone are classified in the preferred options report as 'Rural Centres' catering for the day to day needs of the village and the wider rural areas around. Whilst this may be currently true and significant development would make the sustainability of these villages unviable. Shenstone was originally developed as a sustainable village catering for its residents, with a village centre, employment and housing and as such any significant increase in population would be detrimental to its viability.	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD213	Mr M Shelley	17	This policy talks of the importance of protecting open space for recreation and overall well-being. Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have several protected green spaces which are actively used within their Neighbourhood Plans. Shenstone has recently had one of these areas of land come under consultation for housing in the recent District Council review of the Land Allocation Plan. This proposal was withdrawn. Greenfield amenity land adding to overall well-being should not be considered for development.	Noted
POPD214	Mr M Shelley	20	Any area of special environmental merit has been identified in the Neighbourhood Plans of Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone. The strategy should recognise the contribution of Neighbourhood Plans.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD215	Mrs P Dowd	Chapter 4	The local growth plan housing proposals for Shenstone, Stonnall & Little Aston contradict the Local Plan vision. The consultation document review of housing needs is not comprehensively assessed. Growth proposals may be subject to near future housing pressures to accommodate (ref impact and justification of WM Housing Market Area).	Comments and preferences noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD216	Mrs P Dowd	2	Strategic Priority 1: The Local Plan is flawed in that there is insufficient provision of buses to support rail services, particularly from Stonnall to Shenstone. Stonnall bus services in general are dramatically inadequate to support a reduction in the use of cars.	Noted. Shenstone and Stonnall are identified as a level 3 and level 4 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy having regard to addressing any growth needs
POPD217	Mrs P Dowd	1	The local growth plan housing proposals for Shenstone, Stonnall & Little Aston contradict the Local Plan vision. Pressures of external future housing needs from outside Lichfield must be quantified & justified in the context of the impact of the West Midlands Housing Area.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD218	Mrs P Dowd	3	The evidence provided on pages 101 and 102 and in Table 20.02 of the Lichfield District preferred options report shows that it is inappropriate to select Little Aston, Stonnall & Shenstone for growth. The preferred options for housing growth have been published without a Brownfield Site assessment or a Green belt Review being completed, or the West Midlands Housing Market Area authorities indicating they will accommodate additional growth, so the data platform for the preferred options spatial strategy assumptions is also incomplete.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD219	Mrs P Dowd	4	The policy towards sustainable development is acceptable. However, the LDC has already assessed Stonnall and Little Aston as "not developable" and should be treated as such. The considerations included in any existing "not developable" judgement should be made clear, particularly if they are based on sustainable development criteria. The role of the Neighbourhood Plan is identifying and upholding sustainable development should be made clear as it is not identified.	Comments noted. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis and will inform the local plan review process. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD220	Mrs P Dowd	5	The identification of sustainability standards is important. The Local Plan preferred options should identify where the best potential housing growth exists using this criteria. Electrification of the underused railway line running north of Lichfield Trent Valley station would strengthen the case for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option which is outside the Green Belt. This would reduce the volumes of car movement from the new A38 corridor settlement & should be complemented with i) a new park & ride rail station south of Lichfield / north of Wall, together with appropriate bus services to support access to rail services.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out the preferred settlement hierarchy and growth options. Locations for growth will be considered as the local plan progresses.
POPD221	Mrs P Dowd	6	Flood risk assessment data was obtained for Shenstone, Little Aston & Stonnall during their Neighbourhood Plan preparation periods. The data places limits on what housing developments can be built without risk. This needs to continue to be acknowledged in any future housing development proposals.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD222	Mrs P Dowd	7	Housing growth proposals should not increase pollution. As identified in the response to Question 5, a new rail station would be required for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option to reduce the impact of increased vehicle movements coming from that strategic housing proposal.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD223	Mrs P Dowd	8	The sustainable transport with the greatest potential is to electrify the railway line to the north of Lichfield plus the provision of appropriate bus services to support efficient, regular access to rail services via all the surrounding rural villages in the district.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities.
POPD224	Mrs P Dowd	9	The preferred policy direction set out is not comprehensive, in that it proposes a way forward for housing provision in Lichfield District without identifying i) the Lichfield requirements to grow or not to grow from the West Midlands Housing Market Renewal Area and ii) any Green Belt Review iii) only commits to understanding traveller requirements, not to responding as with other categories of need (Stonnall has had direct experience of the vacuum in this area), iv) any Brownfield analysis having been completed.	Comments noted. Chapter 14 of the consultation documents sets out the methodology for the proposed housing scenarios. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review, Urban Capacity Assessment and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD225	Mrs P Dowd	10	Policy seeks to meet all the housing needs of the District through all levels of affordable and market housing options. All Neighbourhood Plans have considered these issues. Recognition of the findings of the Neighbourhood Plans should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal new preferred policy direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD226	Mrs P Dowd	11	Neighbourhood Plans should be recognised and referenced as part of the formal policy direction. This has been an area of particular importance for Shenstone.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD227	Mrs P Dowd	13	Lichfield District Council appears not to have met current targets for pitch provision and for many years has not refreshed its needs assessment in this area. This gap in planning and provision has had direct implications for the Stonnall area. It is important that new criteria identified in the consultation document in respect of the A5 and A38 corridors for travellers do actually enable a more proactive approach to provision. The consultation document does not actually identify how the new criteria will do this. Given the history in this area, this needs to be significantly clarified.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD228	Mrs P Dowd	14	The employment and economic development focus on Lichfield City, Burntwood and Fradley Park is welcome. The Lichfield District Council employment policy should be further strengthened by identifying what the council will do to support the older employment areas which have larger industrial uses with location and site viability features that challenge their long/term future. The Shenstone industrial estate has examples of this. The user vacancy rate, short term user turnover and traffic impact on the Shenstone village centre require the development of incentives for those users who wish to relocate to the economic development areas cited above. This may be as straightforward as Lichfield Council identifying changes of use from industrial to residential development that will be considered. Change of use of the Shenstone industrial estate to a residential site will also provide an opportunity to rethink the problems of railway station user parking in Shenstone village.	Duly Noted The Employment Land availability assessment (ELAA) will direct policy direction in addition the Our Spatial strategy will consider future housing locations. The Preferred policy direction; Our employment and economic development "seeks to maintain and enhance a diverse local economy and encourage opportunities for inward investment."

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD229	Mrs P Dowd	15	Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone are classified in the preferred options report as "Rural Centres" catering for the day to day needs of each village and the wider rural area around. While this may currently be true, this does not automatically justify any future growth capacity.	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD230	Mrs P Dowd	17	The policy talks of protecting open space for recreation and overall well-being. Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have several protected green spaces which are actively used within their Neighbourhood Plans. One of these areas of land in Shenstone was considered for housing in the recent District Council review of the Land Allocation Plan. The proposal was withdrawn. Green field amenity land contributing to overall well-being should not be considered for housing.	Noted
POPD231	Mrs P Dowd	18	No, I am not aware of current evidence. However, I strongly support continued development of arts and culture at all levels, district, city and village. This must include support for the provision of libraries and resources to promote creative development at all levels.	Noted
POPD232	Mrs P Dowd	19	In the short term integration of arts and culture in strategy policies is acceptable, so long as this is positive and not merely token. In the longer term a stand alone strategic policy should be an objective.	Noted
POPD233	Mrs P Dowd	20	Areas of special environmental merit have been identified in the Neighbourhood Plans of Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone. The strategy should recognise the contribution of the Neighbourhood Plans and take them into account.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD234	Mrs P Dowd	21	Distinctive heritage and quality architectural features, including those identified in the Plan must be continue to be recognised and adopted in any growth and development planning and applications.	Agreed.
POPD235	Mrs P Dowd	22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger, formal role in any future option plan. This should be a formally adopted, stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD236	Mrs P Dowd	23	Lichfield District should continue to protect local heritage, both in the city and its district environs. Neighbourhood Plans should be further recognised and taken into account.	Noted. Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD237	Mr J Carwood	Chapter 22	For areas preferred for residential growth, assistance from LDC and priority should be given to Neighbourhood Plan (NP) makers to outline areas for housing allocations, in order to: - preserve and avoid invalidating efforts by local NP makers of made plans - help NP makers to benefit from new protection criteria in the NPPF 2018 (for NP allocations) - meet obligations of Community Involvement placed on LDC by Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 - follow the principles of the Localism Act 2011 where Neighbourhood preference can influence Local Plans	Noted. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for policies. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD238	Miss D Galt	Chapter 3	Document forwarded to CPRE for support in recognising the importance of green belt for future generations. Green Peace as there are red-legged partridges and hares living on the section of agricultural land that you are recommending we use for housing development. WWF. Document is hard to follow. Reputation of LDC is at risk. By choosing the site at Park Lane LDC do not understand the severity of the CO2 debate. LDC seem to have their sights set on the easy fix of taking green belt land which is labelled green belt in order to protect it for future generations.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review. The evidence base is being updated and will include areas of concerns and will also have regard to comments from statutory consultees addressing issues of concern raised.
POPD239	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust	20	Policies should include specific mention and policy for Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), as national guidance is somewhat vague. Policy should aim to protect LWS from damage, mitigate any impacts that cannot be avoided by reasonable alternatives, and seek to achieve a net gain for LWS habitat condition, size, number and/ or connectivity as far as possible. This could be both through site-specific contributions, but also biodiversity offsetting.	Noted, evidence is currently being updated.
POPD240	Claremont Planning Consultancy for Bromford Housing Group	Chapter 6	The issues affecting Burntwood must not be under-stated at the plan preparation stage due to public objections to growth of the town. Instead opportunities should be pursued through the identification of a strategy that sustainably shapes the economic and social context through suitable allocations. Due to the disposition of the settlement, such allocations will be Green Belt releases but it must be acceptable that such releases are justified to provide the economic growth levels required to uplift Burntwood as well as address the identified housing needs from the District and neighbouring authorities. Although green belt releases are politically important and often objected to by local residents, there importance in delivering the correct strategy for the District and specifically for Burntwood must not be underestimated. To replicate this importance the issues for Burntwood should recognise that there are no other opportunities but Green Belt release sites.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review.The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD241	Claremont Planning Consultancy for Bromford Housing Group	3	Support the outline settlement hierarchy, rightly recognising the importance of Lichfield City and the contribution that Burntwood has to the District's employment environment and housing market. However, what is not clear from this summary is the weighting between these settlements nor any assurance that sustainable settlements such as Burntwood will continue to be developed to encourage the economic growth options across the District. Where sustainable settlements are restricted by policy constraints it is the opportunity of the Local Plan Review to present solutions to existing constraints that will allow the managed growth of settlements. This is in accordance with the options consulted upon and the conclusions of the Council's evidence base which recognises that there is a shortfall of sites within settlements to provide for housing and employment growth over the plan period. In this environment the success and sustainability of settlements should be improved upon, ensuring that the main settlements of Lichfield and Burntwood have sufficient opportunities for economic growth and expansion.	Support for the settlement heirarchy noted.
POPD242	Claremont Planning Consultancy for Bromford Housing Group	Chapter 10	The preferred strategy with respect to its reference to balanced growth across the District. Realistically this must relate to existing settlements and the term 'balanced' must be considered to relate to proportionate growth at existing settlements that demonstrate a particular level of sustainability. Although it is accepted that further work it to be carried out; these aspects should be recognised and any deficit in the policy appropriately addressed. However, the suggestion that neighbourhood plans will review Green Belt boundaries at strategically important locations such as Burntwood is concerning in terms of delivery timetable and ensuring an adequate level of development is provided. In addition, the choices of such local groups are questionable in respect of strategic allocations where a comprehensive District wide approach is typically advanced to ensure effectiveness. It would be more appropriate for release sites to be identified by the District and the appropriate Neighbourhood Plan considered the design and mitigation associated with the sites released from the Green Belt.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be prepared in accordance with national and local policy requirements.
POPD243	L Hill	9	(no comment made)	Noted
POPD244	L Hill	Chapter 20	(no comment made)	Noted
POPD245	L Hill	1	(no comment made)	Noted
POPD246	L Hill	17	(no comment made)	No comment made.
POPD247	Claremont Planning Consultancy for Bromford Housing Group	Chapter 12	The lack of development that is to be focused toward Burntwood appears to frustrate the infrastructure and investments that the town will require. In addition the social infrastructure required will not be brought about through stagnation or reductions in growth. The levels of growth to be attributed to Burntwood should not be limited by its current infrastructure conditions and facility base; rather that growth should be focused at the town to ensure its centre is regenerated, business are attracted to it and that social infrastructure received further funding. The delivery of highway improvements and other built fabric can also be delivered or funded through the planning process that will help to provide direct enhancements tot he town and for the resident population.	Comments noted . The location of growth will be progressed through the local plan review and will have regard to the evidence base being updated and assembled.
POPD248	Mr S Norman	4	It should be recognised that Burntwood is not sustainable as a town with local health services under pressure in inadequate buildings and with the threat of losing one health centre. Shops are still inadequate for the size of population so shoppers will continue to have to drive out of town for their needs adding to air pollution, traffic and noise.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supproted by an extensive evidence base which including an Infrastructure Capacity Study which will inform the next stages of the plan.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD249	Claremont Planning Consultancy for Bromford Housing Group	9	<p>The review of the adopted Local Plan 2015 has been triggered by cross boundary development pressures arising from the Birmingham Housing Market Area, namely the residential requirements of Birmingham City Council. Lichfield District Council has committed to work proactively with partners to identify the appropriate amount of growth to be accommodated through the Local Plan review and collaborate to ensure that deliverable solutions are provided.The GL Hearn report identifies potential location for Green Belt release for the delivery of urban extensions and potential new settlements, including a new settlement around Shenstone and expansion areas around Burntwood, Brownhills and Tamworth. Although a high level Green Belt review has informed these recommendations, it is critical that these suggestions are robustly assessed through Local Plan reviews and the most appropriate development delivery identified that collaborates with local strategies within Districts such as Lichfield. However, it is not apparent from the preferred Options document that the geographic location of Buntwood has been acknowledged as a suitable location.The councils within the HMA, such as Lichfield District, will also be required to progress work to identify small and medium-sized sites which can contribute to meeting the housing needs shortfall through the preparation of Local Plan reviews. Critically recognising that to ensure housing delivery rates, a mixture of development sites is necessary. This process will include identifying additional smaller sites beyond the Green Belt through SHLAAs and local Green Belt assessments considering the performance of sites against green belt purposes at a finer grain. Small and medium-sized development opportunities arising from this work will play an important contribution in meeting the housing needs shortfall, particularly in the short- and medium-term. The emerging Local Plan review must recognise the need to identify these sites, including smaller Green Belt sites, so that releases are not restricted to large scale urban extensions and new settlement forms of development delivery.It is advanced that the review of Green Belt around Burntwood, which has previously been discounted due to environmental designations and constraints, has the real potential of providing deliverable development sites that would contribute to the identified cross-boundary housing needs arising from Birmingham. As such it is critical that the emerging strategic approach of the Local Plan Review and forthcoming Green Belt boundary amendments provide for such sites to be clearly identified and allocated. The policy direction that has been identified provides little certainty of the scale of housing to be provided for or its distribution across the District. This is especially relevant given that the Preferred Options document has repeated references to further work and evidence gathering being required; as well as ongoing discussions with the Birmingham HMA in relation to the nature and extent of cross-boundary housing requirements. The ability to comment comprehensively on the preferred options is therefore frustrated and as such any preferred approach should be equally prepared with caution.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing and employment growth scenrios. Further evidence based work including a comprehnsive Green Belt review will inform the next stages of the local plan review. The consultation document sets out a preferred settlement hierarchy which identifies Burntwood as a Leve 3 - Other main centres.</p>
POPD250	Mr S Norman	Chapter 12	Burntwood still does not have the right infrastructure for its population and this must be addressed before any further housing development is agreed if sustainability is a policy supported by Lichfield District and Staffordshire County Councils.	Comments noted
POPD251	Mr S Norman	14	The statement at 15.13 must happen before any further housing can be agreed. It is a major planning error for Burntwood and Hammerwich to have no town centre with a combined population of 28,000.	This comment is directed to the topic area covered in Question 15. Duly Noted.
POPD252	Claremont Planning Consultancy for Bromford Housing Group	10	Supported in principle. However the policy needs to also take into account the delivery mechanisms of affordable housing and the opportunity to provide for 100% affordable housing schemes within/adjacent to larger settlements to aid the delivery of affordable housing. Currently there is no policy relaxation for such sites so affordable provision is heavily reliant upon the rates of delivery of market schemes. In order to be able to deliver the affordable housing requirements unabated by market trends and infrastructure costs, it would be prudent for the policy to also be supportive of 100% affordable schemes with an edge of settlement context.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD253	Mr S Norman	Chapter 20	Agree with 20.5 insofar as east of Lichfield and North of Tamworth are concerned. Any diminution of Burntwood's Green Belt is not feasible until infrastructure is addressed in order to provide sustainable growth.	Noted. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan and will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD254	Mr S Norman	Chapter 16	Whilst there is a lot of evidence referred to in this section there is little evidence of sustained action to these problems in Chase Terrace Ward and other areas in Burntwood and Lichfield. The Plan needs to spell out the action if it is not to be just a document just for "noting".	Comments noted. The evidence being assembled will help inform and develop policy as the local plan progresses.
POPD255	Mr S Norman	1	It is not possible to disagree with the vision - but where is the evidence that it will be achieved with the reductions in funding for public services and few powers for local government to ensure affordable homes and social homes can be provided?	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD256	Claremont Planning Consultancy for Bromford Housing Group	Chapter 20	<p>Encourage the Council to reconsider the options proposed so that Burntwood received the level of housing it requires and is not inappropriately constrained by the Green Belt designation that surrounds it; nor the level of public objections to a review of the settlement boundary. In this affect option 2 represents a supportable approach whereby growth of Burntwood will be delivered alongside Lichfield City and other sustainable settlements. This option persuades the most investment into existing communities as well as directing housing growth to existing recognisable locations with sustainable attributes. However, the restrictions of the Green Belt should not be used as a means of directing growth to less suitable locations in the open countryside; very special circumstances can be demonstrated through the requirements to deliver cross-boundary housing needs to justify the alterations to Green Belt Boundaries. Such alterations would be located on the edge of the settlements that would have minimal impact on the function and purposes of the Green Belt or its true extent across the District. Even the dispersed development approach will require Green Belt review at Burntwood so such a review should be actioned by the Council to ensure the housing proposed can be accommodated. Option 4 is objected to in respect of its distribution of housing and growth. This strategy does not propose to distribute housing and growth to settlements appropriately and ignores the needs of existing towns such as Burntwood, instead relying upon a new settlement to ensure the quantum of housing required can be achieved. This strategy is questionable with respect to delivery of the proposed housing trajectory and fails to deliver new homes within existing communities.</p>	<p>Comments and preferences noted. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate regarding Green Belt review and meeting housing needs. Site specific suggestions will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.</p>
POPD257	A Yendole Stafford BC	1	Generally supportive.	NFA
POPD258	A Yendole Stafford BC	2	Generally supportive.	Noted
POPD259	A Yendole Stafford Borough Council	22	Supportive. This approach is an appropriate strategy to ensure future sustainable development by utilising existing and new infrastructure provision whilst minimising impact on the West Midlands Green Belt. The Borough Council is aware of the sustainable extensions to Rugeley alongside development in the neighbouring district of Cannock Chase.	Noted.
POPD260	A Yendole Stafford Borough Council	13	Noted that further work will be taking place to determine the level of provision for gypsies and travellers. As a point of clarification Stafford Borough Council can confirm it is not in a position to provide for any unmet gypsy, traveller & travelling show-people needs within Stafford Borough.	Comment and position of Stafford with regards to gypsy, traveller and travelling show people needs noted.
POPD261	A Yendole Stafford Borught Council	Chapter 2	<p>The adopted Plan for Stafford Borough (June 2014) focuses the majority of new housing and employment provision at Stafford Town, without releasing Green Belt areas, and a number of significant development sites are now being delivered. As you may be aware the Borough Council has recently initiated a New Local Plan 2020-2040 to set out the future development strategy beyond the adopted Plan period of 2031. Therefore if it is considered necessary to deliver development in other areas the Borough Council would welcome an opportunity to discuss the implications of this approach in more detail, to ensure the infrastructure implications are considered in balance with achieving housing and employment needs across a wider area.</p> <p>Welcome the opportunity to enter into a Duty to Co-operate Statement.</p>	Noted
POPD262	E Fox South Staffordshire District Council	9	South Staffordshire Council welcomes the approach adopted by Lichfield District which is based on a clear understanding of the issues facing the authority and the pressures arising from the shortfall identified within the wider Housing Market Area within which both Lichfield and South Staffordshire are situated. The principle of making a clearly defined contribution towards meeting the HMA shortfall is supported. Given the scale of the shortfall identified within the wider HMA, we look forward to continuing our partnership working to test your contribution of up to 4,500 dwellings as your preferred policy direction, to ensure that it can be demonstrated as a robust and justifiable figure.	Support for the approach noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD263	Corinne O'Hare Tamworth Borough Council	2	<p>Strategic Objective and priority 4: Our infrastructure Housing on border with Tamworth BC, affects Tamworth infrastructure – priority 4 should recognise that development in Lichfield has an effect on neighbouring authorities so necessary infrastructure should be in Tamworth administrative area too.Strategic Objective & Priority 6: Meeting housing need This strategic objective should have a specific reference to meeting need arising from neighbouring authorities (such as Tamworth and the GBSHMA), therefore the mix should reflect that of neighbouring authorities’ needs also.</p> <p>Strategic Objective & Priority 8: Employment opportunities This strategic objective should have a clear reference to meeting the employment needs should have a reference to meeting needs of neighbouring authorities too.</p>	Comments noted and will be considered as part of the duty to cooperate process. The role of Tamworth is recognised in Chapter 10 regarding settlement hierarchy.
POPD264	Corinne O'Hare Tamworth Borough Council	3	<p>Neighbouring towns (including Tamworth), have been identified as an option to extend within Lichfield District. We would expect close collaboration with Tamworth as further work is required to fully understand the implications of housing on the border with Tamworth on infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Bullet point 2 in spatial strategy mentions assisting in delivering unmet needs of neighbours. TBC and LDC have an agreed level of unmet housing needs agreed – 500 plus 412 by 2031 (5 years before the end of the new LP end date of 2036), this should be acknowledged with regards phasing.</p>	Comments noted. Lichfield District Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities through the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD265	Corinne O'Hare Tamworth Borough Council	7	<p>We believe that because of housing and employment needs for neighbouring authorities cross-boundary air quality issues should be acknowledged and addressed in the policy.</p>	Comments noted.
POPD266	Corinne O'Hare Tamworth Borough Council	9	<p>The housing provision policy should recognise that phasing for Tamworth’s unmet housing needs are required to be delivered earlier, by 2031.</p> <p>It should also be considered that there may be a need for a way of Tamworth receiving obligations for infrastructure from developments in Lichfield that are meeting Tamworth’s housing needs and/or it is evident that the development will exacerbate pressure on existing infrastructure in Tamworth Borough.</p> <p>We acknowledge that further work is required on the evidence base and Tamworth is working with LDC on the GTAA, HEDNA and infrastructure study that will help inform housing and infrastructure provision.</p>	Comments noted. Lichfield District Council will continue to engage with Tamworth Borough Council in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD267	Corinne O'Hare Tamworth Borough Council	10	<p>The document acknowledges that housing for neighbouring authorities will be provided to meet their unmet need.</p> <p>It follows that the specific housing mix required by those authorities should also be reflected in the LDC policy, as the housing mix requirement for other authorities may well be different to those of Lichfield District.</p> <p>Similarly the affordable housing requirement to meet neighbouring authority’s needs should also reflect their specific local needs (which might differ from that in Lichfield District).</p> <p>We suggest that joint working between authorities continues and policy wording is put in place to reflect the possible different housing mix and affordable housing requirements for Tamworth.</p>	Comments noted. The Council have commissioned a joint HEDNA with Tamworth Borough Council and will continue to engage with TBC and other neighbouring authorities as part of the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD268	Corinne O'Hare Tamworth Borough Council	11	<p>We agree that the density policy should include a range of densities appropriate to the housing mix, specific to particular areas. It may be the case (through evidence) that for particular areas such as the north of Tamworth, that a specific housing mix and density is required to meet Tamworth’s housing needs.</p>	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD269	Corinne O'Hare Tamworth Borough Council	12	<p>We suggest that a range of options are included in the self-build and custom build policy so that a policy is not overly restrictive and encourages a flexible approach to the provision of self-build plots.</p>	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD270	Corinne O'Hare Tamworth Borough Council	14	<p>Tamworth agree with the preferred policy direction for employment and economic development, subject to the agreed unmet employment need for Tamworth Borough being met by 2031.</p>	Duly Noted
POPD271	Corinne O'Hare Tamworth Borough Council	20	<p>Tamworth Borough agrees with the preferred policy direction, subject to further evidence being gathered for specific policies. For example, the Lichfield Local Plan Allocation DPD draft main modifications MM1 suggests that “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.”</p> <p>Tamworth Borough Council would be happy to engage in the process of a Green Belt review.</p> <p>It should also be considered that there may be a need for a way of Tamworth receiving obligations for infrastructure from developments in Lichfield that are meeting Tamworth’s housing needs and/or it is evident that the development will exacerbate pressure on existing infrastructure in Tamworth Borough.</p>	Noted. The offer to consider the preparation of joint evidence is welcomed. Further evidence to support a review of the Green Belt review and to identify infrastructure impacts arising from new development which impacts upon neighbouring authorities will be considered at the appropriate stages in the preparation of the Local Plan.
POPD272	National Grid	Whole Document	No comments	Noted
POPD273	Network Rail	8	<p>Preferred policy direction: sustainable transport proposed policy wording to be retained. Encourage the Council to adopt specific policy wording to ensure that the impact of proposed new development (including cumulative impact) on the risk at existing level crossings is assessed by the developer(s), and suitable mitigation incorporated within the development proposals and fully funded by the developer(s). TS/TAs should be undertaken in conjunction with the local highways authority with advice from Network Rail. Contributions will be sought where proposals impact on level crossings to mitigate the impacts of those developments. Wherever possible level crossings will be closed, and either replaced with a footbridge or by a diversionary route.</p> <p>Consideration should be given in Transport Assessments to the potential for increased footfall at Railway Stations as a result of proposals for residential development / employment areas within the local plan. Location of the proposal, accessibility and density of the development, trip generation data should be considered in relation to the station. Where proposals are likely to increase footfall and the need for car parking at Railway Stations, the council should include developer contributions (either via CIL, S106) to provide funding for enhancements as part of planning decisions.</p>	Duly Note comments relating to level crossings, further consideration will be given. Duly Note, in regard to the consideration of developer contributions to secure improvements to rail infrastructure, int should be noted that the District is CIL Charging rail investment does not appear on the Regulation 123 list therefore Section 106 obligations will need to comply with the requirements of Para 56 of the NPPF.
POPD274	Harborough District Council	Whole Document	No comments	Noted
POPD275	Sport England	1	Sport England supports the vision which will help create, promote and support physical activity helping to tackle the health issues faced within the district.	Noted
POPD276	Sport England	2	Sport England supports objectives 5,11 and 14 which will help create, promote and support physical activity helping to tackle the health issues faced within the district.	Comments noted
POPD277	Sport England	8	Support is given to improving accessibility to wider choice of transport modes as alternative to the private car which will help promote healthier lifestyles.	Duly Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD278	Sport England	Chapter 16	<p>It is understood that the Local Plan will be supported by an up to date playing pitch strategy as indicated in Appendix A though it is unclear if an indoor built facilities strategy is to be produced to inform the indoor leisure needs of the district.</p> <p>The role of Sport England’s Active Design guidance (https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/active-design/) should be considered within the policy in enabling opportunities for physical activity through the design and layout of development.</p> <p>Para 16.21: Note that playing pitches extend beyond the provision of football and rugby within the district.</p> <p>16.22 and 16.23: Welcome the Council’s commitment to update its Playing Pitch Strategy though clarity is sought as to the timescales that this will take place by and whether it will consider the level of growth and proposed location of development proposed in the next stage of the local plan. New Playing Pitch Strategies are now supported by a new development calculator which quantifies playing pitch demand generated from new development which can be used instead of the standards approach currently utilised by the Council. Preferred policy: Open space and recreation –support is given to the preferred policy.</p>	Comments noted
POPD279	Sport England	Chapter 18	Policy should include reference to Sport England’s Active Design Guidance which will help to address health issues identified In the vision and objectives.	Comments noted
POPD280	Solihull MBC	9	<p>Solihull MBC welcomes the contribution LDC is intending to make towards the shortfall occurring across the HMA, particularly as this is likely to result in more land being released from the Green Belt and SMBC recognises the difficult decisions that this will entail as our own emerging plan already proposes the release of some 613ha of land from Solihull’s Green Belt (which includes a significant contribution to accommodate regionally important infrastructure).</p> <p>It is understood that the level of growth for Lichfield under the new LHN calculation (333 dpa) will be significantly less than the housing requirement in the existing plan (478 dpa). And although it is recognised that the latter figure already includes a 1,000 dwelling contribution towards meetings needs that arise outside of Lichfield (ie 500 in each of Cannock & Tamworth) it does suggest that even with keeping the level of growth similar to the adopted plan figure, this will able to accommodate option 4 (LHN plus 3,000 HMA contribution (ie an additional 2,000 to the existing plan)) of the housing requirement options in table 14.2. In this context (ie not having to increase the annual housing requirement) it is this Council’s view that the minimum contribution towards the HMA should be higher than the 3,000 set out in option 4. It is noted that the next option (no. 5) is for LHN plus 4,500 HMA contribution, and that this represents the upper limit that LDC believes should be taken forward. This figure represents the mid-point in the range (1,500 to 7,500) given in the GL Hearn study for one Sustainable Urban Extension, and that that study identified two such proposals as recommended options (together with a new settlement). So the Council’s preferred option does not appear to fully accommodate the GL Hearn options (i.e., it does not accommodate 2 x Urban Extensions and 1 new settlement) and if this is an accepted principle then this Council would expect the same approach to be able to be adopted elsewhere. This is in the context that the study itself recognised there are tensions between proposals for new development and the quality of much of the Green Belt around the conurbation.</p> <p>It is interesting to note that if option 5 were to be achieved then this would represent a 46% uplift on the average number of completions in Lichfield over the last twenty years. This compares with an uplift of 81% (to average completions over the last 17 years) that would need to occur in Solihull for this Council to achieve the housing requirement (paragraph 49 of the Council’s supplementary consultation) currently set out in its emerging plan.</p> <p>Option 6 (LHN plus 10,000 for HMA contribution) would require an uplift of 118% from delivery rates over the last 20 years. This is described as ‘clearly not realistic and should be discounted’. Again, if this an accepted principle then this Council would expect the same approach to be able to be adopted elsewhere.</p> <p>It is noted at paragraph 14.22 that ‘evidence clearly demonstrates that the local housing market is not able to deliver 550 plus homes each year on a regular basis’. Forgive if I have missed being able to locate the evidence that demonstrates this, but could you direct me to where this can be found please?</p>	Comments and suggestions in relation to growth options noted. In relation to paragraph 14.22 the Authority Monitoring Report sets out the housing delivery rate for previous few years.
POPD281	Walsall Council	1	The references to sustainable transport and development should be requirements for all new development. The reference to access to quality homes, local employment, facilities and services should state explicitly that these will be in locations that are accessible by sustainable means of transport. The final sentence should state that all new development should seek to be sustainable so that it “will help protect …” etc. Existing development should also aim to adapt measures to become more sustainable.	Comments noted
POPD282	Walsall Council	2	Strategic objectives appear broadly supportable and compatible with the emerging plan. However, there is a need to consider how the objectives might impact on surrounding areas. Issue 8 says “Reducing the number of people commuting outside of our district and reduce the number of people using a car to travel to work. Whilst the latter part of this issue might be a laudable aim, the amount of commuting reflects the decentralisation from Birmingham and the Black Country, so that better-off professional workers have moved to Lichfield District whilst less well-of people have remained in the conurbation. To alter the situation would either mean that Lichfield’s population would have to become more balanced (i.e. less well-off), or that large amounts of economic development would have to be promoted in Lichfield District (in the hope that Lichfield resident professionals would give up their existing jobs. However, as developments in Lichfield would be unlikely to employ only professionals this would risk reverse commuting by less well-off workers from the conurbation, which would be unsustainable and potentially damaging, especially to the Black Country. In this context it is important that Strategic objective and priority should be careful to define “balanced and sustainable communities” as part of an inclusive and sustainable sub-region and not in isolation.	Comments noted
POPD283	Walsall Council	3	Support a strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy as this will clarify the most appropriate locations for different types and scales of development. However, it is unclear from the document what types and scales of development are proposed for each level of settlement within the hierarchy. The plan (and the plan-making process) should provide a basis to assess what the implications and impacts of different types and scales of development might be, including on surrounding areas, as well as within the district. There are also significant constraints affecting some settlements in the hierarchy. For example, Alrewas and Fradley are constrained by existing mineral working and important sand and gravel resource areas likely to be subject to future working.	Comments and support for the proposed settlement hierarchy note. The type and scale of development has not been defined at this stage and will be informed by a range of evidence including a HEDNA.
POPD284	Walsall Council	4	The list of issues appears to be comprehensive, especially when considered together with references elsewhere in the document, and we welcome the recognition of the need for development to “be of a scale and nature appropriate to its locality”.	Comments noted.
POPD285	Walsall Council	5	<p>The policy direction appears to be aimed primarily at commercial installations of wind turbines and solar farms. We agree that these should be guided away from sensitive landscapes. However, many forms of renewable energy generation would be acceptable in such landscapes, for example ground source heat pumps and solar panels on buildings such as dwellings.</p> <p>We note that policies about flood risk and air quality are proposed, but a key way of reducing CO2 emissions, air pollution and energy usage is by locating development in locations that reduce the need to travel and are accessible by walking, cycling, public transport, as well as facilitating the use of low-emission vehicles, so a cross-reference to Chapter 13 would be useful.</p>	Comments regarding a cross reference to chapter 13 sustainable transport noted.
POPD286	Walsall Council	6	Reflects national policy,no comments	Noted
POPD287	Walsall Council	7	Reflects national policy,no comments	Noted
POPD288	Walsall Council	8	The proposal is to follow regional and national priorities. We have no further comments	Duly Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD289	Walsall Council	9	<p>Welcome the acknowledgement that the Black Country has a housing shortfall in addition to that agreed with Birmingham. This is because of the potential shortfalls in housing land currently being identified in the Black Country and the need to investigate all possibilities in helping to accommodate some of that shortfall.</p> <p>Our most recent evidence tells us that the Black Country cannot accommodate all of its identified needs within the urban area of the Black Country. This view is supported by our current work reviewing the urban capacity of the Black Country (http://blackcountrycorestrategy.dudley.gov.uk/t2/) and the Birmingham and Black Country HMA study. Even by increasing densities and looking to other sources of urban land supply we estimate that, to 2036, the Black Country is likely to have a shortfall in the region of 22,000 dwellings and 300ha of employment land.</p> <p>The assessment of local housing need in the consultation accurately reflects that in the standard method. We welcome the proposal to provide additional supply – above locally-generated need – to help meet unmet need from Birmingham and the Black Country. We note the justification provided for the proposal to test for somewhere between options 4 and 5, i.e. 3,000 to 4,500 homes in addition to local need. This direction of travel is welcomed. We would support a figure at the higher end of the range, (i.e. around the scale of Option 5), as the figure put forward in Option 4 (3,000) in our view is not significantly above the current annual requirement.</p> <p>In determining how the additional supply can be apportioned to the Birmingham and Black Country HMA, we ask that the economic functional relationship between the Black Country (in particular Walsall), and Lichfield be taken into account and that a suitable percentage of Lichfield’s allocation be apportioned to the Black Country. We would suggest that account should be taken of approaches that have been undertaken by other Local Authorities e.g. North Warwickshire (which was based on commuting patterns between North Warwickshire and Birmingham and which was recently considered at Examination). North Warwickshire has looked to accommodate 10% of Birmingham’s shortfall which equates to some 3,790 dwellings.</p> <p>In terms of the Black Country’s functional relationship with Lichfield, evidence suggests that between 2010/11 and 2015/16 the net total of residents moving from the Black Country to Lichfield was 5,140 people (9% of the total out migration from the Black Country) in comparison to a net total of 7,160 residents who migrated from Birmingham.</p> <p>In addition, the 2011 commuting patterns between the Black Country and Lichfield suggest that some 3,123 working age residents from the Black Country travelled to work in Lichfield and that 4,727 residents from Lichfield travelled to work in the Black Country. The strongest relationship is with Walsall, where some 2,311 residents travelled to work in Lichfield and 3,197 residents from Lichfield travelled to work in Walsall. This is in comparison to 2,207 Birmingham residents who travelled to work in Lichfield and 6,076 residents from Lichfield who travelled to work in Birmingham. If Lichfield were to take North Warwickshire’s approach to accommodating 10% of the Black Country’s shortfall (based on its commuting patterns), this would equate to around 2,200 dwellings.</p> <p>The comment in paragraph 14.22 that “Evidence clearly demonstrates that the local housing market is not able to deliver 550 plus homes each year on a regular basis” might not be an accurate reflection of what could be achieved in the future. Past delivery has been constrained by the current Green Belt boundaries and a regional context that, at least in recent years, has sought successfully to direct development to securing the regeneration of Birmingham and the Black Country. We recognise that national policy indicates that the search for land should take place on a phased basis, with sites beyond the Green belt being assessed first, before sites within the Green Belt (both within the Black Country and in Lichfield) are to be considered.</p> <p>Further technical work is needed on this evidence. We would welcome the opportunity to hold Duty to Co-operate discussions with you to determine the approaches and percentage of Lichfield’s allocations which can be attributed to meeting needs arising in the Black Country and the justification for this based upon migration patterns and commuting flows between Lichfield and the Black Country.</p>	Comments noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities including the Black Country authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD290	Walsall Council	10	Reflects national policy,no comments	Noted
POPD291	Walsall Council	11	Consider the plan should specify minimum densities to be achieved on all sites, subject to safeguarding the character of the area. This is especially important given the likelihood that some development will need to occur on land that is currently Green Belt. Achieving minimum densities is also important in contributing to sustainable development, as higher density development is easier to serve efficiently by public transport and to access by walking or cycling.	Comments relating to space standards noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD292	Walsall Council	12	Given the limited evidence of demand for self and custom build housing, we agree that the policy should only provide general support except where a landowner has expressed a willingness to support this form of development and the site is in a sustainable location in accordance with the other criteria of the plan.	Comments and preferred approach noted. The Council maintains a self build register and monitors demand within the District.
POPD293	Walsall Council	13	Support the proposed site assessment criteria. However, given that much of Lichfield District lies in the Green Belt, including almost the whole of the A5 corridor, we suggest that consideration should be given to allocating traveller sites through a strategic policy as an inset in the Green Belt, rather than through non-strategic policies or the determination of planning applications.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD294	Walsall Council	14	The additional work proposed should distinguish between B1(a) (office) use and other uses in classes B1(b), (c), B2 and B8.	Duly Noted
POPD295	Walsall Council	15	No specific concerns. Suggest that where feasible priority is given to new housing supporting existing centres before proposing new neighbourhood centres.	Duly Noted
POPD296	Walsall Council	16	Difficult to provide a meaningful response however as suggested we would anticipate locations for a new hotels and overnight stay accommodation uses being directed towards established town centres.	Duly Noted
POPD297	Walsall Council	Chapter 16	No comments	Noted
POPD298	Walsall Council	18	No comments	No comments made
POPD299	Walsall Council	19	Providing for arts and culture uses in town and village centre policy as part of an approach to strengthen and diversify existing centres would help to support a flexible approach to delivery within a sustainable pattern of development and with regard to impacts in both economic and accessibility terms.	Noted
POPD300	Walsall Council	20	Green Belt policy should be kept separate from natural environment policies. The proposals in relation to natural resources and environmental assets are too vague to be able to provide meaningful comments at this time.	Noted, more detailed policies will be prepared in subsequent iterations.
POPD301	Walsall Council	21	The policy on the historic and built environment needs be clear about the issues that it is seeking to address, whether these are protecting and enhancing the historic environment, safeguarding important views or supporting tree planting. We would note that Lichfield City, especially the cathedral, is visible from parts of Walsall. As well as consideration being given to protecting these views, we recognise that development on the higher ground in Walsall could potentially have an impact on the setting of Lichfield.	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD302	Walsall Council	22	<p>The word “not” should be omitted from the second sentence of the first bullet point under Preferred policy: High quality design so that it states: “Where the proposal does not relates to a heritage asset it will be necessary to demonstrate that the proposed development will not restrict the ability for the heritage asset to be sustained...”</p> <p>We would also suggest an amendment to the third bullet point to state “The built vernacular. New development, including extensions and alterations to existing buildings, should carefully respect and enhance the character of the surrounding area and development in terms of plan, layout, size, scale, materials, proportion, detail, architectural design and public views.”</p> <p>This amendment would enable the policy statement to closer meet paragraphs 127 and 185 of the NPPF (July 2018) with the aims of establishing areas with a strong sense of place and which enhance the character of the vernacular buildings which are often non-designated heritage assets.</p>	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations.
POPD303	Walsall Council	23	No comments.	Noted
POPD304	Walsall Council	Chapter 2	Suggest the role of the County Council in planning for transport, waste and minerals be more clearly explained.	Noted.
POPD305	Walsall Council	Chapter 5	The ‘Landscape and ecology’ section of this chapter identifies minerals as ‘natural assets’ (see also Glossary), it would be more helpful if it explained what types of minerals are present (i.e. sand and gravel) and why they are being safeguarded. Would be helpful to identify any significant waste issues for the District, such as any new infrastructure planned or existing facilities that could be a constraint to other development (e.g. landfill sites, composting and anaerobic digestion). There should also be a cross-reference to the Waste Local Plan and the role of the County Council in planning for waste.	Comments noted
POPD306	Walsall Council	Chapters 19-23 (in Objective against chapter 22)	We note that the chapter on Growth requirements does not yet set the scales of growth to be planned for and that further work and evidence is needed to define the strategic growth options. Whilst the overall approach of focussing growth towards the most sustainable locations is generally supportable, we anticipate there will need to be further joint working and consultation before the Publication of a Draft Plan. We trust that not providing detailed comments on these chapters will not prejudice our ability to cooperate on future consultations.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review.The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs.
POPD307	House Builders Federation	3	The strategic policies of the LPR should set out a spatial strategy which accommodates the level of growth needed within the District and where that growth should be located. The spatial strategy should set out a level of housing growth that meets the housing needs of the District and includes provision to assist in delivering the unmet needs of the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area (HMA). The LPR should consider the most sustainable locations as informed by the settlement hierarchy directing growth to both the existing builtup areas of settlements and sustainable extensions to existing settlements. There should be a short and long-term supply of sites within and adjacent to existing urban areas and on brownfield and greenfield land which is sufficient to meet the District’s housing requirements. The LPR should also consider any implications in the District from the Greater Birmingham Strategic Growth Study.	Comment noted. The Local Plan Review consultation document considers the outputs from the Greater Birmingham Strategic Growth Study . This is discussed in detail in Chapter 14 Homes for the future and considered as part of the growth options.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD308	House Builders Federation	9	The strategic policy for housing should set out the overall level of housing growth between 2016 – 2036. The strategic policy should ensure that a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land is available to deliver the housing requirement which meets the District’s housing needs and assists in meeting unmet housing needs arising in the Greater Birmingham HMA. The spatial distribution of housing growth should provide a sufficient supply of land to meet the District’s housing requirement and to ensure the maintenance of a 5 year housing land supply and achievement of measurements against the housing delivery test. This should include the identification of strategic and nonstrategic allocations for residential development.	Comments noted. The SHLAA which is a living document and updated and published on an annual basis.
POPD309	House Builders Federation	10	The housing needs for different groups should be assessed to justify any policies on the size, type and tenure of housing including a need for affordable housing. All policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence which should be adequate, proportionate and focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned. All households should have access to different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs. Market signals are important in determining the size and type of homes needed. When planning for an acceptable mix of dwellings types to meet people’s housing needs the Council should focus on ensuring that there are appropriate sites allocated to meet the needs of specifically identified groups of households such as self / custom builders and the elderly without seeking a specific housing mix on individual sites. The LPR should ensure that suitable sites are available for a wide range of developments across a wide choice of appropriate locations. The setting of the thresholds and the level and type of affordable housing required together with the provision of other necessary infrastructure should not undermine the deliverability of the LPR . The cumulative burden of policy requirements should be set so that most development is deliverable without further viability assessment negotiations.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD310	House Builders Federation	11	Housing mix and density are intrinsically linked and should be considered holistically. In viability assessment testing the inter-relationship between density, house size (any implications from the introduction of optional space and accessible / adaptable homes standards), house mix and developable acreage should be considered. A blanket approach to housing density across the District is unlikely to provide a variety of typologies to meet the housing needs of different groups. A range of density standards specific to different areas of the District is necessary to ensure that any proposed density is appropriate to the character of the surrounding area. It is also appropriate to encourage the development of higher densities in suitable locations such as in town / city centres and locations with good accessibility to public transport. If a minimum residential development density of 35 dwellings per hectare or any other specifically identified density standard is sought where a density below this minimum is proposed then consideration on a case by case basis should be given to determine if a lower density is appropriate in that location.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD311	House Builders Federation	12	The NPPG sets out ways in which the Council should consider supporting self / custom build The Council should support self-build and custom-build developments where these are sustainably located and consistent with other national and local planning policies. The Council’s preferred policy approach should be permissible to development for self / custom build immediately adjoining as well as within settlement boundaries. The Council should identify specific site allocations for self / custom build development. The Council should also consider a Rural Exceptions Site Policy for self / custom build. A policy requirement for a proportion of self / custom build plots on all or certain sized residential development sites should not be sought. This approach only changes housing delivery from one form of house building company to another without any consequential additional contribution to boosting housing supply. It also seeks to place the burden for delivery of self / custom build plots on housebuilders contrary to national guidance which outlines that the Council should engage with landowners and encourage them to consider self / custom build. Any proposed policy approach should not move beyond encouragement by requiring provision of self / custom build plots on all or certain sized residential development sites. A policy requirement for self / custom build plots on residential development sites is not justifiable. The Council’s Self & Custom Build Register alone is not a sound basis for setting a specific policy requirement. It is also possible for individuals and organisations to register with more than one Council so there is a possibility of some double counting. The Council’s Register may indicate a level of expression of interest in self / custom build but it cannot be reliably translated into actual demand should such plots be made available. The Council should also assess the delivery of self / custom build housing coming forward as a result of windfall development. The Council’s policy approach should be realistic to ensure that where self / custom build plots are provided they are delivered and do not remain unsold. It is unlikely that the allocation of plots on large housing sites can be co-ordinated with the development of the wider site. At any one time there are often multiple contractors and large machinery operating on a housing site from both a practical and health & safety perspective it is difficult to envisage the development of single plots by individuals operating alongside this construction activity. If demand for plots is not realised then they would remain permanently vacant effectively removing these undeveloped plots from the Council’s housing land supply. Where plots are not sold it is important that the Council’s policy is clear about when undeveloped plots revert back for development by the original housebuilder. It is important that plots should not be left empty to detriment of immediately adjacent neighbouring properties or the development as a whole. The timescale for reversion of these plots to the original housebuilder should be as short as possible. The consequential delay in developing such plots presents further practical difficulties in terms of co-ordinating their development with construction activity on the wider site. There are even greater logistical problems created if the original housebuilder is required to return to a finished site after a marketing period has finished to build out plots which have not been sold to self / custom builders. As well as on-site practicalities any adverse impacts on viability should be tested. The Council should provide evidence to indicate any adverse effects on the viability of large housing sites affected by such a policy approach. Self / custom build are exemption from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions and affordable home ownership provision. The Council’s responsibility would need to robustly viability test the LPR in order that the cumulative burden of policy requirements is set so that most development is deliverable without further viability assessment negotiations and the deliverability of the Local Plan is not undermined. A Viability Assessment may conclude that a self / custom build policy requirement has a detrimental impact upon the level of affordable housing provision on sites. The Council may wish to adopt an aspirational approach in allocating plots to deliver self / custom build but this should not be pursued at the expense of delivering affordable housing for which a specific need has been identified in the Council’s own evidence.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses. The Council maintains a self-build register in accordance with legalisative requirements and monitors the demand for self build plots within the District. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a plan-wide viability assessment.
POPD312	Sue Woodward - Labour Group	Whole Document	2.10 While we appreciate that homes are desperately needed across the uk and also acknowledge LDC’s Duty to Cooperate, we strongly urge that the Green Belt is not regarded as an easy option for development, especially the Green Belt around Burntwood. Any such moves should only be considered, as a last resort, to meet the District’s own need for affordable housing.10.1 We endorse the need for private and public sector investment in Burntwood, have been pressing LDC to revise its Capital Strategy accordingly. We believe that only by a genuine commitment by LDC to capital investment in the town will significant private sector funding be leveraged in.In relation to site B13, every effort should be made to press the owner on redeveloping this derelict site which is an eyesore and a blight on the town centre. We recognise that site B16 is within the Green Belt. Any further encroachment into the Green Belt should be strongly resisted.The same applies to site B19	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD313	Environment Agency	4	The preferred policy regarding sustainable development (page 46) references steering development away from areas of highest flood risk and ensuring development within those areas undertake a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment. We suggest that this is reworded to indicate that ‘development within these areas demonstrate they are designed appropriately so that they are safe from the effects of flooding, do not increase flood risk elsewhere and where possible reduce flood risk elsewhere’ (in line with the NPPF) – and subject to the recommendations of the level 1 SFRA as this provides a more strategic steer for what should be achieved.	Suggest wording noted.
POPD314	Environment Agency	Chapter 19	The preferred option for the spatial distribution of growth identified within this plan, we advise this should not be fixed until the water-based evidence is available to confirm that this strategy is appropriate in terms of water resources infrastructure. The proposed settlement hierarchy and preferred additional areas of growth identified (North-East of Lichfield and North of Tamworth) should be in line with the sequential approach to managing flood risk, which can then be further refined through the detail of the site allocation process.	Comments noted. Comments regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local planand will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy. Advice from the EA will help inform that process.
POPD315	Clifton Campville with Thorp Constatine Parish Council	2	We Support Strategic objective & priority 2: Rural communities. Improvements must be made to local facilities and especially local transport in order to promote sustainable growth for both housing and employment. Local transport to support isolated rural communities should be considered regardless of future development.	Noted
POPD316	Environment Agency	Chapter 11	Paragraphs 11.24-11.28 outline national policies in relation to the flood risk, climate change and water supply issues. It summarises the sequential approach to managing flood risk, and details our response to the previous Issues and Options consultation.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including an SFRA which will be compliant with national policy.
POPD317	Environment Agency	Whole Document	Appendix B that Policies NR9 (Water Quality) and IP2 (Lichfield Canal) are to be retained as part of the Local Plan review, although it should be acknowledged they may need to be updated to reflect the new evidence base. In light of the close interrelationship between flood risk and water resource and water quality issues, we query why these water policies are to be retained whilst the flood risk policy is to be reviewed. We recommend, especially given the imminent WCS that water issues are assessed in the whole and the consideration to reviewing the Water Quality policy in particular is given alongside the flood risk policy and the new SFRA. Once the Level 1 SFRA has been published we would be happy to work with your Authority in developing a more detailed draft policy on flood risk issues, in line with the advice given in our previous response to the Issues and Options consultation regarding the points to be addressed within such a policy.	Comments noted. Lichfield District Council will continue to engage with the Environment Agency as the Local Plan Review process and relevant evidence base documents such as the SFRA evolve.
POPD318	Clifton Campville with Thorp Constatine Parish Council	3	It is agreed the spatial strategy should be based upon the identified settlement hierarchy.	Support for the settlement heirarchy noted.
POPD319	Mrs Higgs	3	Objects to approach in Q3 - Spatial Strategy. Since the late 50’ and early sixties when houses were built for the Birmingham Overspill , too may houses built around burntwood. Fields and open spaces have disappeared but no amenities or consideration for the people living in Burntwood. It is time land was found to create new settlements elsewhere. Land that is left will be needed for food production. Builders only want to build on green field sites, it’s time things changed.	Comments noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD320	Bromsgrove District Council	Chapter 2	This response represents an informal view at this stage. BDC has read the Supplementary Consultation with interest and our comments largely relate to the wider Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area (GBHMA) and Duty to Co-operate requirements. We note and welcome Paragraphs 2.17-2.19 of the consultation document which acknowledge the Duty to Co-operate requirements and the need for Statements of Common Ground.	Support noted.
POPD321	Bromsgrove District Council	Chapter 14	It is recognised that there is currently no agreement in place between the 14 authorities within the HMA in relation to the potential apportionment and location of homes to meet the unmet needs. Paragraph 14.26 is of particular note and states: “The Council should test accommodating between 3,000 and 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting the unmet needs from the HMA. This offers an assurance to other authorities that the Council are taking a proactive and progressive approach in helping to deal with this strategic issue.” Whilst this approach is noted and welcomed, it is suggested that until a SOCG apportions the number and location of homes across the 14 authorities, it may be premature to identify specific figures here, although identifying a range does provide flexibility.	Comments noted. Lichfield District Council will continue to engage with the HMA authorities in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD322	Bromsgrove District Council	Chapter 22	The Preferred Option for growth is set out at Paragraph 22.2 – this would see new homes focussed on sustainable settlements identified in the preferred settlement hierarchy. Growth would be attributed in accordance with the levels of the hierarchy, with larger levels of growth to those settlements higher in the hierarchy. It is agreed that this would seem a laudable approach. Paragraph 22.4 recognises that alongside the settlement hierarchy, strategic growth study and high level analysis of growth options has concluded that there are two areas for further exploration these being growth to the north east of Lichfield City and growth to the north of Tamworth. This is noted.	Comments noted
POPD323	SM Salt	3	Does not consider the Spatial Strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Burntwood’s infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable.• Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated.• Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey’s corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires.• Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes.• Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents.• Has no faith in any new Green Belt review as the 2013 used terms, and questions which prejudiced answers and statements resulting in parcels of land not being considered as important to the Green Belt. Alternative strategy – New Settlements Considers there are no ‘exceptional circumstances’ in which Burntwood’s Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward. LDC should be planning for new settlements at: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• West of the A38, Brookhay• Alrewas Quarry, East of A38• Packington Hall Farm, Tamworth Road• Any other suitable and sustainable locations outside the Green Belt.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD324	PN Martin - Shenstone	1	The Local Plan housing growth proposals for Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston contradict the proposed Local Plan vision. The vision states that Lichfield District Council wants to see residents “proud of their communities” with a “strong sense of local community... and belonging”. Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have these strong characteristics. However later in the consultation document, the proposals for housing growth, dependant on the scale of the growth, location and type of growth could put the vision completely at risk. The consultation document review of housing needs is not comprehensively assessed. Lichfield needs are assessed in detail but no needs from outside Lichfield are assessed. The external needs need to be quantified. Any housing need to be met by Lichfield District Council arising from the wider West Midlands Housing Market Area needs to be fully justified. Currently those needs are not identified in any detail or justified in the consultation document. The growth proposals may therefore be subject to near future housing pressures to accommodate - that impact is not identified in the consultation document.	Comments noted. The vision iprovides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD325	PN Martin - Shenstone	2	The justification for Strategic Priority 1. “Communities capable of growth” which includes Little Aston and Shenstone is flawed. This is because Little Aston and Shenstone have very high scores for housing growth potential because of their access to a bus service or railway station “serving 5 main centres”. Three of the five centres identified as benefitting Little Aston and Shenstone are Bromsgrove, Longbridge and Redditch. These are simply railway connections along the length of a cross city line only and no actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Little Aston and Shenstone are identified. Also, Shenstone station only has two trains per hour compared with 4 per hour for Lichfield Stations, and these trains are susceptible to cancellation when there are operating difficulties on the Cross-City line. Also, the bus services are of no use to people getting to and from work as they arrive too late in the morning and leave too early in the evening.	Comments noted. The wording "capable of growth" is not referenced in the strategic priorities and policies chapter but is referenced in chapter 20 in relation to the settlement sustainability study. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD326	PN Martin - Shenstone	3	The evidence for Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone having capacity for growth is considered on pages 101 and 102 of the Lichfield District Council preferred options report including Table 20.2. This section, introduced as “what the evidence tells us” shows that Shenstone has more growth potential negatives than positives in that it has many more red and amber judgements on Table 20.2 than green judgements. Stonnall is shown as having a balance of negative and positive and Little Aston more positive than negative however in the case of Little Aston and Stonnall the SHLAA interest in land designations are significantly shown as “non developable”. This is strong evidence of the inappropriateness of selecting Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone for growth. The Lichfield District Council strategy for housing based on a settlement hierarchy of communities such as Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone which are primarily in the Green Belt should be revised. The priorities below should be based on unused existing industrial land, existing urban areas and the two new growth settlements. Therefore, Lichfield District Council housing growth should be focussed on the alternative areas that are identified in the proposed spatial strategy (i) Brownfield sites that are no longer viable (ii) Existing urban areas with a good range of established services (iii) The two potential strategic growth communities north east of Lichfield and north of Tamworth. The preferred options for housing growth have been published without a Brownfield Site assessment having been completed or a Green Belt Review having been completed or the other West Midland Housing Market Area authorities indicating they will accommodate additional growth, so the data platform for the preferred options spatial strategy assumptions is also incomplete.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process. The SHLAA is a living document and reviewed and updated on an annual basis.
POPD327	PN Martin - Shenstone	4	The Lichfield District Council preferred policy towards sustainable development is acceptable in that it seeks to protect our natural environment. However, the District Council already have a published Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment known as the SHLAA which for Little Aston and Stonnall shows very significant numbers of land owner enquiries adjacent to Stonnall and Little Aston as “not developable”. This SHLAA designation of “not developable” is considered positive classification by Little Aston and Stonnall residents. The considerations included in any existing “not developable” judgement should also be made clear in any future decision making particularly if they are based on sustainable development criteria. The role of the Neighbourhood Plan in the identification and upholding of sustainable development should be made clear as is not identified. The Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone Neighbourhood Plans have all been used effectively to date in challenging non sustainable development in recent years.	Comments noted. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis and will inform the local plan review process. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD328	PN Martin - Shenstone	5	The identification of sustainability standards is important. The Local Plan preferred options should identify where the best potential housing growth exists using this criterion. Electrification of the underused railway line running north east of Lichfield Trent Valley station would further strengthen the case for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option which is outside of the Green Belt. This proposal would reduce the volumes of car movements from the proposed new A38 corridor settlement and should be complemented with a new park and ride rail station south of Lichfield north of Wall. This would reduce the car movements through south Staffordshire villages as they enter north Birmingham.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out the preferred settlement hierarchy and growth option. Locations for growth will be considered as the local plan progresses.
POPD329	PN Martin - Shenstone	6	Flood risk assessment data was obtained for Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall during their Neighbourhood Plan preparation periods. The data places limits on what can be housing development built without risk. This needs to be continued to be acknowledged in any future housing development proposals.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD330	PN Martin - Shenstone	7	Any housing growth proposals should not increase pollution. To date Shenstone and Little Aston await any meaningful enhancement to rail travel times or quality from the new train franchise. As identified above a new rail station would be required for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option north east of Lichfield to reduce the impact of increased vehicle movements coming from that strategic housing proposal.	Comments noted.
POPD331	PN Martin - Shenstone	8	As identified in previous responses to the growth preferred options. The sustainable transport with the greatest potential that provides the greatest opportunity is to electrify the railway line to the north east of Lichfield. The reliability of the Cross-City line is a key to its use by commuters. After 2010, when the service was unreliable for use by commuters, the sale of season tickets at Shenstone Station declined by over 25% and has not yet got back to the level in 2010. Parking at Shenstone station is inadequate with rail users parking in adjacent streets. This may be alleviated if the potential development of Shenstone Business Park takes place, but housing development in the Court Drive area of Shenstone is likely to make the position worse.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD332	PN Martin - Shenstone	9	The preferred policy direction as set out is not comprehensive, in that it proposes a way forward for housing provision in Lichfield District without: (i) identifying the Lichfield requirements to grow or not to grow from the West Midlands Housing Market Renewal Area and (ii) any Green Belt Review (iii) only commits to understanding traveller requirements, not to responding as with other categories of need (Stonnall has had direct experience of the current vacuum in this third area) (iv) any Brownfield analysis having been completed.	Comments noted. Chapter 14 of the consultation documents sets out the methodology for the proposed housing scenarios. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review, Urban Capacity Assessment and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD333	PN Martin - Shenstone	10	This policy direction seeks to meet all the housing needs of the District through all levels of affordable and market housing options. All neighbourhood Plans have considered these issues. The recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying affordable and market needs at the neighbourhood level with agreed housing sizes and bedroom mix ratios should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of any new preferred policy direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD334	PN Martin - Shenstone	11	Again, recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying the appropriate density at the neighbourhood plan level should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of the policy direction. This has been an area of particular importance to Shenstone, where before the Neighbourhood Plan the area was subject to planning application exhibiting new build over intensification	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD335	PN Martin - Shenstone	12	A register of sites suitable for self-builders in the whole of Lichfield District would assist those who wish to build their own home.	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD336	PN Martin - Shenstone	13	Lichfield District Council has not met current targets for pitch provision and has not for many years refreshed its needs assessment in this area. This gap in planning and provision has had direct implications for the Stonnall area. It is important that the new criteria identified in the consultation document in respect of the A5 and A38 corridors for travellers, do actually enable a more proactive approach to provision. The consultation document does not actually identify how the new criteria will do this. Given the history in this area this needs to be significantly clarified.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD337	PN Martin - Shenstone	14	The employment and economic development focus on Lichfield City, Burntwood and Fraley Park is welcome. The Lichfield District Council employment policy should be further strengthened by identifying what the council will do to support the older employment areas which have larger industrial uses with location and site viability features that challenge their long-term future. The Shenstone industrial estate has examples of this. The industrial estate user vacancy rate, short term user churn and traffic impact on the Shenstone village centre require the development of incentives for those users who wish to relocate to the economic development areas above. This may be as straightforward as Lichfield Council identifying the changes of use from industrial to residential development that will be considered.	Duly Noted The Employment Land availability assessment (ELAA) will direct policy direction in additional the Our Spatial strategy will consider future housing locations. The Preferred policy direction; Our employment and ecominc development "seeks to maintain and enhance a diverse local econmoy and ensiurage opportunities for inward investment."
POPD338	PN Martin - Shenstone	15	Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone are classified in the preferred options report as “Rural Centres” catering for the day to day needs of the village and the wider rural area around. While this may be currently true this does not automatically justify any future growth capacity. Parking in the centre of Shenstone is inadequate and any housing developments not within easy walking distance of the village centre will only make the problem worse.	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD339	PN Martin - Shenstone	17	This policy talks of the importance of protecting open space for recreation and overall well-being. Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have several protected green spaces which are actively used within their Neighbourhood Plans. Shenstone has recently had one of these areas of land come under consideration for housing in the recent District Council review of the Land Allocation Plan. This proposal was withdrawn. Green field amenity land adding to overall well-being should not be considered for housing.	Noted
POPD340	PN Martin - Shenstone	20	Any area of special environmental merit has been identified in the Neighbourhood Plans of Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone. The strategy should recognise the contribution of Neighbourhood Plans.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment contribute.
POPD341	PN Martin - Shenstone	21	The provision of high-quality housing development is being reduced by the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in that (i) the consultation on what the Lichfield CIL strategy is to invest in is not open to broad, regular consultation about quality priorities, and (ii) the CIL introduction has limited the developers' resources left for Section 106 contributions to add quality improvements when a specific housing development is approved.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process. Consultation on the CIL process will be in accordance with the Adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
POPD342	PN Martin - Shenstone	22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan. This should be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of stra
POPD343	PN Martin - Shenstone	23	This question is about how Lichfield protects local heritage and the answer is in using the Neighbourhood Plans which should have a stronger role	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment.A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD344	Chontell Buchanan	Chapter 5	Brooklyn Farm, Land South of Highfields Road, Chasetown is promoted. In respect of Chapter 5, The requirement and provision of housing within Lichfield District has long been an important factor in plan making for the District. There has been a shortfall in the early part of the plan in reference to the delivery of housing. There has been a disparity between the number of planning permissions being granted and the quantity of housing completions each year, with a significant shortfall in completions being displayed. First City consider delivery of housing should be the main goal when allocating sites. In addition to sites being sustainable and deliverable from a planning perspective, sites which can guarantee delivery should be given priority. This approach would also align with the recent changes to the NPPF where delivery levels will be scrutinised. Control over the site shows that there is a commitment to not only securing planning permission but to deliver completions. Consider this should be taken into consideration by the Council when deciding which sites go forward as allocations in the Local Plan Review. For this reason, this site should be allocated for residential development and this area of Burntwood be viewed in a favourable light due to its ability to deliver the much-needed housing in the District. We therefore ask the Council to be mindful of achieving results when deciding on the most appropriate directions and locations of growth and acknowledge the most appropriate policy directions to enable and support development in line with the purpose of the planning system which is to, “contribute to the achievement of sustainable developmenf {NPPF, paragraph 7) in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review.The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD345	Chontell Buchanan	1	<p>Note the Burntwood issues set out by the Council and welcome the acknowledgement by the Council to the limited supply of sites for development within the existing urban area including brownfield sites. Also note figure 5.3 Landscape designations and features show a large part of the south western area of the District is within the Green Belt. This influences both Burntwood and Lichfield, both of which are the most sustainable settlements in the District but are also constrained by the Green Belt. Supports comments in the vision regarding new sustainably located development needed to meet the requirements of the District and will have regard to the needs arising from within the housing market area.</p> <p>However, Considers it is important to acknowledge that in order to meet the needs of the District and the wider HMA in a sustainable way, inevitably it will require the release of Green Belt land on the edge of the existing most sustainable locations of Burntwood and Lichfield. This could potentially result in a conflict of interest in connection to the final paragraph of the "Vision for Our District1to some extent, which states, “The districts natural environments and varied landscapes will be conserved and enhanced. Locally important green spaces and corridors will meet recreational and health needs. Sustainable development will help protect the biodiversity, cultural and amenity value of the countryside and will minimise use of scarce natural and historic resources, contributing to mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change.” Consider it is important to indicate that these factors will have to be balanced and a planning judgement made on the most sustainable sites.</p>	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The vision and local plan should be read as a whole

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD346	Chontell Buchanan	2	Generally support the strategic objective and priorities set out in Chapter 8, however, are mindful of the link between Strategic Objective and priority 6: Meeting Housing Need and Strategic Objective and Priority 12: Countryside Character and the intertwined balance that will arise in the District as a result of the location of the Green Belt surrounding the most sustainable settlements in the District and the requirement to provide housing for both the Districts needs and to contribute the needs of the wider HMA.	Noted
POPD347	Chontell Buchanan	3	Supports need to accommodate development outside of the existing built up areas of the settlement in sustainable extensions to existing settlements, and to assist with the delivery of the unmet need of neighbouring areas in addition to the needs of the District. Does not agree with bullet point 7 which relates to the Green Belt within the District. Considers there is a requirement for additional land to meet the needs of the District and to assist with the unmet housing need from neighbouring centres. It is also understood that there is limited capacity within the existing built up areas of the most sustainable settlements to meet future need. Considers it is imperative that the District Council take the lead on determining amendments to the Green Belt and this should not be determined at Neighbourhood Plan stage. In accordance with the NPPF and acknowledged by Council, the alterations of Green Belt Boundaries should be considered through the Spatial Strategy as it is a strategic issue and should be analysed with the best interests of the whole District taken into consideration and Green Belt boundaries amended in the most sustainable locations. Supports the alteration of the Green Belt boundary to the south of Burntwood to accommodate future growth.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan
POPD348	Chontell Buchanan	4	Agree with the Preferred Strategy Policy: Sustainable Development Principles, however, great importance should be given to the potential constraints that arise regarding brownfield sites. Understands the desire for reuse of brownfield land, however, considers it is important to acknowledge that a site being considered as brownfield land does not automatically render the site sustainable from an accessibility perspective and it is necessary at Local Plan stage to identify sites which provide the opportunity to reduce the need to travel as set out in bullet point 8. It is also important to acknowledge the remediation of brownfield sites as a result of contamination, can often lead to a delay in delivery (either as a result of viability issues or time required to remediate the site which has a knock-on effect on housing delivery of the plan. This would not significantly boost delivery of housing completions required during the plan period and could render the plan 'unsound'. Consider the Council should take a pragmatic and realistic approach to the allocation of sites with delivery being a key criterion in the allocation process. This will result in the requirement for Greenfield sites being allocated and in particular Green Belt sites due to the location of the two most sustainable settlements in the District. In order to meet the future needs of Burntwood, it is inevitable the release of Green Belt land will be required and therefore the most sustainable sites should be given priority. The land south of Highfields Road is highly sustainable with excellent access links to the transport network and within easy distance of the existing services and facilities available within Burntwood. This is a positive attribute of the site, in addition to the land promoter, a national house builder, having the appetite to deliver completions. Burntwood is located within a commutable distance to the wider HMA via the existing road network (including the A5 and M6 toll) it would therefore be logical to consider Burntwood as one of the most sustainable areas of the District to assist with the wider HMA unmet residential need	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence which will inform the site allocation process and next stages of the plan this includes a Urban Capacity Assessment and a comprehensive Green Belt Review.
POPD349	Chontell Buchanan	9	Considers the figure of 'Option 5: Local housing need plus 4,500 home contribution', equating to 11,160 to cover the plan period 2016-2036 incorporates the requirement for Lichfield and a contribution to the wider HMA as an appropriate starting point for the Council to deliberate and should be the minimum figure proposed for the emerging plan. A lower figure than mentioned above, would not assist with, "the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay." (paragraph 59, NPPF, February 2019) Considers it would also be appropriate for an additional option to be considered which would sit in between options 5 and 6 in the region of 650 dwellings per annum. The Council have acknowledged towards the start of the current plan there has been a discrepancy between planning permissions granted and the competition of homes, resulting in a deficit in completions albeit in light of a 5-year housing land supply. This suggests that there has been a stumbling block that has arisen once permission has been granted. This could be as a result of a number of reasons such as contaminated land and viability issues. It would therefore be unfeasible to reduce the housing requirement in the emerging local plan review when there is a requirement for Lichfield to meet its own future needs but also contribute the shortfall in the wider HMA. Therefore Options 1,2,3 and 4 should be disregarded. Understand the importance of reviewing and analysing past trends in regard to housing delivery as set out in Table 14.1. However, it is also important to understand that within a 20 year period as shown in the aforementioned table, some of the delivery figures would have been based on lower delivery rates and lower requirements set out in old plans. This is not necessarily truly reflective and appropriate comparable data such as the figures from the start of the current local plan, i.e., 2015. It is also difficult to ignore the global recession which impact the whole of the country and was not Lichfield District specific. The results since the start of the existing Local Plan should be analysed and considered further. Based on the employment requirements and the economic needs of the District the housing requirement should be higher than set in the current adopted plan. The Council should take a progressive and proactive approach in dealing with this strategic issue and committing to delivering the sufficient housing to meet the identified needs of the District and HMA	Comments and preference for Option 5 noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing and employment growth scenarios. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD350	Chontell Buchanan	10	Consider it is important that all the needs of the community as a whole are taken into consideration as part of the Local Plan Review. However, when preparing plans, it is important to ensure an element of flexibility which will ensure the appropriate mix of housing is delivered in the correct areas but also that the level imposed doesn't have a negative impact on sites and applications that would render sites unviable.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment.
POPD351	Chontell Buchanan	11	It is important that the Local Plan has an element of flexibility to it and doesn't impose a blanket density policy which may not be appropriate for all developments in all locations throughout the District. A density of 35 dwellings per hectare and above is more likely to be appropriate in specific locations such as town centre sites and around transport hubs. In order to ensure attractive developments come to fruition and cohesive communities are expanded and/ or created, it is also important to consider the locality of the site and the surrounding environment which will help to influence the density of development sites.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD352	Chontell Buchanan	15	Support the preferred policy in connection to the economy of Burntwood and support the desire to focus on the creation of a vibrant and diverse town centre. Also supports Burntwood being the main focus for investment, including both public and private sector funding and agree the focus should be on retail, employment, leisure, recreation health, education and improvements to the environmental quality and public realm to create an active centre. Residential development should be focused on the edge of the existing urban areas in sustainable locations, namely, land to the south of Burntwood. The spending of the residents of those new housing in Burntwood will assist the economic health and sustainability of the Settlement.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD353	Chontell Buchanan	Chapter 19	Broadly supports the Preferred Growth Option set out in Chapter 22 of the Preferred Options and Policy Directions. Paragraph 22.2 identifies the strategic approach to focus development in line with the settlement hierarchy with larger levels of growth directed to those settlements higher up in the hierarchy such as Lichfield and Burntwood. Supports the policy direction and consider it to be the most sustainable and sound approach. However, do not agree with the proposed directions of growth to the north east of Lichfield City and north of Tamworth. Whilst acknowledging both areas of growth are outside of the Green Belt, that alone, should not be the only deciding factor on preferred areas of growth. Significantly more information is required in connection to these areas of growth to make an informed decision. Sustainability in accordance with the settlement hierarchy should be the starting point for the identification of land for future development. It has been well documented that there is a requirement for additional land to meet the needs of the District and to assist with the unmet housing need from neighbouring areas. It is also understood that there is limited capacity within the existing built up areas of the most sustainable settlements to meet future need. Consider it is imperative that the District Council take the lead on determining amendments to the Green Belt and this should not be determined at Neighbourhood Plan stage as suggested in paragraph 22.5. In accordance with the NPPF and acknowledged by the Council, the alterations of Green Belt Boundaries should be considered through the Spatial Strategy as it is a strategic issue and should be analysed with the best interests of the whole District taken into consideration and Green Belt boundaries amended in the most sustainable locations. Support the alteration of the Green Belt boundary to the south of Burntwood to accommodate future growth. In connection to table 22.1 Consider the Council should take a positive, proactive and pragmatic approach and not see the release of Green Belt land around some settlements to facilitate growth as a disadvantage. This should be regarded as an opportunity to shape future growth in a sustainable way which will benefit the existing and future communities of the District	Comments noted. Whilst under the heading Chapter 19, the comments relate to Chapter 22 and are dealt with on that basis. Comments regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan including a Green belt review and HEDNA and will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy
POPD354	Mike Owen	Whole document	1. The document is clear of jargon or techno speak. 2. The elements required seem to have been deeply considered and the overall position is clear for the future 3. The document is comprehensive and future for the district looks very positive if these elements can all be realised.	Comments welcomed

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD355	Bletsoes (Christopher Templar) on behalf of Peter Yeomans	3	Promotes land south of Norton Lane, Burntwood which is designated green belt. There is a short supply of developable sites at Burntwood which are not in green belt, it is only a matter of time before additional sites are needed within the green belt. Green belt is an important tool for preventing development for various reasons but it can be overly proctective when you consider the land it protects, for example Land at Norton Lane is an uninspiring pony paddock adjoining existing development. Para 19.3 identifies growth adjacent towns however there are very limited sites adjoining Burntwood that are not currently designated as green belt. Given the reliance on Burntwood as a preferred settlement for development boundaries of the green belt must be altered to allow for sites currentyl located in the greenbelt. Consequently the planned green belt review is essential.	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD356	Bletsoes (Christopher Templar) on behalf of Peter Yeomans	9	Promotes land south of Norton Lane, Burntwood which is designated green belt. There is a short supply of developable sites at Burntwood which are not in green belt, it is only a matter of time before additional sites are needed within the green belt. Green belt is an important tool for preventing development for various reasons but it can be overly proctective when you consider the land it protects, for example Land at Norton Lane is an uninspiring pony paddock adjoining existing development. Para 19.3 identifies growth adjacent towns however there are very limited sites adjoining Burntwood that are not currently designated as green belt. Given the reliance on Burntwood as a preferred settlement for development boundaries of the green belt must be altered to allow for sites currentyl located in the greenbelt. Consequently the planned green belt review is essential.	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD357	Bletsoes (Christopher Templar) on behalf of Peter Yeomans	20 and Appendix A	Promotes land south of Norton Lane, Burntwood which is designated green belt. There is a short supply of developable sites at Burntwood which are not in green belt, it is only a matter of time before additional sites are needed within the green belt. Green belt is an important tool for preventing development for various reasons but it can be overly proctective when you consider the land it protects, for example Land at Norton Lane is an uninspiring pony paddock adjoining existing development. Para 19.3 identifies growth adjacent towns however there are very limited sites adjoining Burntwood that are not currently designated as green belt. Given the reliance on Burntwood as a preferred settlement for development boundaries of the green belt must be altered to allow for sites currentyl located in the greenbelt. Consequently the planned green belt review is essential.	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD358	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero Developments (Robert Pearson)	4	The preferred policy approach towards sustainable development is considered to be reflective of national planning policy and is supported	Comments noted.
POPD359	Severn Trent (Jack Robinson)	1	Support the proposed vision, especially themes of the natural environment addressing climate change, sustainable development and increasing green open space. Interested to hear the Council's views on how green space could be multifunctional, providing amenity and communal space in good weather but also as blue / green infrastructure addressing water quality and flood alleviating benefits during storm events.	Comments noted. The Council is preparing a Green Infrastructure Study and SFRA the recommendations of which will be fed into the local plan review.
POPD360	Severn Trent (Jack Robinson)	2	Supportive of proposed strateigc objectives, specifically objectives 3, 13 & 14. These all utilise open space and enhacing existing natural resources / areas to help mitigate some of the impacts of climate change. <u>Passionately believe that efficient use of this kind of space, on top of increased vegetation and tree planting can play a major role in sustainable place making.</u>	Comments noted.
POPD361	Severn Trent (Jack Robinson)	3	Generally support the proposal of 'balanced growth across the district with growth which will be focused on most sustainable locations as informed by our settlement hierarchy.' More supportive of a spatial strategy with a combination of urban focus and urban extension. This is more sustainable as existing infrastructure is available which can be upgraded to cope with new development. Less supportive of dispersive development as it may require a greater number of upgrades. Less supportive of new settlements due to large infrastructure invested required by Severn Trent and the developer.	Comment noted. Support for the approach towards the proposal for balanced growth focused on the most sustainable locations is welcomed.
POPD362	Severn Trent (Jack Robinson)	4	There are some strong points in point 11 of the policy which set good standards for sustainable development. Interested to understand the aspirations for water usage and storm water run-off reductions on redevelopment sites. Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on clean water infrastructure charge if properties are built so consumption per person is 110 litres per person per day or less. What standard betterment do you ask re-development to work towards regarding storm water run off? Strongly support point 12 and welcome invitation to discuss future opportunities of SUDS retrofitting across the district. Severn Trent offer 100% discount on sewerage infrastructure charge if there is no surface water connection and a 75% discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system. Align with views on point 13 and will continue to support and assist the council in more detailed assessments in what way we can. Support the proposal in point 15 and align with the desire to protect water resources for generations to come. Highlight previous comments regarding infrastructure charges as an incentive for sustainable development and supporting the need for green open space which can be utilised for deployment of SUDS and increased tree/vegetation planting.	Comments noted and will be considered further to inform the next stage of the local plan process. Discussions with severn trent will be ongoing as part of the local plan process.
POPD363	Severn Trent (Jack Robinson)	6	Generally supportive of proposed policy direction. Consider it could go further to detail aspirations around betterment of future re-development run-off rates. Severn Trent are aware that the non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage request that developments are built as close as reasonably practical to the greenfield equivalent rates. Some LPAs have explored surface water management guidance notes which ask for a default of 30% betterment achievable through SUDS, with a desired aspiration that brownfield sites could be restored back in line with greenfield run-off rates. Wish to continue support and assist with ongoing flood risk studies and assesments.	Comments noted and will be considered further to inform the next stage of the local plan process. Discussions with severn trent will be ongoing as part of the local plan process.
POPD364	Severn Trent (Jack Robinson)	9	Support this evidence based housing policy aswell as the spatial hierarchy and how to distribute development. Refer to the response to question 3.	Comments noted and support towards approach to housing policy, spatial hierarchy and distribution of development welcome.
POPD365	Severn Trent (Jack Robinson)	11	High densities of impermeable area can generate substantial run-off during storm events. Responses to questions 4 and 6 relating to total site run-off rates remain valid. Housing density should be considered and offset with open green space, SUDS and / or appropriate quantity of attenuation; especially where densities are near the upper desirable limit of 35 dwellings per hectare.	Comments noted.
POPD366	Severn Trent (Jack Robinson)	14	Supportive of this policy and like the focus towards expanding existing employment / industrial areas and the re-development of brownfield sites.	Duly Noted
POPD367	Severn Trent (Jack Robinson)	20	Strongly supportive of natural resources being recognised separately as a policy. Welcome green open space designations and blue / green infrastructure initiatives.	Noted
POPD368	Severn Trent (Jack Robinson)	22	Supportive of this policy direction, specifically for its promotion of tree planting and consideration for urban creep. Although we are not opposed to urban creep we take a view that there should be some consideration on how to mitigate its effect in years to come for example providing additional additional green open space early on to allow upsizing of surface water management features in the future or designing in capacity from the offset on new developments.	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations.
POPD369	Severn Trent (Jack Robinson)	Whole document	Provides general guidelines relating to the role of Severn Trent, Sewage Strategy, Surface Water and Sewer Flooding, Water Quality, Water Supply and Engery Efficiency.	Comments noted. The District Council will continue to engage with Severn Trent as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD370	Julie Jones	Whole document	Local plan is considering a considerable increase in housing for the Burntwood Area but the following needs to be addressed before further impact on the problems we already have. - Burntwood needs better town centre facilities - The existing social infrastructure including health provision and schools require improvement - Significant environmental constraints near the town including SSIs, AONB and SACS - Issues regarding transport movement and accessibility. Burntwood is classed as a deprived area, more housing can only make matters worse.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supproted by an extensive evidence base including a landscape and visual impact assessment and infrastructure capacity study which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD371	Keith Allen	3	Do not support the Preferred Spatial Strategy. Would like it replaced by a strategy which focuses new development on new settlements outside the Green Belt. Have no faith in any Green Belt review.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supproted by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD372	Redditch Borough Council	Chapter 2	This response represents an informal view at this stage. Redditch Borough Council has read the Supplementary Consultation with interest and our comments largely relate to the wider Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area (GBHMA) and Duty to Co-operate requirements. We note and welcome Paragraphs 2.17-2.19 of the consultation document which acknowledge the Duty to Co-operate requirements and the need for Statements of Common Ground.	Support noted.
POPD373	Redditch Borough Council	Chapter 14	It is recognised that there is currently no agreement in place between the 14 authorities within the HMA in relation to the potential apportionment and location of homes to meet the unmet needs. Paragraph 14.26 is of particular note and states: "The Council should test accommodating between 3,000 and 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting the unmet needs from the HMA. This offers an assurance to other authorities that the Council are taking a proactive and progressive approach in helping to deal with this strategic issue." Whilst this approach is noted and welcomed, it is suggested that until a SOCG apportions the number and location of homes across the 14 authorities, it may be premature to identify specific figures here, although identifying a range does provide flexibility.	Comments noted. Lichfield District Council will continue to engage with the HMA authorities in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD374	Redditch Borough Council	Chapter 22	The Preferred Option for growth is set out at Paragraph 22.2 – this would see new homes focussed on sustainable settlements identified in the preferred settlement hierarchy. Growth would be attributed in accordance with the levels of the hierarchy, with larger levels of growth to those settlements higher in the hierarchy. It is agreed that this would seem a laudable approach. Paragraph 22.4 recognises that alongside the settlement hierarchy, strategic growth study and high level analysis of growth options has concluded that there are two areas for further exploration these being growth to the north east of Lichfield City and growth to the north of Tamworth. This is noted.	Comments noted
POPD375	Cannock Chase District Council	9	Supports LDC in seeking to help address the wider GBBCHMA housing shortfall by taking a proactive approach in identifying the scale of potential contribution to the housing shortfall (of between 3,000-4,500 homes above local housing needs). welcome continued discussions in relation to the distribution of this growth (particularly in relation to any cross boundary implications).	Support noted.
POPD376	Paul Jones	3	Do not support the Preferred Spatial Strategy. Would like it replaced by a strategy which focuses new development on new settlements outside the Green Belt. Have no faith in any Green Belt review. Would like to draw attention to possible forthcoming planning applications in relation to sites of 'Windy Ridge' and 'Fern Bank'. Development of these sites is opposed by a number of local residents as they have not been considered in the local plan. Request the bill going through parliament which limits development on sites that have been agreed in the local plan and inhibits developers from appealing to use non agreed sites should be adopted by LDC	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD377	Cannock Chase District Council	14	No objections in principle	Duly Noted
POPD378	Cannock Chase District Council	15	Welcomes the reference to having regard to neighbouring centres and supports the expansion of Burntwood to meet local needs only.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD379	Cannock Chase District Council	13	Noted that the requirements and distribution of these requirements is yet to be determined. Welcome continued discussions in order to identify any cross boundary implications arising.	Noted. Lichfield District Council will continue to engage with Cannock Chase District Council as the Local Plan progresses in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD380	Cannock Chase District Council	Chapter 2	Noted that the preferred strategy for future development is to focus on existing settlements in line with the settlement hierarchy for housing growth and existing employment areas for economic growth. As part of this it is also noted that paragraph 14.21 outlines further testing of the Strategic Growth Study (GL Hearn/Wood) options is to be undertaken. Cannock Chase Council would welcome continued discussions under the Duty to Cooperate in relation to these strategic matters, particularly in terms of any development options that have cross boundary implications (e.g. at Rugeley/Brereton and Burntwood), GBHMA, the most appropriate options for meeting the overall needs of the housing market area (particularly given that options for growth within our District would potentially require consideration of Green Belt land release), options for accommodating economic growth, former Rugeley Power Station, Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople needs, Cannock Chase SAC and evidence base documents. Cannock Chase Council supports Lichfield District Council in seeking to help address the wider GBBCHMA housing shortfall by taking a proactive approach in identifying the scale of potential contribution to the housing shortfall (of between 3,000-4,500 homes above local housing needs).	Continuing discussions welcomed as part of our Duty to Cooperate. Support noted.
POPD381	Emma Canney	3	Extremely upsetting to find out most of the land in Hammerwich been put forward for development. The need for housing is an excuse, the government has clearly met their need for demand and this purely comes down to greed and money making! I have not seen any hospitals, doctors, schools being built just profit making housing developments. Small narrow lanes have increased with traffic and speeding, there has has been an increase in litter and this will impact on wildlife. Deer of Cannock Chase have had their land taken away from them. We should not have housing developments forced upon us and on the green belt when there are plenty of other areas more suitable.	Comments and preferences noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review and an updated SHLAA which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD382	Sarah Weiss	3	Do not support the Prefered Spatial Strategy. The current proposals would have a negative impact on Burntwood. Disappointed green belt land would be considered for expansion of homes. The more green belt land which is taken the more species that will inevitably become homeless and more wildlife will be at risk of extinction. The impact of new houses and an influx of people in the area would cause huge traffic problems and issues with health care services and school provision. Schools in the town are already struggling with numbers so why cause more problems.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD383	Staffordshire County Council	9	To test a level between 3,000-4,500 dwellings seems a reasonable approach but consideration needs to be given to the financial crisis and previous regional policy of Urban Renaissance that may have constrained delivery against the demand that may have existed. If the figure to be tested is not robust and subject to challenge, then it can have knock on effects for accurately planning the infrastructure required to support growth.	Comments noted.
POPD384	Nikki Carter	Whole document	Horried to hear plans to build on further green belt areas in Burntwood when we need so much more housing. Need to look at better town centre facilities, existing social infrastructure, limited supply of sites for development within the existing urban area, nature, scale and direction of future growth, significant environmental constraints near the town and issues regarding transport movement and accessibility.	Comments and preferenes noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan. The Local Plan review will be accompanied by A Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will identify infrastructure requirements and how they will be delivered.
POPD385	Staffordshire County Council	Chapter 5	The District wide percentage of households within 350m of a half hourly bus service or better is 60%. The Lichfield City area figure is now 79%. At paragraph 5.33 mention could also be made to the many non-designated above and below ground heritage assets recorded by the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record (HER). The Key Characteristics: Historic Environment box in section 5 could also include numbers of other designated heritage assets such as Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens. Numbers of non-designated heritage assets in the district could be provided by the HER on request if this was deemed useful and appropriate. At paragraph 5.37 reference should be made to the extensive Neolithic ceremonial landscapes, particularly within the Trent Valley, in the District.	Comments noted
POPD386	Staffordshire County Council	8	It is recommended that SCC and LDC complete traffic appraisals to identify the impact of the preferred options for growth and inform an agreed package of highway and sustainable transport measures. There is an existing shortage of lorry parking in Staffordshire we have experience of such in and around Fradley the Local Plan should explore the demand and supply for HCV parking within the District and consider the allocation of a HCV parking area if the evidence In relation to section 13: Our Sustainable Transport the policy and explanatory text should reflect the package of highway and sustainable transport infrastructure that emerges from the transport modelling and sustainable transport assessments as identified in, '12: Our infrastructure'. This will also be reflected in a new Lichfield District Integrated Transport Strategy that will be produced to inform the emerging new Local Plan. The final package of measures needs to consider the likely availability of funding from developers and the public sector. The most sustainable housing developments will enable walking and cycling access to both primary and secondary school. The policy needs to emphasise the importance of reducing the need for all travel through enhanced telecommunications, particularly in AM and PM peak commuter periods. Developers need to be strongly encouraged to make the necessary arrangements with the commercial providers for the provision of superfast broadband services.	Duly Noted we will continue to work with the County Council to ensure the Local Plan review is a compliant with the requirements identified within the National Planning Policy Framework.
POPD387	Staffordshire County Council	2	In relation to Strategic Objective Number 5: Sustainable Transport the Objective should recognise that new technology is expected to have a significant impact on reducing the need for travel and will reduce the environmental impact of travel. Provision by developers of the best possible broadband services (Fibre to the Premise (FTP)) and charging points for low emission vehicles, will be required as well as walking, cycling and public transport facilities, as part of an overall package of highway and sustainable transport measures.	Comments noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD388	Beverley Cope	Whole document	Concern over the lack of substantial housing development in Whittington. Whittington has a ageing and shriking population causing server loss of facilities. Need development of approximately 100 houses to revitalise the village including affordable housing.Land at Huddlesford Lane was the preferred site by public vote. Greent belt is strangling the village to death.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review.A comprehensive Green Belt review will be undertaken for the District and will have regard to meeting housing needs and the sustainability of any proposals.
POPD389	Staffordshire County Council	22	Encouraging the use of smart technology such as electric vehicles is supported, the importance of the use of low emission vehicles as part of the package of sustainable transport measures should also be emphasised. Developers should be encouraged to install infrastructure to facilitate electric vehicle charging at employment locations and for designated parking spaces within residential developments.	Comments noted
POPD390	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	1	Admirable as a statement of principle but some detailed policy objectives may run counter to this ideal.	Comments noted, however no detail is provided in respect of the concern referenced.
POPD391	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	2	Healthy and safe lifestyles should also include pro-active support for / expansion of community hospital facilities, GP surgeries and day / residential care facilities.	Comments noted. Any specific proposals will be considered having regard to the relevant stratigic objectives and policies in the plan.
POPD392	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	3	Essentially the same as proposed in the initial consultation exercise 8 years ago. Leaves the prospect of green belt boundary changes wide open. The Neighbourhood Plan states clear preference for infill development within existing settlement boundaries. Current hierarchy places Whittington as Level 3 - Larger service villages. Given the loss of services and facilities it is recommended by the Parish Council that Whittington is downgraded to Level 4 - smaller services villages. It is considered that the Level 4 definition is more fitting to Whittington.	Comments noted. The settlement hierarchy has been informed by the findings of the Settlement Sustainability Study which identifies Whittington as Level 3 - Larger Service Villages. The Settlement Study defines Level 3 tier settlements as having common attributes including meeting the day to day needs of the community and acting as hubs for the wider rural areas. Level 4 tier settlements are defined as having less access to education facilities and facilities to meet most day to day needs.
POPD393	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	4	Ok but how would sustainable aspects be evaluated at planning application stage?	Comments noted. The Local Plan Strategy includes Core Policy 3 which sets out key development principles in a similar manner to those proposed within the preferred strategic policy. This policy forms part of the Development Plan and is taken into consideration when planning applications are being determined.
POPD394	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	5	Renewable energy development siting policy should not preclude proposals from high energy users in other locations	Comments noted.
POPD395	Staffordshire County Council	Chapter 12	The provision of an adequate supply of school places will be an essential consideration for the Plan. Equally for any larger allocation the location and accessibility to new and/or existing schools will be key in place making considerations. In relation to Secondary schools there are significant considerations at Lichfield City based on the preferred option to direct growth to main urban areas. Secondary school places was developed, to align with the existing local plan further additional capacity over that identified for the current Local Plan is unlikely to be achievable. In the other main urban areas of the district; Burntwood and north of Tamworth, there remains some opportunity for growth at existing secondary schools if necessary. In Rugeley the growth in secondary school places, which is required because of the redevelopment of the Power Station site, is currently being addressed as part of application. Many of the primary schools across the district currently operate at, or near to, their capacity. The current local plan has enabled additional primary school infrastructure to be delivered in the form of new schools located within these strategic sites/locations. Some additional small-scale housing could be accommodated.There are potential constraints at Fradley in relation to Primary School infrastructure.	Comments noted
POPD396	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	6	Ok but how would policy be applied to change of use proposals	Noted. The policy states that planning applications for development within the plan area must be accommodated by site-specific flood risk assessments. This relates to all applications.
POPD397	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	7	Need to set strict guidelines for wood burning appliances. Tenuous claims on carbon neutrality are far outweighed by pollution issues.	Comments and suggestions noted.
POPD398	Staffordshire County Council	Whole Document	At paragraph 1.11 Bullet Point 8 heritage assets don't fit well in a policy/theme on 'natural' resources. This could be added in the next policy/theme at bullet point 9 that focuses on the built and historic environment. In the Glossary and Abbreviations, a definition of what a heritage assets (designated and non-designated) would be useful.	Comments noted.
POPD399	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	8	Focuses on urban priorities. Rural communities are reliant on private car use and progressive loss of public transport services heightens this. Policy needs to acknowledge the reality: - Promote move to hybrid / electric vehicles - Charging points in key locations - Preferential parking charges	Duly Noted, the Preferred Policy Direction identifies the following future action which will ensure the points raised will be considered "Identify sustainble trasnport improvements which will be supported in line with local, regional and national priorities". Further, that Preferred policy : High quaility design bullet 7 relates to Sustainable Travel in reagrd to housing locations and detailed design elements.
POPD400	Staffordshire County Council	Chapter 2	The use of the Staffordshire Historic Environment Character Assessment (HECA) and the Lichfield Extensive Urban Survey as part of the evidence base is welcomed. Any attempt to update the HECA would be supported. Additional areas may be needed to be included reflecting any proposed changes to the Local Plan and its scope.	Noted.
POPD401	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	9	Is Option 5 the preferred option? Should document refer to Birmingham's housing needs?	Chapter 14 includes a section titled 'needs for the housing market area' and the housing growth options suggested include a contribution to meeting the GBHMA shortfall. Paragraph 14.26 sets out that the council should test accommodating between 3,000 and 4,500 additional dwellings which equates to option 4 and option 5.
POPD402	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	10	No issues	Noted
POPD403	Staffordshire County Council	Chapter 18	Generally supportive. A minor wording change is proposed and the additional evidence base is welcomed. Preferred Policy directions are generally supported. It is expected that public rights of way are protected and, where possible, enhanced in conjunction with any development.	Comments noted
POPD404	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	11	Principles ok but adopting a pragmatic approach is essential. Densities could vary between village centre and the perimeter especially if green belt / green field land is involved.	Comments noted.
POPD405	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	12	Ok but not the constraints imposed by designated Conservation Areas	Comments noted.
POPD406	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	13	Bullet point 1 needs to be tight8 up - unclear what 'near the a5/a38' includes	Noted
POPD407	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	14	Prioritising brownfield / redevelopment of existing sites appears to be a continuation of existing policy. This should be extended to cover other areas (eg Trent Valley Road and Crossfields area)	Duly Noted
POPD408	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	15	No issues	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD409	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	16	No issues	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD410	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	17	Whittington already well provided for but renewal can be costly. Grant Aid issues?	Noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD411	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	18	Generally well provided for. The addition of a new cinema complex would be welcome.	Noted
POPD412	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	19	Link to Economic growth, Enterprise and Tourism desirable to ensure ongoing financial support.	Noted
POPD413	Staffordshire County Council	1	Welcomed that the Vision recognises the important role the historic environment has in fostering community identity and pride.	Noted
POPD414	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	20	Must relate to transport and infrastructure policy: hs2, road network, continuing increase in car ownership irrespective of move to low emission vehicles. Building more houses will generate higher demand irrespective of measures seeking to promote greater use of public transport etc.	Noted
POPD415	Staffordshire County Council	4	Encouraging the sustainable re-use of previously developed land and the reuse of buildings is welcomed as is the acknowledgement of the positive contribution that the conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities. Regarding contamination and ground instability of brownfield land, the very nature of these (i.e. they may contain above or below ground heritage assets relating to former industrial/other activity) means that heritage should also be considered as potential (albeit mitigatable) constraint. The conservation, enhancement and improved understanding of heritage assets is welcomed. At 11.11 it is welcomed that the needs of heritage is included as a consideration for climate change. Recommends wording asking for major development to incorporate sustainable drainage which benefits water quantity, water quality and biodiversity.	Comments and suggested amendment to wording noted
POPD416	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	21	Preserving character of smaller spaces is just as important as the focus on larger scale views and vistas and should be acknowledged here.	Noted.
POPD417	Staffordshire County Council	11	Support ‘the density is appropriate to the character of the surrounding area’ is retained in the preferred policy.	Comments noted
POPD418	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	22	Specific master plans for small and medium scale developments are not sustainable and likely to be quickly overtaken by changing circumstances. Each location should be judged on its merits. Plans should evolve over time within a robust policy framework embracing listed building/conservation aspects.	Noted.
POPD419	Whittington and Fisherwick Parish Council (David Walton)	23	Should also include assessment of potential economic and social benefit	Evidence is prepared and assessments such as the sustainability appraisal undertaken to enable informed decisions to be made.
POPD420	Staffordshire County Council	15	Support the weight given to the sustaining and enhancing heritage assets and their settings.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD421	Staffordshire County Council	20	Consideration to historic landscapes should be retained in the preferred policy.	Noted, evidence is currently being updated.
POPD422	Staffordshire County Council	17	It is expected that public rights of way are protected and, where possible, enhanced in conjunction with any development public rights of way can form a key part in promoting health and wellbeing and the future sustainability of a community.	Noted. Further consideration required with regard to which policy will include the provision/protection of long distance cycle routes/footpaths.
POPD423	Susan Cohen	Whole document	Green belt land is very important and more consideration should be given to under utilised brownfield sites for development. Green belt land should be protected. Shenstone is a small village benefitting from its location between two larger towns and you are proposing to turn the village into a soulless town with high density housing. The roads in Shenstone are unsuitable for high traffic volumes. Sounds like Shenstone is mainly being considered for development because it has a train station. The car park is packed during the day and so are neighbouring roads. The train line cannot support the current volumes of people commuting into Birmingham. Instead of encouraging more Shenstone residents to use public transport why dont you ask why they use their cars in preference.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and urban capacity assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD424	Staffordshire County Council	Chapter 14	We are generally supportive of the policy direction to ensure all sectors of the community have access to affordable housing of the correct size, type and tenure for their needs. Is it possible to consider strength of local connections / current residency in Staffordshire as a priority for housing being marketed at the over 65's? The Plan should be cognisant to prevent a net influx of population 65+ from out of area, which is not sustainable for the adult social care system. Housing for older people that should be considered as part of the HEDNA.	Comments noted. The HEDNA will look a number of aspects including typologies and housing mix.
POPD425	Staffordshire County Council	8	In support of health and care could consideration be given to accessibility for the less mobile, including wheelchairs and mobility scooters.	Duly Note comments relating to level crossings, consideration should be given to the requirements contained within Preferred policy: High quality design.
POPD426	Mr and Mrs Kidd	Whole document	Noticed several planning applications for housing to be built in around the Burntwood and Hammerwick areas, namely Hospital road areas. Over the past few years we've noticed a large increase of traffic in the area. Understand housing needs to be built but this should be limited to areas near the toll road and old gravel working in Alrewas etc where much of the land is old brownfield sites. Fear the area will decline into one more heartless sea of housing	Noted. The Local Plan Review will be supproted by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and urban capcity assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD427	Trevor Stephenson	3	Do not support the Prefered Spatial Strategy. The current proposals would have a negative impact on Burntwood. Disappointed green belt land would be considered for expansion of homes. Brownfield areas need to be considered. Apart from the need for housing, this country is in desperate need to consider the overall ecology of the country, we are losing wildlife at a rate that will be unrecoverable in the future.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. The Local Plan Review will be supproted by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD428	Norman Heeks	Whole document	Whittington looks like it needs to be revitalised and the services improved, if this can only be achieved by adding new developments I strongly recommend you look closely at this	Comments noted.
POPD429	Jayne Kirk	Whole document	Highlight the need for extra doctors / healthcare within Lichfield. The amount of development is extremley high in Lichfield but on none of the sites has a provision been made for doctors surgeries despite three primary schools being planned. This needs to be addressed.	The Health Authority inculding the Clincil Commissoning Group will be a key partner in the development of the Infastrctre Delivery Plan. Idetification for facilities to address current and future need can then be refetced within preferred policies.
POPD430	CT Planning on behalf of Mr P Smith	3	Promotes land at Church Farm, Armitage Agree the spatial strategy is based on an identified settlement hierarchy would help deliver sustainable development. The strategy should seek to deliver housing growth across the District by directing new developments to sustainable locations. Support the inclusion of Armitage with Handsacre as Level 3 - Larger Service Village. It is entirely appropraite that this village is recognised as a sustainable settlement and retains its Key Village status.	Comments and support for the settlement heirarchy noted.
POPD431	CT Planning on behalf of Mr P Smith	9	Support the preferred policy direction for housing provision. Agree the Strategic Policy for Housing should set out the overall level of housing growth and it should ensure a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land in the District over the plan period. Recognise the need for 6,600 new dwellings over the plan period may change with any revision to the Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need. Support the Council testing the ability of the district to accommodate between 3,000 - 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting unment needs from the HMA.	Comments and support for testing between options 4 and 5 noted.
POPD432	CT Planning on behalf of Mr P Smith	Chapter 22	Promotes land at Church Farm, Armitage Support the preferred option for housing growth particularly the identification of Armitage with Handsacre as a location for growth. Support the review of Green Belt boundaries in the District as part of the identification of locations for housing allocations. Land at Church Farm is well related to the existing settlement of Armitage. The site has defensible, well established hedgerows and comprises of 0.9 ha. It is capable of accommodating up to 25 dwellings.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD433	Historic England	Chapter 5	5.34 refers to ancient monuments rather than scheduled monuments and this should be revised. Key Characteristics box is recommended that other heritage assets are also referred to including non-designated assets such as locally listed buildings and buried archaeology. Have the activities at Burntwood and along the canals led to building materials and styles which form part of a local distinctiveness that could be emphasised in the Plan moving forward? The landscape section emphasises the archaeological background and organic growth of the District which is actually part of the historic environment. If this is to remain within the landscape section it is recommended that the synergy between the historic, built and natural environment is highlighted in the Plan and further in the Sustainability Appraisal with Historic Landscape Characterisation information to assist with masterplanning of sites. Should also include the rivers which have potential for paleolithic remains.	Comments noted
POPD434	Historic England	Chapter 6	Amend to read ‘Protecting our historic environment, heritage assets and their setting’ for the avoidance of doubt and in line with NPPF.	
POPD435	Historic England	1	The overall vision is welcomed. Recommend the historic environment is included in the last paragraph along with natural environments and varied landscapes as historic environment offers opportunities for heritage led regeneration and influences local identity as well as contributing to wellbeing.	Comments noted
POPD436	Historic England	2	Strategic objective and priority 14: Built environment seems to address heritage too so suggest reword to read ‘Built and historic environment’ to ensure heritage assets that are not built are included.	Comments noted
POPD437	Historic England	3	The Plan will need to demonstrate a positive approach to the historic environment in line with NPPF suggest the Plan incorporate a strategic historic environment policy, as indicated in this consultation, as well as more detailed historic environment policies for development management purposes and that all sites are assessed in relation to the historic environment.	Comments noted. The preferred policy approach towards the Historic Environment is set out within Chapter 18 of the consultation document.
POPD438	Historic England	4	Preferred policy approach is supported. However, BP6 and BP10 should refer to ‘heritage assets and their setting’.	Comments and suggested amendment to wording noted
POPD439	Historic England	5	A positive approach to the historic environment will need to be demonstrated for the Plan to be sound. Historic England is currently working on a renewable energy advice note and we will keep you up to date on any consultation.	Comments noted.
POPD440	Historic England	6	No concerns in general about the preferred policy. Recommend the SA considers risks of watering and de-watering of buried archaeology.	Comments noted.
POPD441	Historic England	7	Supported. Deterioration in air quality can lead to degradation of historic fabric surfaces where chemical changes start to take place.	Support noted.
POPD442	Historic England	8	Supported. Infrastructure and transport have the potential to impact on the historic environment whether directly and indirectly.	Duly noted No Further Action
POPD443	Historic England	9	The Plan needs to demonstrate a positive approach to the historic environment, recommend sites are assessed in relation to the historic environment.	Noted.
POPD444	Historic England	10	See responses to Q11 and Q12 if housing density and self-build matters are to be built into a housing mix policy.	Noted.
POPD445	Historic England	11	Housing density can affect heritage assets positively and harm if not sensitive to existing built form e.g. within or adjacent to a Conservation Area, or the setting of a heritage asset. Policy should include a caveat that this may be revised in certain circumstances or certain sites e.g. in relation to the historic environment.	Comments noted.
POPD446	Historic England	12	Would need to be general and link to any development management historic environment policies and/or site specific policies containing bespoke criteria for the site to set out design parameters to ensure the historic environment is conserved or enhanced in line with NPPF and to ensure the Plan can demonstrate a positive approach to the historic environment.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD447	Historic England	13	Should demonstrate a positive approach to the historic environment, recommend that any sites are assessed in relation to the historic environment. Would this part of the Plan also account for any requirements for travelling Showpeople as this is not clear from current wording?	Noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process. Lichfield District Council will continue to engage with Historic England as the Local Plan progresses in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD448	Historic England	14	Should demonstrate a positive approach to the historic environment recommend that any sites put forward for allocation are assessed in relation to the historic environment.	Duly Noted
POPD449	Historic England	15	It is noted that extant policies would be taken forward in respect of the Centres, as set out in Appendix B, and these are welcomed. However, it would be worth considering whether any revisions are required during the Plan process once the housing supply figures issue becomes more apparent. The Sustainability Appraisal should assist with highlighting and assessing any increase in risk or opportunity in respect of the Centres and the historic environment as the Plan progresses.	Duly Noted
POPD450	Historic England	16	Generally supported. It is recommended that specific assets that are referred to in the historic environment and landscape sections of the Plan are noted within the SA to emphasise synergy and within the Plan to highlight local distinctiveness and sense of place.	Duly Noted Preferred Policy: Historic and built environment addresses these concerns.
POPD451	Historic England	17	No concerns.	Noted
POPD452	Historic England	18	Are there opportunities to link any relevant requirements into Centres policies where appropriate? Alternatively it may be useful to consider a SPD or separate document either for the District or in conjunction with DTC authorities in terms of an Arts and culture strategy for a wider area including links to the historic environment where relevant.	Noted
POPD453	Historic England	19	Are there opportunities to link any relevant requirements into Centres policies where appropriate? Alternatively it may be useful to consider a SPD or separate document either for the District or in conjunction with DTC authorities in terms of an Arts and culture strategy for a wider area including links to the historic environment where relevant.	Noted
POPD454	Historic England	20	Supported in general and the reference to historic landscapes is welcomed. Recommended that Historic landscape characterisation (HLC) is referred to, and utilised, within the Plan and SA since it can be used to help secure good quality, well designed and sustainable places.	Noted, evidence is currently being updated.
POPD455	Historic England	21	We would be pleased to discuss significant long distance views, particularly with respect to the Lichfield spires, our advice note on tall buildings may be of use to you at this time. This matter also links in with housing density issues set out in our response to Question 11.	Noted.
POPD456	Historic England	22	Could ensure the aspirations of the Plan are clear to developers at the outset and that post decision amendment applications do not weaken any agreed design ethos. Use of design codes for individual sites to be agreed as part of a planning submission could be another alternative.	Noted.
POPD457	Historic England	23	Preferred policy direction for evidence supporting heritage assets seems clear. Any reference to assessment of longer distance significant views and vistas as set out in the preferred direction would be supported.	Noted.
POPD458	duplicate of POPD981			
POPD459	Lee Powell	3	Appalled at the proposals for reclassifying Green Belt in order to build more houses. The population of Burntwood has grown whilst the facilities and amenities in the area have diminished. The infrastructure is inadequate for the number of people who live in Burntwood and the Council is proposing to add more houses and people to the area putting even more of a strain on infrastructure. This is unacceptable and unsustainable. The road system cannot cope, health services are inadequate and shopping facilities in the area are pathetic. Do not support the spatial strategy. Want it replaced by a strategy that focuses new development on new settlements outside the Green Belt.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD460	CT Planning on behalf of Mr J Duncan	3	Promotes land to the east of Common Lane, Whittington Agree the spatial strategy is based on an identified settlement hierarchy would help deliver sustainable development. The strategy should seek to deliver housing growth across the District by directing new developments to sustainable locations. Support the inclusion of Whittington as Level 3 - Larger Service Village. It is entirely appropriate that this village is recognised as a sustainable settlement and retains its Key Village status.	Comments and support for the settlement hierarchy noted.
POPD461	CT Planning on behalf of Mr J Duncan	9	Support the preferred policy direction for housing provision. Agree the Strategic Policy for Housing should set out the overall level of housing growth and it should ensure a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land in the District over the plan period. Recognise the need for 6,600 new dwellings over the plan period may change with any revision to the Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need. Support the Council testing the ability of the district to accommodate between 3,000 - 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting unmet needs from the HMA.	Comments and support for testing between options 4 and 5 noted.
POPD462	CT Planning on behalf of Mr J Duncan	Chapter 22	Promotes land to the east of Common Lane, Whittington Support the preferred option for housing growth particularly the identification of Whittington as a location for growth. Support the review of Green Belt boundaries in the District as part of the identification of locations for housing allocations. Land at Common Lane is well related to the existing settlement of Whittington. The site would represent a logical extension to the development boundary of Whittington. It is capable of accommodating 21 dwellings.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD463	CT Planning on behalf of South Staffordshire Water	3	Promotes land at Shenstone Pumping Station, Lynn Lane, Shenstone Agree the spatial strategy is based on an identified settlement hierarchy would help deliver sustainable development. The strategy should seek to deliver housing growth across the District by directing new developments to sustainable locations. Support the inclusion of Shenstone as Level 3 - Larger Service Village. It is entirely appropriate that this village is recognised as a sustainable settlement and retains its Key Village status.	Comments and support for the settlement hierarchy noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD464	CT Planning on behalf of South Staffordshire Water	9	Support the preferred policy direction for housing provision. Agree the Strategic Policy for Housing should set out the overall level of housing growth and it should ensure a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land in the District over the plan period. Recognise the need for 6,600 new dwellings over the plan period may change with any revision to the Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need. Support the Council testing the ability of the district to accommodate between 3,000 - 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting unmet needs from the HMA.	Comments and support for testing between options 4 and 5 noted.
POPD465	CT Planning on behalf of South Staffordshire Water	Chapter 22	Promotes land at Shenstone Pumping Station, Lynn Lane, Shenstone Support the preferred option for housing growth particularly the identification of Shenstone as a location for growth. Support the review of Green Belt boundaries in the District as part of the identification of locations for housing allocations. Land at Shenstone Pumping Station, Lynn Lane is well located to the existing pattern of development at Shenstone. The site can provide 40 dwellings. South Staffordshire Water are committed to bringing the site forward for development within the next 5 years.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD466	Joan Hill	Whole document	Fully agree with all set out in the specimen letter from the Spatial Policy and Delivery team.	Duly noted No Further Actions
POPD467	Carol and John Rolls	Whole document	Diabolical what is being planned with our green belt all for the sake of money. Infrastructure will not cope, roads are congested enough and the doctors surgeries and schools are struggling to cope.	Comments noted. LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing and employment needs. The evidence base being assembled will have regard to access to services and facilities to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD468	Richard Parry	Whole document	Become increasingly aware of what appears to be a disregard for Burntwood of the councils jurisdiction. On the numerous occasions development has been proposed for improvement infrastructure it always fizzles out but over time housing is applied for it goes ahead putting further strain on the limited amenities, schools, gp surgeries and traffic. Plans for Lichfield Town Centre are proposed to have further funds allocated, suggest those funds are allocated to an out of town shopping area such as on brownfield sites in Burntwood.	Comments noted. The Local Plan review will be accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will identify infrastructure requirements and how they will be delivered.
POPD469	Alex Johnson	Whole document	Recently received a document in the post about housing growth in the parish of shenstone / stonall but cant find whereabouts in the document or on the website where exactly the building of housing is being proposed	Comments noted.
POPD470	Mr and Mrs T Challoner-Miles	3	Do not support the preferred spatial strategy, want it replaced with a strategy that focuses new development on settlements outside the greenbelt.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD471	Robert Hazel	Whole document	Seeks to express outrage that the Council is considered development on green belt land which will blight the lovely countryside. Fear that the already busy rat run in Norton Lane will be exacerbated with additional traffic and no additional roads to alleviate the added congestion that is likely to materialise. Local infrastructure does not support the established developments.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and urban capacity assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD472	Emma Blackburn	3	Do not agree with plans to use Green belt land as sites for new housing. It is vital green belt land and countryside is protected and maintained for the health and wellbeing of all Burntwood's residents and wildlife. Do not consider the spatial strategy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development. Burntwood's current infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which have developed. The road network is poor. Unless the whole of Mount Road is redesignated for housing there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes. The town needs improvement and money spent on improving the amenities and infrastructure before any plans for further housing is agreed. Listen to residents who chose to live and work in Burntwood and surrounding areas and are people who make it possible for these towns to exist. No exceptional circumstances in which Burntwood's Green Belt can be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward. LDC should be planning for new settlements west of the A38, Brookhay, Alrewas Quarry, east of A38, Packington Hall Farm, Tamworth Road and other suitable and sustainable locations outside the Green Belt. Please consider alternative sites for new housing and understand the value of Green Belt land to the local community.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD473	Mr and Mrs Faulkner	3	Do not agree with the amount of green belt land for housing. The possibility of building 11000 houses will have a massive impact on local living, destroying a vast area of Cannock Chase. Burntwood's infrastructure and amenities are incapable of handling this amount of build. Brownfield should be explored.	The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD474	Neil Pemberton	3	Objects to plans for new residential developments on Green Belt land surrounding Burntwood. Green belt around Burntwood needs to be preserved for the health and wellbeing of residents. The existing infrastructure and facilities are inadequate for the current population. No faith in any new Green Belt review and would favour an approach that focuses on developing sites outside the Greenbelt alongside redeveloping Brownfield sites inside the current Green Belt. The size of the majority of proposed development is completely unsustainable. Less inclined to object to smaller proposed development sites at White Horse Road and Stockhay Lane, these sites would have the least impact on Burntwood's struggling infrastructure and the Green belt.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD475	Fradley and Streethay Parish Council	Chapter 22	Support	Noted.
POPD476	Fradley and Streethay Parish Council	14	The A38 junctions at Hilliards Cross and Fradley Lane and the need/desire for a lorry park on Fradley Park are very important issues for residents and businesses alike and 'essential' for sustainable growth in this area.	This comment is directed to the topic areas covered in Question 8 and is noted.
POPD477	Fradley and Streethay Parish Council	4	Would like to see more specific ideas and targets for developers to achieve.	Noted
POPD478	Fradley and Streethay Parish Council	Chapter 14	No mention of specific house types. Fradley requires more bungalows and homes suitable for our ageing population.	Comments noted.
POPD479	Fradley and Streethay Parish Council	Chapter 2	Not enough reference to Neighbourhood Plans.	Noted. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for policies. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD480	G and A Constantine	Chapter 22	Any development between Little Aston and Shenstone eats into the greenbelt and is one step further in merging the Lichfield and Birmingham areas and expanding the conurbation. The Little Aston to Shenstone Green Belt strategic gap, is one of the most important in the Greater Birmingham area and it must be protected from further development in the Green Belt. Links into Birmingham are already at capacity during peak periods. Any development would have to be in keeping with the area. The preferred strategic options for growth have concluded that there are two specific large areas for further exploration to the north-east of Lichfield city and to the north of Tamworth both are sustainable locations but benefit from not being within the Green Belt. Council are not able to demonstrate exceptional circumstances when there are large sustainable development areas outside the Green Belt.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD481	Elford Homes (Mr Misselke)	3	Agree that a spatial strategy based upon an identified settlement hierarchy would help deliver sustainable development. The spatial strategy should seek to deliver housing growth across the District by directing new development to sustainable locations. Support the inclusion of Lichfield City in the proposed settlement hierarchy as a Level 1 "Strategic Centre".	Comments and support for the settlement hierarchy noted.
POPD482	Elford Homes (Mr Misselke)	9	Support the testing to accommodate between 3,000-4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting the unmet needs from other Local Authority areas outside Lichfield. Support the proposed preferred policy direction for housing provision. Agree that the Strategic Policy for Housing should set out the overall level of housing growth and that it should ensure a sufficient supply. Recognise the proposed need new homes may change.	Comments and support for testing between options 4 and 5 noted.
POPD483	Elford Homes (Mr Misselke)	12	Support. Support identifying specific allocations for self-build and custom development especially on site at Fosseyway Lane. Site is in Green Belt and is logical extension to Lichfield City.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD484	Elford Homes (Mr Misselke)	Chapter 22	Support preferred options and support review of Green Belt. Propose inclusion of site at Fosseyway, Lichfield.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD485	N Brown	Whole document	Whittington is in need of more housing development for young first time buyers.	Duly Noted Policies relating to affordable housing and dwelling mix (house size) will be developed through the Review process.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD486	Mark Liell LLp for John Kingslake Farms	3	Promoting land at Mile Oak, Fazeley. Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill, are identified as Level 3 “larger service villages”, they and the immediate locality are fundamentally part of Tamworth, and intrinsically linked, due to the proximity of the nearby excellent road network, Infrastructure, employment, health (the Sir Robert Peel Hospital) and education facilities. They are not rural. Support reviewof the GreenBelt and that changes should not be based on “exceptional circumstances”, but the overall merit of the removal, in accommodating housing judged against, and relative to the adverse impact of otherwise entertaining housing development on non-Green Belt land, where other deficiencies, such as infrastructure and transport onstraints and/or flooding vulnerability implications may exist.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD487	Mark Liell LLp for John Kingslake Farms	9	Promoting land at Mile Oak Fazeley. There is an imbalanace with more older people currently living in the District than the national norm and pursuit of development for families /younger people should be encouraged and inform site allocations, housing types and design. Sites should be considered on their merit and greenfield sites should be considered on their merits. Too much housing squeezed on allocated sites results in less attractive schemes. The Council ought to adopt Option 5 + strategy at least 11,160 and entail some greenbelt land removal.	Comments and support for Option 5 and above noted.
POPD488	Mark Liell LLp for John Kingslake Farms	11	Promoting land at Mile Oak Fazeley. There is an imbalanace with more older people currently living in the District than the national norm and pursuit of development for families /younger people should be encouraged and inform site allocations, housing types and design. Sites should be considered on their merit and greenfield sites should be considered on their merits. Too much housing squeezed on allocated sites results in less attractive schemes. The Council ought to adopt Option 5 + strategy at least 11,160 and entail some greenbelt land removal.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD489	Mark Liell LLp for John Kingslake Farms	20	Promotes land at Mile Oak, Fazeley. Support new housing in Fazeley. All undeveloped land is currently Green Belt. Consider 1,000-2,500 units in this locality would make a meaningful contribution to the overall envisaged need. Proposed site is available, deliverable and sustainable and would deliver circa 1,000 dwellings upto 2036.	Noted. Not relevant to this question.
POPD490	Mark Liell LLp for John Kingslake Farms	22	Promotes land at Mile Oak, Fazeley. Support new housing in Fazeley. All undeveloped land is currently Green Belt. Consider 1,000-2,500 units in this locality would make a meaningful contribution to the overall envisaged need. Proposed site is available, deliverable and sustainable and would deliver circa 1,000 dwellings upto 2036.	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations.
POPD491	Wardell Armstrong for Leavesley Group	1	Economic objective of the NPPF is undervalued. Under the consideration of ‘Quality homes’ the needs of the elderly should be reflected in a manner consistent with the Government’s priority.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The vision indicates residents will be able to access quality homes which "meet their needs".
POPD492	Wardell Armstrong for Leavesley Group	2	Promoting land at Fradley. Support key settlements accommodating sustainable growth such as Alrewas and Fradley. Fradley and Alrewas are not constrained by Green Blet and on this basis are the most sustainable to deliver both housing and economic growth. Housing Secretary of State supports diverse range of housing and to build them out more quickly.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.
POPD493	Wardell Armstrong for Leavesley Group	3	Promoting land at Fradley. Welcome Fradley being a level 3 large service village and promoting development some through planning applications at Fradley. Residential growth option 2 is supported. Agreed that options 1,3 and 4 are less realistic, deliverable or sustainable options.	Comments and support for the settlement hierarchy and growth option 2 noted.
POPD494	Wardell Armstrong for Leavesley Group	9	Promoting land at Fradley, sites are available now, offer a sustainable location and are realistically deliverable within 5 years. At this early stage of Plan making, the lack of an evidence base on local and unmet housing need makes the matter of provision arbitrary, and comments are reserved until the next stage. The Preferred policy direction reference ‘homes for older people including specialist care provision’ is supported.	Comments noted.
POPD495	Wardell Armstrong for Leavesley Group	11	Promoting land at Fradley. Support specific allocations for custom and self-build housing, provision for the elderly, retired housing and care homes. Evidence shows that new build for older people will help free up existing homes by encouraging them to down size which is a material benefit to housing market.	Comments noted. he Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD496	Wardell Armstrong for Leavesley Group	14	Promotes land at Fradley. The policy at 15.8 is sensible, the proposition that ‘growth will be focussed on current employment areas’ is restrictive as it neither supports any sustainable provision elsewhere opportunity at existing established sites alongside the A38 Corridor. It is recommended that a more flexible approach in policy making is required. The Table 21.1 wording of ‘Fradley Park employment areas and growth at Fradley’ is supported as locations for growth, which should not be overly restricted in that the assessment at Table 21.1 demonstrates that it is the most sustainable location for strategic growth in the District.	Duly Noted the Housing and emplyment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for empoyment development needs.
POPD497	CBRE for St Modwen	2	Objective 8 should be expanded - revised wording suggested.	Noted
POPD498	CBRE for St Modwen	14	Promoting existing employment allocation in Lichfield City which is likely to start well in advance of the LPR. Support seeking a positive economic environment which is essential for future economic growth. Manufacturing and logistics important to the local economy. Policies that unduly restrict the scale, form and nature of employment proposals will limit the ability to attract investment and the economic growth and jobs required for the District. Our Client would therefore not support a policy which would have the effect of limiting the opportunity to attract and accommodate a diverse range of employment occupiers and uses to the District, including major inward investors and occupiers.	Duly Noted the Housing and emplyment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for empoyment development needs.
POPD499	CBRE for St Modwen	Chapter 22	It should be made clear that the Council intends to retain specific allocations in the Local Plan Review as vital to meeting the economic growth of the District, particularly if the LPR is to replace the LPS. To attract large inward investment opportunities land identified for major new employment development should be of sufficient scale, be readily available, and be free from significant environmental, infrastructure and other development constraint which should not seek to unduly restrict the scale, form and nature of proposals. Important to have alternative opportunities to Fradley for logisitics such as Cricket Lane which are attractive to the market.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process.
POPD500	CBRE for St Modwen	Whole Document	Does not make clear what the preferred policy options are and it is therefore challenging to comment on fully. As there are no preferred policies to provide comment on, it is essential that a consultation on a Draft Plan is carried out when the policies have been formed (based on an up-to-date evidence base) prior to the Submission consultation on the tests of soundness.	LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing and employment needs. The next stages of the local plan will be informed by a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios.
POPD501	Leavesley Group	1	A more aspirational vision, beyond merely “having regard to” these needs, acknowledging the role of the District in meeting housing needs and including reference to the role it will play in identifying sustainable locations for strategic development within the Greater Birmingham HMA Strategic Growth area would benefit the clarity and purpose of the plan.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD502	Leavesley Group	2	Promoting land at Fradley. Strategic objective and priority 1 is welcomed. Disappointed there is no apportionment of what each settlement would be expected to contribute towards meeting housing needs. Strategic objective and priority 6- unmet housing need is a key priority across the Greater Birmingham HMA. Furthermore, the recent undeliverability of housing in Lichfield justifies making housing need a strategic priority, particularly in extending settlements which are not located in the green belt.beyond the Green Belt, only four authorities (Lichfield, South Staffordshire, North Warwickshire and Stratford-on-Avon) have capacity for larger, developments to meet the need arising from Birmingham. The scale of the need identified lends itself to the allocation of larger development sites outside of the green belt. Whilst the level of need allocated to Lichfield is likely to require major strategic intervention to boost housing delivery. A combination of other development options will be required to maintain supply whilst the higher generating developments gain impetus.Dunstall provides an opportunity to deliver residential development to support the sustainable vision and objectives of the Local Plan Review by assisting to meet housing need for the village of Fradley, Lichfield and the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area. Additionally, Lichfield District Council is proposing to extend employment land allocation in the village of Fradley. Such extension of employment land will require an increase in housing delivery to meet future needs. The allocation of Dunstall as a short-term, deliverable residential site.	Comments noted. The ojectives and priorities omit any reference to particular settlements at this stage as they are being refined through this consultation and the wider Local Plan Review.The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate regarding Green Belt review and meeting housing needs. Site specific suggestions will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review
POPD503	Leavesley Group	3	Promoting land at Fradley. Welcome preferred spatial option to include residential growth at Fradley, this is supported by Parish Council. Fradley is clearly one of the larger of the rural settlements and has good access to public transport and easy access to services and facilities both within the settlement and elsewhere. The preferred policy recognises that depending on the level of growth required, there may be a need for sustainable extensions to existing settlements such as Fradley. Details of the site’s ability to be developed at Dunstall Farm are provided.	Comments and support for the preferred spatial strategy noted.
POPD504	Leavesley Group	4	The policy needs to acknowledge that not all housing needs will be met utilising brownfield land and that there will be a need to bring forward residential development on land which is greenfield.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an Urban Capacity Assessment. The preferred policy approach seeks to encourage the re-use of previously developed land.
POPD505	Leavesley Group	9	The preferred policy direction does not make reference to the need to cater for housing needs for the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area. Dunstall presents an achievable, desirable and deliverable site to enable Fradley, Lichfield and the Greater Birmingham HMA meet its housing need and unmet housing need in the short-term.	Chapter 14 sets out the latest position with regards to the GBHMA shortfall and Table 14.2 sets out a number of scenarios which contribute towards meeting the GBHMA shortfall. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring GBHMA authorities in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD506	Fisher German LLP for SW Bostock	3	Promoting site at Clifton Campville. Not support spatial strategy as does not give sufficient weight to distance to sustainable centres or available sites. Without sufficient growth, village communities can lose vital services and facilities. Clifton Campville is particularly vulnerable. The Spatial Strategy should reflect the need for growth throughout the spatial hierarchy.A more pragmatic approach to the settlement hierarchy should be adopted, with availability of sites included as a consideration. Accept a level of Green Belt release is likely to be needed, this can be supported by the delivery of sites on non-Green Belt land also.Support the Council's proposed Residential Growth Option 3. This option ensures all settlements (including Clifton Campville) are able to receive a proportionate level of development to ensure the continued viability of services and facilities. Delivery of new housing assists in ensuring balanced communities and allows people to remain within the communities in which they have grown up. Opportunities to raise the sustainability of settlements should be afforded great weight in both plan making and decision taking. Particularly with regards to the social benefits this could have. Local shops and community centres can have a direct impact on people's ability to be independent and engage with others, reducing social isolation. The delivery of additional services in villages can also support the wider area, particularly the small hamlets and farmsteads in close proximity.	Comments and preferences for Residential Growth Option 3 noted.
POPD507	Fisher German LLP for SW Bostock	9	Promoting land in Clifton Campville. All GBHMA Authorities should be working to deliver considerable additional levels of growth to compensate for this shortfall.We agree with the Council that the District should look to make a significant contribution to meeting the unmet needs of the wider GBHMA. consider that the Council can and should be looking to deliver a greater quantum of the wider HMA requirement. concerned therefore that the Council have not fully examined reasonable alternatives should have looked at 6,000 and 7,000 dwellings.We consider that in excess of 6,000 dwellings is likely to be a deliverable housing requirement for the District and would serve to make a more equitable contribution to meeting the wider HMA requirement. do not believe that a blanket increase on density is appropriate nor justified. It will serve to create poor quality, overly urbanised developments, not the high quality developments. should look to tackle the issue by allocating sufficient land.could introduce a stepped housing requirement to allow sufficient time for the market to begin delivering at higher levels, particularly allowing strategic sites to come forward. smaller sites in the urban and rural areas could ensure continuity in delivery, supported by the stepped trajectory. good practice to have a varied portfolio of allocations, of different sizes and in different locationsDispersed housing ensures the greatest spread of potential sites which can delivered therefore at the same time.	Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities in the HMA in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process.
POPD508	Fisher German LLP for SW Bostock	10	Endorse para 14.35. Plan should not be overly restrictive and policies should allow for discussion during the application phase of the most appropriate mix for each scheme, dependant on local circumstances, character, local need and the market.	Comments noted
POPD509	Fisher German LLP for SW Bostock	11	In some circumstances increased density could be appropriate. Consider that 35 dwellings per hectare should be expressed as a target rather than an absolute requirement. Density of housing development should be informed by each site's opportunities and constraints and the development of the masterplan informed by neighbouring housing and overall localised character. Wider HMA should look to deliver additional sites, rather than to increase the density of the sites to ensure future developments are of a suitable design, appropriate for the sites location and neighbouring character.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD510	Fisher German LLP for SW Bostock	12	Not necessary to include a specific policy on self and custom build housing where this is against the wishes of the land owner. Urge the Council to be cautious assuming positive and quick delivery on sites predominantly being delivered through self-build, given the complications associated with such methods of delivery. Object to a policy which looks to enforce the delivery of self/custom build housing as a proportion of major developments, such requirements may impede development unnecessarily, adding to developer burden without even delivering additional housing units. It is not our experience that self-builders want to buy serviced plots within or adjacent to a modern housing development. Our experience is that for the most part that they are instead looking for more bespoke rural opportunities. Therefore, we consider the application of such policies entirely unjustified and ineffective and potentially damaging to the delivery of housing where it is applied.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD511	Fisher German LLP for SW Bostock	22	A masterplan would be a requirement of the application process of such sites regardless. Not considered practical or likely to deliver masterplans for small and medium sites in advance of the application process. Any requirements of development should be realistic and proportionate. Requirements on development should have regard for viability and deliverability. Planning policies should not, as an unintended circumstance, render development unviable, through overly onerous application of design policies.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process.
POPD512	J Blakemore	3	Concern at loss of green belt. Recent developments have increased road traffic and increased demand on shops with difficulty parking on High St Chasetown. Problem in Meerash Lane with excessive speed, litter and noise. Roads can't take any more vehicles as already overstretched. Conflict issues with horse riders and farm vehicles concern at access for emergency vehicles. Concern at loss of habitat and issues with environmental/wildlife impact. Increase in crime since new houses and vandalism. Policing at all time low.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including an Infrastructure Capacity Study which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD513	Peter Brett Associates for Barwood Land	9	Promoting Site at Arkall Farm, Tamworth. Agree further evidence is required. Spatial distribution of growth should include the identification of any strategic allocations for residential development which should include land north of Tamworth at Arkall Farm.as highlighted in both residential growth options 1 (town focused development) and 2 (town and key rural focused development) set out in chapter 20, in its preferred growth options and as it ranked so highly as a growth option in the Greater Birmingham Strategic Growth Study (GL Hearn, 2018).	Comments noted.
POPD514	Peter Brett Associates for Barwood Land	10	Promoting site at Arkall Farm, Tamworth. Agree but should refer specifically to committed sites by encouraging higher densities. Arkall farm is ideally suited as site is suitable and capable, has outline permission; close to services and facilities; can achieve average of 39dph; not in Green Belt; deliver new facilities which have already been extensively planned for.	Comments and preferences noted
POPD515	Peter Brett Associates for Barwood Land	11	Promoting site at Arkall Farm, Tamworth. Agree but should refer specifically to committed sites by encouraging higher densities. Arkall farm is ideally suited as site is suitable and capable, has outline permission; close to services and facilities; can achieve average of 39dph; not in Green Belt; deliver new facilities which have already been extensively planned for.	Comments noted.
POPD516	Peter Brett Associates for Barwood Land	8	Promoting site at Arkall Farm, Tamworth. Higher density now proposed for the site can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's objectives for sustainable transport.	Duly noted No Further Action
POPD517	Peter Brett Associates for Barwood Land	Chapter 20	Arkall Farm is suitable, achievable and developable for some 1,560 dwellings and the allocation of the site for such will result in significant social, economic and environmental benefits and align closely with the objectives and preferred policy directions set out within the consultation document.	Noted
POPD518	Briggs and Stone for GKN	3	Supportive of the "balanced growth" in the spatial strategy and Residential Growth Option 2, for a spread of development across the District to be focussed on sustainable locations identified in the settlement hierarchy; in particular the inclusion of Larger Service Villages including Little Aston which is considered sustainable.The South area of the District represents a perfect opportunity for sustainable growth, we strongly support the development strategy in the form of sustainable extensions of appropriate scales to towns and villages that are within the Green Belt. These areas offer a good level of services and connectivity and where sites are available that would not detrimentally impact on the openness of the Green Belt development should be supported.	Comments and support growth option two is noted.
POPD519	David Lock Associates for Tarmac	1	Promoting new village.Strategic Objective and priority 1 should be broadened to include the potential for well-connected new villages that could assist in delivering balanced and sustainable communities in Lichfield.	Comments noted
POPD520	David Lock Associates for Tarmac	2	Promoting new village. Strategic Objective and priority 1 should be broadened to include the potential for well-connected new villages that could assist in delivering balanced and sustainable communities in Lichfield.	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review.
POPD521	Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Anwyl Land Limited	1	Promotes land north of Rake Hill, Burntwood Broadly speaking the proposed vision is supported subject to it being able to meet development needs going forward which will necessitate the release of Green Belt land for development.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level. Site specific suggestions will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review
POPD522	Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Anwyl Land Limited	2	Promotes land north of Rake Hill, Burntwood Support Strategic Objective 1 subject to it being able to accommodate development needs which necessitate the release of Green Belt land for development especially around settlements such as Burntwood Support Strategic Objective 5 and in that respect Burntwood is demonstrably sustainable location for future growth which has the ability to accommodate sustainable travel patterns Support Strategic Objective 9 insofar as an enlarged and improved town centre for Burntwood is planned	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.
POPD523	Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Anwyl Land Limited	3	Promotes land north of Rake Hill, Burntwood Supports a strategy that focuses future development towards sustainable development locations based on a settlement hierarchy, specially Burntwood. The settlement hierarchy recognises the key role Burntwood plays in the District, sitting above all other settlements other than Lichfield. Important that spatial strategy allocates a significant proportion of housing and employment requirements towards Burntwood. Supportive of a strategy that seeks to improve Burntwood town centre. There are limited opportunities for the reuse of previously developed land within the settlement limits of Burntwood to accommodate housing and employment needs, therefore greenfield land on the edge of the settlement needs to be considered. As Burntwood is Green Belt some sites will need to be released to meet its needs. Land at Rake Hill is available for development of circa 200 dwellings. Submits a supporting vision document. Consider that Green Belt sites ought to be released and this should be dealt with in the Local Plan not Neighbourhood Plan as this may cause unnecessary delays.	Comments and support for the settlement heirarchy noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD524	Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Anwyl Land Limited	9	Promotes land north of Rake Hill, Burntwood Concerned the local housing need of 333 dpa is below the Local Plan's current housing need. The Council need to ensure that the quantum of housing provided in the District meets the current and future needs. Local housing need will need to be reassessed following changes to the government's standard methodology. Support a strategy which commits the Council to meeting unmet need within GBHMA. The options between 3,000 & 4,500 bring the annual requirement more in line with the Local Plan's current provision. The council needs to ensure there is a sufficient mix of sites to help meet the requirements and they should be located in sustainable areas such as Burntwood.	Comments and support for meeting GBHMA unmet need noted.
POPD525	David Lock Associates for Tarmac	3	Promoting new village. Should be revisited to include the potential for smaller new settlements, for example through well connected sustainable villages.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD526	Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Anwyl Land Limited	11	Para 123 of the revised NPPF contains provision requiring the use of minimum density policies in Development Plans. Therefore there should be no issue for individual allocations in any new Local Plan to be subject to minimum density requirements of 35 dpa. However a blanket approach to density to unlikely to be appropriate and therefore welcome the flexibility for this to be carried out on a case by case basis.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD527	Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Anwyl Land Limited	12	Promotes land north of Rake Hill, Burntwood Object to any policy which required an element of allocated housing sites to provide a percentage of self build and custom build homes	Noted.
POPD528	Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Anwyl Land Limited	14	Promotes land north of Rake Hill, Burntwood Support Burntwood being the focus for future employment development in the District and the delivery of this could be complemented through the delivery of more housing around Burntwood and an improved town centre	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs. Our Spatial Strategy identifies the preferred location for housing growth.
POPD529	Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Anwyl Land Limited	15	Promotes land north of Rake Hill, Burntwood Support Burntwood being the focus for investment to regenerate its town centre. Welcome development proposals for retail, leisure, office and cultural facilities being focused towards Burntwood in line with the hierarchy of centres which identifies Burntwood as a town centre.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD530	Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Anwyl Land Limited	17	Promotes land north of Rake Hill, Burntwood. The site lies close to walking routes and has the ability to promote walking and cycling being located in proximity to shops and services to meet local needs. The vision document shows generous amounts of open space. Willing to work with the Council to identify initiatives that could form part of planning requirements for the site to help tackle obesity.	Noted
POPD531	David Lock Associates for Tarmac	8	Promoting new village. Welcome retained policy wording and more evidence. Policy fails to acknowledge Rail Investment Strategy which extends service from Lichfield to Burton and identifies a new rail station at Alrewas. Policy should be amended to include specific reference to facilitating and supporting the creation of a new station at Alrewas. There is opportunity to create a new village at Alrewas Quarry which could help deliver and be served by a new rail station at Alrewas. Further details are supplied.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD532	David Lock Associates for Tarmac	9	Promotes new village. Does not agree with testing only 3-4,500 above the local housing need. It is inappropriate for LDC to curtail future housing growth based on what it has achieved in the past alone. It would not therefore be consistent with national policy or in the interests of meeting HMA needs to set a housing requirement in the Local Plan Review lower than is currently expected under the current Local Plan. LDC should test accommodating at least 558 per annum but up to 883 (option 6) which is consistent with the five-year supply expectations. A mid-point of approximately 720 per annum is considered a reasonable working assumption balancing ambition and realism.	Comments and support for testing option 6 noted.
POPD533	Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Anwyl Land Limited	22	Promotes land north of Rake Hill, Burntwood A masterplan for small and medium scale developments which addresses the opportunities and constraints could help bring sites forward as it shows how much development is likely to be realistically achieved. However, once a developer carries out detailed site investigations it may be that development cannot be carried out in strict accordance with the masterplan and therefore it needs flexibility. High level framework plans can be useful in indicating likely points of access, parts of the site which are likely to accommodate development, open space, structural landscaping etc. Confirms there are no known reasons why the site cannot be brought forward in accordance with the plan.	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations.
POPD534	David Lock Associates for Tarmac	Chapter 19	Promoting new village. Document has not considered all reasonable options for residential growth in the district. In particular, it has not considered the reasonable option of smaller new settlements and has missed a key opportunity of well-connected and sustainable new villages, such as could be developed at Alrewas Quarry. In this regard, Lichfield District Council's approach is inconsistent with national policy by setting out a preferred strategy which most likely relies on Green Belt Releases before all other options outside of the Green Belt have been considered fully.	Comments noted. Comments regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan and will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD535	David Lock Associates for Tarmac	Chapter 20	Promoting new village. Document has not considered all reasonable options for residential growth in the district. In particular, it has not considered the reasonable option of smaller new settlements and has missed a key opportunity of well-connected and sustainable new villages, such as could be developed at Alrewas Quarry. In this regard, Lichfield District Council's approach is inconsistent with national policy by setting out a preferred strategy which most likely relies on Green Belt Releases before all other options outside of the Green Belt have been considered fully.	Comments noted. Comments regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan and will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD536	David Lock Associates for Tarmac	Chapter 21	Promoting new village. Document has not considered all reasonable options for residential growth in the district. In particular, it has not considered the reasonable option of smaller new settlements and has missed a key opportunity of well-connected and sustainable new villages, such as could be developed at Alrewas Quarry. In this regard, Lichfield District Council's approach is inconsistent with national policy by setting out a preferred strategy which most likely relies on Green Belt Releases before all other options outside of the Green Belt have been considered fully.	Comments noted. Comments regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan and will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD537	Lichfields for NMA	Chapter 15	Support for the continued recognition of the Arboretum in the Local Plan. NMA would request that the protection of the NMA is given significant weight in any new assessment process. Need to ensure existing site access arrangements to the site are protected. The NMA requires a safe and convenient link to the A513, key event days, such as the Remembrance Sunday or Ride to the Wall, traffic can accumulate. Adding further traffic to this junction arising from substantive housing or employment floorspace, would create further conflicts with the operation of the NMA.	Comments noted
POPD538	Lichfields for NMA	Chapter 19	Supports the preferred residential growth options that focus development at existing major towns. As the Council considers all development options, the NMA would request that the protection of the NMA is given significant weight in any new assessment process. Whilst the Council's assessment discounted Growth Option 4 (which included land known as Brookhay to the south of the Arboretum), the NMA is concerned that the assessment criteria appeared to give no weight to the potential for harmful effects on the NMA, and its setting. The incompatible nature of large-scale residential development with the ongoing functioning of the NMA, both from an operational perspective and with regard to protecting its prevailing environment, is self-evident. The site's nationally important role is reliant upon visitors having an opportunity to experience remembrance in a setting that fosters tranquillity, isolation and peace. Development proposals that threaten to encroach upon the NMA, transforming both its immediate setting and wider outlook, would only detract from this experience. Adding further traffic to this junction arising from substantive housing or employment floorspace, would create further conflicts with the operation of the NMA.	Comments noted
POPD539	Fisher German for Mercer Farms	3	Promoting land at Harlaston. Does not give sufficient weight to distance to sustainable centres, nor has been adequately informed by the availability of sites, particularly those settlements within the Green Belt. We consider that the option proposed by Residential Growth Option 2 and 3 to be the preferable approaches, ensuring dispersed growth, assisting in protecting rural communities from a deterioration in service provision. Harlaston is particularly vulnerable and needs sufficient levels of growth to ensure the viability of services. Harlaston is not the most sustainable location, it does benefit from being within 5 miles of Tamworth. Only a small number of settlements are outside the green belt limiting the option of directing growth to such locations. Support Residential Growth Option 3 as ensures all settlements are able to receive a proportionate level of development to ensure the continued viability of services and facilities. Given the need to accommodate the unmet needs of Greater Birmingham and the Black Country it is considered that both, new settlements and dispersed development would be the most appropriate strategy, delivering high levels of growth at one or more new settlements, whilst still growing the lower order settlements to ensure the vitality of the villages.	Comments and preferences for Residential Growth Option 3 noted.
POPD540	Fisher German for Mercer Farms	9	Promoting land at Harlaston. All GBHMA Authorities should be working to deliver considerable additional levels of growth to compensate for this shortfall. We agree with the Council that the District should look to make a significant contribution to meeting the unmet needs of the wider GBHMA. Consider that the Council can and should be looking to deliver a greater quantum of the wider HMA requirement. Concerned therefore that the Council have not fully examined reasonable alternatives should have looked at 6,000 and 7,000 dwellings. We consider that in excess of 6,000 dwellings is likely to be a deliverable housing requirement for the District and would serve to make a more equitable contribution to meeting the wider HMA requirement. Do not believe that a blanket increase on density is appropriate nor justified. It will serve to create poor quality, overly urbanised developments, not the high quality developments. Should look to tackle the issue by allocating sufficient land could introduce a stepped housing requirement to allow sufficient time for the market to begin delivering at higher levels, particularly allowing strategic sites to come forward. Smaller sites in the urban and rural areas could ensure continuity in delivery, supported by the stepped trajectory. Good practice to have a varied portfolio of allocations of different sizes and in different locations. Dispersed housing ensures the greatest spread of potential sites which can be delivered therefore at the same time.	Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities in the HMA in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process.
POPD541	Lee Arnold	Whole Document	Desperate to move into Whittington for the last 6 years and house prices for the few properties that have been available have not made that possible. Please allow some development for this village.	Duly Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD542	CT Planning on behalf of Mr Leedham	3	Promotes Land at Coppice Lane, Clifton Campville A spatial strategy based upon an identified settlement hierarchy would help deliver sustainable development. Neither the spatial strategy nor the settlement hierarchy should seek to preclude development coming forward in Level 5 settlements where development would contribute to the vitality and viability of these rural communities. LPA need to consider, positively, the ability of smaller rural villages to accommodate additional housing growth in order to maintain and improve the sustainability of the community. Clifton Campville is not dissimilar from Hopwas and Hill Ridware which have been given Level 4 status. Consideration should be given to combining the Level 4 and Level 5 settlements into one category to allow a more flexible approach to rural housing provision.	Comments relating to rural settlements noted.
POPD543	CT Planning on behalf of Mr Leedham	9	Promotes Land at Coppice Lane, Clifton Campville Support the preferred policy direction for housing provision. Agree the Strategic Policy for Housing should set out the overall level of housing growth and it should ensure a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land in the District over the plan period. Recognise the need for 6,600 new dwellings over the plan period may change with any revision to the Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need. Support the Council testing the ability of the district to accommodate between 3,000 - 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting unment needs from the HMA.	Comments and support for testing between options 4 and 5 noted.
POPD544	CT Planning on behalf of Mr Leedham	Chapter 22	Promotes Land at Coppice Lane, Clifton Campville Consideration should be given to allocating a proportionate amount of new housing growth to Level 5 settlements particulalry those such as Clifton Campville which support some services and facilities. Land is available to the east of Chestnut Lane that could be allocated to provide housing for the village. The site is well related in size and scale to the village. The site comprises 1.93 ha and could ccome forward to provide a mixture of dwellings	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD545	Fisher German for Mercer Farms	10	Endorse para 14.35 wherein it states that “any policy which sets housing mix and appropriate provision for affordable homes will need to be tested to ensure this does not render developments unviable” Plan should not be overly restrictive and policies should allow for discussion during the application phase of the most appropriate mix for each scheme, dependant on local circumstances, character, local need and the market.	Comments noted
POPD546	Fisher German for Mercer Farms	11	In some circumstances increased density could be appropriate. Consider that 35 dwellings per hectare should be expressed as a target rather than an absolute requirement. Density of housing development should be informed by each site’s opportunities and constraints and the development of the masterplan informed by neighbouring housing and overall localised character. Wider HMA should look to deliver additional sites, rather than to increase the density of the sites to ensure future developments are of a suitable design, appropriate for the sites location and neighbouring character.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD547	Fisher German for Mercer Farms	12	Not necessary to include a specific policy on self and custom build housing where this is against the wishes of the land owner. Urge the Council to be cautious assuming positive and quick delivery on sites predominantly being delivered through self-build, given the complications associated with such methods of delivery. Object to a policy which looks to enforce the delivery of self/custom build housing as a proportion of major developments, such requirements may impede development unnecessarily, adding to developer burden without even delivering additional housing units. It is not our experience that self-builders want to buy serviced plots within or adjacent to a modern housing development. Our experience is that for the most part that they are instead looking for more bespoke rural opportunities. Therefore, we consider the application of such policies entirely unjustified and ineffective and potentially damaging to the delivery of housing where it is applied.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD548	Fisher German for Mercer Farms	22	A masterplan would be a requirement of the application process of such sites regardless. Not considered practical or likely to deliver masterplans for small and medium sites in advance of the application process. Any requirements of development should be realistic and proportionate. Requirements on development should have regard for viability and deliverability. Planning policies should not, as an unintended circumstance, render development unviable, through overly onerous application of design policies.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process.
POPD549	CT Planning on behalf of Trustees of St John’s Hospital	3	Promotes St Johns Hospital: Former Lichfield Lawn Tennis Club Agree the spatial strategy is based on an identified settlement hierarchy would help deliver sustainable development. The strategy should seek to deliver housing growth across the District by directing new developments to sustainable locations. Support the identification of Lichfield City as Level 1 - Strategic Centre. It is entirely appropraite that Lichfield is recognised as a sustainable settlement of the District.	Comments and support for the settlement heirarchy noted.
POPD550	CT Planning on behalf of Trustees of St John’s Hospital	9	Promotes St Johns Hospital: Former Lichfield Lawn Tennis Club Agree the Strategic Policy for Housing should set out the overall level of housing growth and it should ensure a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land in the District over the plan period. Recognise the need for 6,600 new dwellings over the plan period may change with any revision to the Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need. Support the Council testing the ability of the district to accommodate between 3,000 - 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting unment needs from the HMA.	Comments and support for testing between options 4 and 5 noted.
POPD551	CT Planning on behalf of Trustees of St John’s Hospital	Chapter 22	Promotes St Johns Hospital: Former Lichfield Lawn Tennis Club Support the preferred option for housing growth and the identification of Lichfield as a location for new housing development. Land at the former Lawn Tennis Club represents vacant, previously developed site within Lichfield. Site is available for residential development and comprises of 0.48 hectares. Site is considered well suited for accommodating specialist housing given its relationship to St John’s Hospital to north of the site.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process.
POPD552	Keith Stanley	Whole Document	The Green Belt in Burntwood is important and for development to take place on Green Belt there have to be exception circumstances. The Green Belt should stay as the Green Belt. LDC should take full notice of Burntwood Neighbourhood Plan which is at an advanced stage of preparations. This document makes a coherent case for future developments in this area.	Duly Noted. A Green Belt Review will be completed and Urban Capacity Assessment will be completed as part of the Local Plan review process
POPD553	Alison & Stuart Woodley	1	The villages of Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston need to keep there individual identities. Any new homes should be in keeping with there surroundings.	Comments noted
POPD554	Alison & Stuart Woodley	2	Shenstone is ideal for housing growth due to its rail network, but it would need more parking to cope with the extra amount of people.	Noted.
POPD555	Alison & Stuart Woodley	3	Priority should be given to brown field sites and not green belt. An in depth brown field assessment should be carried out.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including an Urban Capacity Assessment.
POPD556	Alison & Stuart Woodley	5	Sustainability standards are important. The plan should identify the best potential sites i.e improved rail links on a38 corridor to reduce traffic through the villages.	Comments and suggestions noted.
POPD557	Alison & Stuart Woodley	6	Don't build in high risk flood areas	Comments noted.
POPD558	Alison & Stuart Woodley	7	Housing growth should not increase pollution	Noted.
POPD559	Alison & Stuart Woodley	8	Electrify the rail line to the north east of Lichfield	The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD560	Alison & Stuart Woodley	9	Policy direction is not comprehensive	Noted.
POPD561	Alison & Stuart Woodley	10	Mixed housing is important	Comments noted
POPD562	Alison & Stuart Woodley	11	Agree	Support noted
POPD563	Alison & Stuart Woodley	12	Create a register of suitable sites for self bulders	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD564	Alison & Stuart Woodley	13	Clarification is required in this regard in the consultation document	Noted
POPD565	Alison & Stuart Woodley	14	If the industrial estate is not being used to its full potential it could be considered for a brown field site	Duly Noted The Employment Land availability assessment (ELAA) will direct policy direction in additional the Our Spatial strategy will consider future housing locations.
POPD566	Alison & Stuart Woodley	15	The villages can cater for there residents and surrounding areas. Growth may mean they will no longer be able to do this	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD567	Alison & Stuart Woodley	17	Keep any existing recreation areas. Build new ones within any new development	Noted
POPD568	Alison & Stuart Woodley	19	Not important	Noted
POPD569	Alison & Stuart Woodley	20	The strategy should recognise the neighbourhood plans	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD570	Alison & Stuart Woodley	22	Neighbourhood plans are important and should have priority in consultations	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD571	Alison & Stuart Woodley	23	Neighbourhood plans are important and should have priority in consultations	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment.A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD572	CT Planning on behalf of Essington Park	3	Promotes land at Dark Lane, Alrewas Agree the spatial strategy is based on an identified settlement hierarchy would help deliver sustainable development. The strategy should seek to deliver housing growth across the District by directing new developments to sustainable locations. Support the inclusion of Alrewas as Level 3 - Larger Service Village. It is entirely appropraite that this village is recognised as a sustainable settlement and retains its Key Village status.	Comments and support for the settlement heirarchy noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD573	CT Planning on behalf of Essington Park	9	Promotes land at Dark Lane, Alrewas Agree the Strategic Policy for Housing should set out the overall level of housing growth and it should ensure a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land in the District over the plan period. Recognise the need for 6,600 new dwellings over the plan period may change with any revision to the Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need. Support the Council testing the ability of the district to accommodate between 3,000 - 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting unmet needs from the HMA.	Comments and support for testing between options 4 and 5 noted.
POPD574	CT Planning on behalf of Essington Park	Chapter 22	Promotes land at Dark Lane, Alrewas Support the preferred option for Housing Growth and the identification of Alrewas as a location for new housing development. A site that is most suitable as a housing allocation is land at Dark Lane, Alrewas forming an extension to the land being developed to the east. Land at Dark Lane, Alrewas is well related in scale and location to the existing and committed residential development in Alrewas. Planning permission has been granted to the east of the site and the site could be developed without adversely impacting upon the Conservation Area. The site can accommodate some 20 dwellings.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process.
POPD575	A Churchley	Whole Document	Don't agree that building in Stonnall is feasible unless you invest in buses and tying bus times to train times in Shenstone. You cannot live in Stonnall and get to work on the existing bus service. The school is over subscribed at the moment and if you do decide to build it should be affordable housing and an opportunity for downsizing for older residents	Comments noted. Stonnall has been identified as a level 4 settlement through the sustainability study. The evidence base is being further updated / assembled in relation to housing needs and settlement hierarchy which includes access to services and facilities to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD576	Burntwood Town Council	1	Burntwood Town Council are pleased to see that sustainable growth within the key settlement of Burntwood features prominently, yet has some reservations about parts of the vision.	Noted but no justification / suggestions provided
POPD577	Burntwood Town Council	2	Welcome the proposed strategic objectives and priorities, particularly the need for local infrastructure,(including sustainable transport), an improved town centre for Burntwood and an enhanced tourism offering.	Noted
POPD578	Tetlow King (Meghan Rossiter) on behalf of Rentplus	10	Welcome the planned evidence base on the HEDNA and ask that local RPs and others supporting development in the District including Rentplus are directly engaged with this before it is completed in May 2019. Practicalities of delivering affordable housing including tenures such as rent to buy should be fully understood and reviewed through direct discussion with providers to ensure that the way in which local housing needs are calculated and the viability of delivering new tenures reflects providers knowledge and experiences. The preferred policy directionfor housing mix should respond ambitiously and flexibly to the new evidence of housing need. Rent to buy should form a part of this response as one clear mechanism for enabling affordable access to home ownership for the many households across Lichfield who do not currently expect to own. The ability to save for a deposit is the main roadblock to home ownership for many households and these householdes benefit from access to affordable rent to buy. Diversifying the local housing offer helps households access housing that meets their needs without recourse to public subsidy, as Rentplus is funded by private investment. The delivery of rent to buy is not at the expense of other affordable tenures, as many of those accessing rent to buy come from existing social and affordable rented homes, these are freed up for other households in need while rent to buy can be delivered as part of a wider affordable housing tenure mix. Rentplus is reaching the first five year mark at which the first quatre of households entering Rentplus rent to buy schemes are expected to purchase. Delivering rent to buy in Lichfield will enable the Council to explore new opportunities to meet more needs, as a more diverse affordable housing supply with different sources of funding helps deliver sites more quickly.	Comments noted.
POPD579	Burntwood Town Council	3	Agree with the report that “There is a significantly lesser range of facilities and services and poorer access than those within Lichfield City”, and that “Burntwood has a small town centre and does not meet the current needs of the community”. With this in mind, we do not think that the Spatial Strategy is appropriate for delivering sustainable development within the settlement of Burntwood. We would also object to any review of the Green Belt in Burntwood, without a full and proper appraisal of the current Brownfield sites on offer within the settlement	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD580	Burntwood Town Council	4	Yes, particularly: the re-use of previously developed land, development to be guided away from known areas of flood risk, to assist in the regeneration and evolution of towns and villages, and be of a scale and nature appropriate to its locality	Comments noted.
POPD581	Burntwood Town Council	5	Agree with approach	Comments noted.
POPD582	Burntwood Town Council	6	Agree with preferred policy direction	Comments noted.
POPD583	Burntwood Town Council	7	We welcome the inclusion of an policy for air quality which will relate to the council’s air quality action plan for Muckley Corner, an area through which many of our residents commute and which has high levels of nitrogen dioxide	Comments noted.
POPD584	Burntwood Town Council	8	Agree with the preferred policy direction	Duly Notes No Further Action
POPD585	Burntwood Town Council	9	Agree with the preferred policy direction	Support noted.
POPD586	Delta Planning on behalf of Prologis	3	Consider the settlement hierarchy identified is generally appropriate with regard to housing growth, but in respect of employment land does not fully take account of the role Fradley plays in terms of employment provision which sets it apart from other larger service villages. This role should be specifically acknowledged as part of the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy. Consider the HEDNA should consider not only unmet housing needs arising within the HMA but also strategic employment land requirements. Strategic employment land requirements are not highlighted as a matter than needs to addressed through the Local Plan. Many studies have identified a significant shortfall in provision of strategic employment land across the West Midlands. The role Lichfield should play in addressing these strategic employment land requirements need to be fully investigated through the review.	Comments noted. The Spatial Strategy makes reference to both housing and employment growth. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a HEDNA which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD587	Burntwood Town Council	10	Agree with the preferred policy direction	Support noted
POPD588	Delta Planning on behalf of Prologis	14	Fully agree the preferred policy approach to employment growth. Existing employment areas are located in proximity to existing residential areas, are accessible by a range of transport modes and benefit from existing infrastrucutre provision. Market confidence in a local plans a significant role when companies decide where to locate and successful established employment locations are where most businesses want to be. Consider the existing employment area at Fradley Park offers the best opportunity for future growth. Further land is available to the south of the Prologis site between current and approved development land and the route of HS2.	Duly Noted
POPD589	Burntwood Town Council	11	Agree with the preferred policy direction.	Support noted.
POPD590	Burntwood Town Council	12	Agree with the preferred policy direction	Support noted.
POPD591	Burntwood Town Council	13	Agree with the preferred policy direction.	Noted
POPD592	Burntwood Town Council	14	Agree with the preferred policy direction and welcome the fact that “Burntwood will be a main focus for investment”.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD593	Burntwood Town Council	15	Agree with the preferred policy direction	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD594	Burntwood Town Council	16	Agree with the preferred policy approach, and welcome the inclusion of Chasewater Country Park as a key tourism attraction.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD595	Burntwood Town Council	17	Note that “Support will be given to improvements in community infrastructure that are intended to improve access to or enable delivery of positive improvements against locally evidenced health and well-being needs”, and believe that the creation of a Greenway between Lichfield and Chasewater, utilising the disused railway line, would benefit many of our residents in this regard	Noted. Further consideration required with regard to which policy will include the provision/protection of long distance cycle routes/footpaths.
POPD596	Burntwood Town Council	18	We feel that the current provision (and investment) is focused too heavily on Lichfield City, and that the residents of Burntwood would benefit from some meaningful investment into the arts in their local area.	Noted.
POPD597	Burntwood Town Council	19	We think that a standalone strategic policy would be more beneficial and would enhance integration into other strategic policies	Noted
POPD598	Burntwood Town Council	20	Agree with the preferred policy approach	Noted
POPD599	Burntwood Town Council	21	Across Gentleshaw Common from Chorley Road	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD600	Burntwood Town Council	22	Burntwood has suffered from a lack of proper master – planning for many years. The community could vastly benefit from improvements to the built environment	Noted.
POPD601	Burntwood Town Council	23	No	Noted.
POPD602	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	1	It is noted that the Vision remains broadly the same as that of the adopted Local Plan Strategy and it is considered that this remains relevant and is supported	Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD603	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	2	It is recognised that the Strategic Objectives & Priorities section represents refined versions of those contained within the adopted Local Plan Strategy and it is considered that these remain broadly relevant for the Local Plan Review. Strategic Objective & Priority 7 is strongly supported by Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd, as this seeks to promote economic prosperity for the District and its residents by supporting measures which enable the local economy to thrive and adapt to changing economic circumstances and make the most of new economic opportunities. The land identified at Appendix 1, adjacent to Drayton Manor Park, could accommodate employment development which would create new employment opportunities and enable a thriving economy for the District and assist in achieving this Strategic Objective & Priority. Creating new employment opportunities through the development of new enterprise is encompassed within Strategic Objective & Priority 8. Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd supports this objective, particularly as the development of the land adjacent to Drayton Manor Park would assist in developing new businesses, thereby meeting this strategic objective and priority.	Comments and preferences noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.
POPD604	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	3	Acknowledges the reasoning for the spatial distribution strategy proposed in the Preferred Options document but considers there is also a requirement to meet cross-boundary needs from Tamworth and considers that there are opportunities for some of the District's employment growth to be located in areas close to the boundary with Tamworth, such as this site adjacent to the established Drayton Business Park, rather than in locations such as Fradley which would promote unsustainable travel patterns. Considers this employment location would assist in reducing commuting and would provide opportunities for higher value jobs, and there may also be benefits of co-location adjacent to the existing Business Park. It is recognised that land adjacent to Drayton Manor Park lies within the West Midlands Green Belt. The review of Green Belt to inform changes to the Green Belt boundary through the adopted Local Plan remains relevant to the review process. However, notes that there is a need to update this evidence in light of the proposed changes to the Settlement Hierarchy, but also as no Green Belt assessment of land adjacent to Drayton Manor Park has ever been included within the Council's Green Belt evidence base. It is acknowledged that there would need to be exceptional circumstances for removing land from the Green Belt in this location. Accordingly, it is considered that the exceptional circumstances that warrant the further release of Green Belt land are that it would allow for the necessary growth in respect of employment to meet housing growth requirements, and because it is strategically located to deliver cross-boundary employment needs. Whilst Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd support the identified settlement hierarchy, it is also considered that a strategy which also allows for employment growth close to where needs arise and would enable the provision of a wide choice of employment sites, for a variety of local and in-coming businesses, would be more appropriate.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review and HEDNA which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD605	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	14	Supports components of the policy direction but notes that the preferred spatial distribution for employment growth has been determined prior to the overall level of jobs and employment land required to 2036 being established. Notes the Council has committed to producing a Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, but consider that in the absence of this evidence it is premature to determine the spatial strategy for employment, as in seeking to balance housing and employment growth, it may be the case that insufficient sites are available within the identified current employment areas, and thus further new locations for employment may therefore be required. Considers a full ELR is required not just an update. Considers new forecasts for job growth required based on 2016 data. Considers two sets of new forecast required based on i) past trends and then ii) 'policy on' scenario. Supports acknowledgement that additional employment growth beyond existing areas may be needed which requires Green Belt review. Considers review must include land adjacent Drayton Manor and evidence base deficient as not included assessment of site in previous reviews. Broadly agrees with key factors as informing broad spatial distribution but that Green belt review should be considered at site level, not on broad parcels or options. Document should make clear difference between high level assessment as a separate process from assessments in the SA. Considers current approach misses potential impacts from focus on existing employment areas and misses opportunities to lessen impacts if new locations were added. Considers the locations considered for new employment too narrow and a new option should be added to meet cross boundary needs with Tamworth.	Comments noted. The Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs.
POPD606	Savills (Jessica Graham) on behalf of The Crown Estate	Whole Document	<p>Previously promoted three sites:</p> <p>Site 1 - Land off Abnalls Lane - potential yield 19 dwellings</p> <p>Site 2 - Land off Walsall Road North - potential yield 250 dwellings</p> <p>Site 3 - Land off Limburg Avenue - potential yield 24 dwellings</p> <p>Strongly disagree with the exclusion of Site 1 from Green Belt Review as this site is not part of the parkland and is private property. Request that this site is included and assessed in any upcoming Green Belt review.</p> <p>Discussed TCE wider land ownership with the Council of approximately 140 ha to the west of Lichfield and submitted 67 ha of this land to the Call for Sites to be considered for residential development within the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Submitted a site location plan to show areas of land to be considered for residential development - three sites listed above and two additional parcels:</p> <p>Area 1 - potential to yield 260 dwellings</p> <p>Area 2 (inc Site 1) - potential to yield 250 dwellings</p>	Comments and preferences noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD607	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	4	Preferred approach is supported	Noted.
POPD608	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	5	BREEAM sustainability assessment of development in line with government approach should be left to discretion of the developer, therefore approach of not replacing the policy to set local sustainability standards is appropriate. Support identifying locations for renewable energy developments, but reference to timescales for collection of evidence re areas for sustainable wind and solar energy is omitted from appendix A.	Comments in relation to BREEAM and preferences towards the proposed approach noted.
POPD609	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	6	Preferred policy direction is supported.	Support noted.
POPD610	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	7	Preferred policy direction is supported.	Support noted.
POPD611	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	8	Preferred approach is supported	Duly Notes No Further Action
POPD612	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	20	The Preferred Policy direction implies that all of the landscape/countryside of the District is 'valued'. Firstly, this is not justified or evidenced against the Landscape Institutes criteria and, secondly, if all landscape/countryside demonstrated the same certain qualities, it would not be 'valued', as those qualities would instead be the inherent 'norm' or baseline. As such, this policy direction as written requires amendment as it fails to have regard to national policy	Noted
POPD613	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	21	Policy direction is supported	Noted
POPD614	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	22	Requiring masterplans for all small and medium development is too onerous. Illustrative schemes should be done on a site by site basis, rather than through a policy requirement.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process
POPD615	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	23	Requirement for a heritage statement should be within validation guidance not in Local Plan policy.	Noted. A heritage statement is currently a requirement of the local validation process.
POPD616	Church Commissioners for England (Barton Wilmore)	Whole Document	Two parcels of land west and south of Bleak house Burntwood. the sites have the potential to accommodate a total of circa 375 dwellings (based on an average density of 35 dwellings per hectare (dph)). The Sites are available for development and well located in the context of Burntwood. Bleak House is within close walking distance to amenity, services, facilities and transport links.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered by the Local Plan Review.
POPD617	Church Commissioners for England (Barton Wilmore)	1	Supports the vision. Remove typo 'and' in final sentence of vision	Comments noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD618	Church Comissioners for England (Barton Wilmore)	2	Supports Strategic Objectives and Priorities 1,5,6,9 and 15. Considers Strategic Objective & Priority 6 should be amended to state " To provide an appropriate mix of market, specialist and affordable homes that are well designed and meet the assessed housing needs of Lichfield district over the plan periodand a portion of the unmet need arising from the housing market area."	Noted. The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated. LDC's requirement to contribution towards meeting wider HMA unmet need is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD619	Church Comissioners for England (Barton Wilmore)	3	Supports the Council's propsoed settlement hierarchy.	Comments and support for the settlement heirarchy noted.
POPD620	Church Comissioners for England (Barton Wilmore)	4	Supports the preferred policy approach.	Comments noted.
POPD621	Church Comissioners for England (Barton Wilmore)	9	Recognises 325 dwellings per annum published in PPG, but should take into account wider housing market areas. Should therefore meet the unmet need of Birmingham and Black Country housing market areas, and the mix and affordability of the district and wider areas. Should produce an updated SHMA using latest data, working with neighbouring boroughs and across HMA adiministrative boundaries. LDC doesn't identify in the POPD a preferred option of the seven. The Standard Method's need should be increased to account for economic growth. This could range from 500 to 800 per annum until more up to date evidence of job growth is adopted by LDC. This may need to be higher given the LEPS aspirations. Lichfield has a duty to deliver a share of the unmet need ranging from 28,000 to 2031 to 80,000 to 2036, therefore may need to review the intended contribution through the LDC review.	Comments noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing and employment growth scenrios. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD622	Clr Helen Fisher	Whole Document	Concern that further growth in Burntwood should be accompanied by infrastructure and amenities. Unsustainable. Current house pricing are value for money for familes. Building on the Greenbelt a concern of local residents when brownfield land is available - Mount Road should be considered. Consens regarding traffic congestion. Appriciate that Lichfield should grow but Burntwood until its residents have better infrastructure and facilities. Requirement for a 'Centre' for Burntwood with Snakey's corner being the obvious choice with rejuvenation from recent development never been a better time to look at this area. Burntwood needs to thrive not just survive.	The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assesment which will inform the next stage of the plan process. Burntwood is identified as a level 2 settlement having regard to its access to services and facilities.The evidence base being assembled will further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD623	Church Comissioners for England (Barton Wilmore)	Chapter 19	Consider Options 1 and 2 most appropriate approach to meeting needs of district and beyond as have largest range of shops and services, existing infrastructure, are the main population centres where there is need and has the most reliable and frequent connections. Approach does not conflict with proortionate growth in rural areas to meet locla need. To meet need around Burntwood, Green Belt release required. Own Green Belt review indicates their 2 sites make only limited contribution to Green Belt. Sites are deliverable and could also deliver local enhancements for recreation and improve walking links between Burntwood, Chasewater CP and Cannock Chase.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review process.
POPD624	Jeanette Light Up	3	Not in agreement 1, Infrastructure and amenities not adequate 2, Redevelopment at Snakey's Corner unlikely , past no delivery, not appropriate for the size of the settlement 3, Greenbelt needed for health and wellbeing of the residents 4, other than the by pass immediate network is poort resulting in poor traffic flowpublic transport deteriorating 5, Woefully inadequate medical facilities further growth will add to problem.	Comments noted.
POPD625	Church Comissioners for England (Barton Wilmore)	10	The Preferred Options and Policy Directions consultation fails to specify the Council's preferred housing mix, which includes homes to meet specific needs, such as affordable housing, student accommodation, homes for older people, people with disabilities, service families, self- build, etc. The Commissioners recommend that Lichfield District update the SHMA, which will inform the housing mix required for Lichfield District.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD626	Mr R Gray (J F & B M Gray)	2	Duplicate of POPD1232	Duplicate of POPD1232
POPD627	Mr R Gray (J F & B M Gray)	3	Agree - that balanced growth across the District is appropriate however argue mix of typologies need to be alloacted to ensure sufficient supply of land. Note allocated SDA are yet to come forward, mix of small medium and large for each settlement should be considered. Green Belt review is requiredto deliver quantum of growth anticipated. Consider their site (East of the Village of Whittington known as land at Sheepwash farm Fisherwick Road Whittington), should perform a less important role than other around the settlement of Whittington, weel enclosed by existing farm buildings and the West Coast Line.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD628	Mr R Gray (J F & B M Gray)	4	Broadly agree - especially on emphasis to regenerate and evole towns and villages by ensuring new development can maintain vitality, viability and vibrancy of local communities eg Whittington.	Comments noted.
POPD629	Mr R Gray (J F & B M Gray)	9	Broadly Agree - however welcome more emphasis on overall housing growth to accommodate unmet need arising from BC, B, Tam. Seen to be a delivery of brownfield before greenfield caveat brownfield sites have issues which need to be resolved before delivery. Therefore should be a balance reuse brownfield - bring forward deliverable and viable greenfield. Table 14.2 perferred Option = 6 higher than previous but with a mix of site typologies incorporating urban extensions around edge of villages and a potenial new settlement this would be a deliverable strategy.	Comments noted. The preferred policy direction makes reference to understanding and underpinning local housing need for the distrct and the level of housing to be accommodated to assist in meeting the unmet needs arising from the HMA. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD630	Mr R Gray (J F & B M Gray)	12	Should only be provided in places where there is defined need and requirement. Should not prejudice tradional route of delivery.	Comments noted. The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD631	Mr R Gray (J F & B M Gray)	22	Further clarity of the area wide assessments, and definitions of small and medium. Support high quality design but should not be overly prescriptive to allow for the change in the housing market over time.	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations.
POPD632	John Punch	2	Communities capable of growth is a nonsense. Few people go to Bromsgrove, Longbridge or Redditch on the train with the majority travelling to Sutton or Birmingham. There are no benefits to the Lichfield areas by accessing Worcestershire	Comments noted. The wording "capable of growth" is not referenced in the strategic priorties and policies but is referenced in chapter 20 in relation to the settlement sustainability study. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD633	John Punch	3	There are no brownfield assessments, no greenbelt assessment nor links to adjoining local authorities. The priortiy should be areas with good infrastructure or at least available space provide such infrastructure eg A38 corridor	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supproted by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review, Urban Capacity Assessment and Infrastructure Capacity Studywhich will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD634	John Punch	4	There is a contridiction regarding flood risk. Shenstone and Stonnall have poor drainage but are proposed for development. Neighbourhood Plans have been used successfully but not appear to be ignored.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence which will inform the next stages of the plan this includes a SFRA. Chapter 11 sets out a specific preferred policy approach towards flood risk.
POPD635	John Punch	8	There needs to be more opportunities to use public transport. This is hindered by lack of links to buses and trains without using cars. Insufficient car parking or the ability to access stations bu cause cause longer car journeys. Rat runs during rush hour are a problem in villages.	The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD636	John Punch	6	Not only have flood risks been identified in Neighbourhood Plans, there is a change in climate bringing increased flooding risks. It is essential flood risk is considered in any developments	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD637	John Punch	7	Air quality in villages is linked to cars using rat runs and outside schools. Unless a large number of nuclear power station, there will never be sufficient electricity to charge all of the cars. A local policy is better.	Comments noted.
POPD638	John Punch	8	Agree with astatements but see the need for more stations with better bus links and car parking.	The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD639	John Punch	9	Cannot add anything to my comments in earlier sections. Use Neighbourhood Plans	Noted.
POPD640	John Punch	10	Cannot add anything to my comments in earlier sections. Use Neighbourhood Plans	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD641	John Punch	11	Current planning application process appears to work well in most cases. Different needs in different areas and ability to make a profit will dictate density and mix.	Comments noted.
POPD642	blank representation			
POPD643	John Punch	13	There are always problems in locating sites. However unless there is a policy which is actually followed unofficial sites will spring up leading to problems in communities like Stonnal	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD644	John Punch	15	Not sure what a rural centre is supposed to be. Villages are governed to a great extent by available infrastructure and services as well as development potential. Neighbourhood Plans have identified what is possible or not.	Duly Noted
POPD645	John Punch	16	There may be a lack of lower cost hotels close to Lichfield which increases car by tourists.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD646	John Punch	17	Essential to protect open spaces, parks and village halls	Noted. Review wording to ensure inclusion of village halls within definition of buildings to be protected.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD647	John Punch	20	What is wrong with using Neighbourhood Plans?	Not all areas have Neighbourhood Plans. Neighbourhood Plans have limited scope and provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD648	David Gibson	Whole Document	Concerned with Burntwood, concern regarding sloping nature of most sites, drainage, need for additional facilities and services, need for new road structure to prevent congestion and need to use brownfield sites and empty homes so greenfield sites are available to grow food.	Duly Noted
POPD649	John Punch	22	What is wrong with using Neighbourhood Plans?	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD650	Mrs Margaret Jones (Elford Parish Council)	Whole Document	In response to Section 5,6,7,8 - no question references given, Agree with Vision issues and objectives. Agree with Rural issues identified in section 6. Wish to address lack of transport, lack of bus service. There are few services within the village , some growth need to ensure school is sustainable. Agree with conclusions on growth in section 22 reflects Elford Neighbourhood Plan policies.	Duly Noted, Support Noted, The Local Plan review will be accompanied by A Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will identify infrastructure requirements and how they will be delivered.
POPD651	Mrs P Kreuser on behalf of Mr & Mrs D Johnson	3	Agree- Support inculsion of Fradley as a level 3 Larger Service Village. Wide range of services and faclities that support the local community. Served by good public transport.	Comments and supprot noted.
POPD652	Fradley West Consortium	Whole Document	Welcomes timely review, the preferred housing requirement must be set against a standard OAN with up-lifts to take account of availability. The LPR must meet the wider HMA shortfall and test delivery at 650 per annum, should give a higher ranking to the settlement of Fradley, SHLAA should be amended to appropriately reference Dradley Junction site and land at Fradley Jct which is brownfield should be allocated.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be informed by an extensive evidence base including a HEDNA which will test growth scenarios and a plan wide viability assessment. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis.
POPD653	Mrs P Kreuser on behalf of Mr & Mrs D Johnson	9	Support the proposed preferred policy deirction for housing growth. Agree Strategic Policy for housing should set out overall level of housing growthand it should ensure sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land in the District over the period up to 2036. Recognise the proposed need for 66000 over 2016-2036 but may change - standard methodology. Support the council testing the ability of accomodate between 3k - 4k additional dwellings to assist in meeting other LA need.	Comments and support for testing Option 4 and 5 noted.
POPD654	Mrs P Kreuser on behalf of Mr & Mrs D Johnson	Whole Document	Support Preferred options for housing growth and para 22.3 Fig 22.1 particular identification of Fradley - wide services and facilities, extensive employment opportunities and good public transport access to Lichfeild and Burton upon Trent including destinations in between. Land at Home Long Lane Fradley represnts a site that is suitable to come forward for residenital development. The site comprises of 0.7 hectares. the site capacity 20 dwellings and varity of design and type size and tenure. SHLAA 369 adjacent to village settlement of Fradley. well related in scales and location to the existing village parttern of development withn Fradley existing development adjopins the development at the south. Site compriese of dwelling and outbuildings site has weel contained defined defensible boundaries. There are no know tech nical reasons that would preculde the site from being brought forward from residenital development.	Comments and support for housing growth at Fradley noted.
POPD655	Dan Asbury	Whole Document	Horrified at the proposed development sites in question, particularly those surrounding Gentleshaw Common. Urge Lichfield council not to make this mistake, once greenbelt land is built on theres no bringing it back. Burntwood roads and infrastructure are at an appalling level in comparison to Lichfield and the proposed development would exacerbate this and create a deeper resentment towards the Council.	Duly Noted
POPD656	Fradley West Consortium	1	Important that the vision includes a reference to meeting growth assoicated with the Greater Birmingham Housing Market. The vision provides no commitment to protect the Green Belt or an approach of favouring non green belt locations in advance of Green Belt which is not consistent with the NPPF.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate regarding Green Belt review and meeting housing needs . Green Belt policy is dealt with elsewhere in the document.
POPD657	Fradley West Consortium	2	Generally supportive, whilst objective 6 refers to meeting need, the objective should recognise cross boundary issues and meeting any needs that cannot be met by greater Birmingham HMA.	Comments noted. The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.LDC's requirement to contribution towards meeting wider HMA unmet need is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD658	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mrs E sketchley	2	Agree with 8.4, Agree with objective 1 Growth of housing and employment and socail facilities will assit in the creation of blanced communities. Agree broadly with Objective 2 This objective wil support settlements and communities that have not so far been inculded as growth locations in the settlement hierarchy. Broadly Agree with Objectives 7 & 8 This objective should say that this will inculde the allocation of lanf to ensure this objective is met. Broadly agree with Objective 10 specilcay the provision of new facilities for tourist accommodation.	Comments noted. The objectives and policies are strategic. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review
POPD659	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mrs E sketchley	3	Slow nature of housing delivery in the District has been due to the time taken for strategic sites to come on stream in thse few locations. A new strategy should inculde for the allacotion and delivery of small and medium sized sites which are very important part of sites portfolio. Acknowledged in NPPF Para 59, variety of and coming forward. Para 68 expressly identifies small and medium sized sites to accommodate at least 10% of overall housing requirements. This size type is readli avaiable in key villages and in some of the rural villages and this express requirement should influnce the strategy to ensure that allocated of S&M sites will be allocated. Hierarchy comments - it is unclear how much additional development can be assimilated into Lichfield itself without serious compromise of the historic setting and belt belt purpose. Larger villages are capable of taking additional development for emplyment specifically Mile Oak and Fazeley. Not clear why adjoining settlements are inculded in the hierarchy table when they are outside of the district. Key Settlements that are in close proximity to these areas should be recognised as the growth locations in close proximity to nearby towns eg Mile Oak Fazeley. Hierarchy should be altered too reflect the above comments.	Comments regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy includes neighbouring towns and settlements as these settlements offer a range of services and facilities and are located adjacent to the district.
POPD660	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mrs E sketchley	9	Preferred Options cannot indicate the amount of housing that is required for Lichfeild in the new plan period - due to lack of agreement with HMA re Birmingham housing needs. Base figure of 333 is the only figure that can currently be calculated as there is not information on the additional requirements of the HMA or indeed for any econmic uplift attached. until housing requirements are agreed with HMA almost impossible to comment on strategic locations - policies are influncued by number of houses. Table 14.2 - it is difficult to agree/disagree a strtagy when the overall requirement figure remains opaque at best. Plan should be subject to further consultation before submission - when overall quantum is clear and can be viewed against the proposed distribution.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out a number of growth scenarios and identifies the the preferred growth options to be tested. The next stages of the local plan will be informed by a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. It is anticipated the Council will consult on the next stage of the Local Plan in accordance with the timescales set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD661	Paul Wood	3	Agree the spatial strategy based on the identified settlement hierarchy is an appropriate option for LDC to deliver sustainable settlement. Surprised to see Little Aston updated from a Level 4 village to a Level 3 village. Consider Little Aston's original classification as a Level 4 village to be more appropaite. Paragraph 10.14 states LDC has updated its assessment of sustainability for settlements within District. Following this Little Aston has been updated to Level 3 - Large Service Village and now added as a 'sustainable settlement' for the purposes of Residential Growth Option 2. Both of the key characteristics of the Larger Service Village are inconsistent with previous published evidence in relation to the nature of Little Aston village by LDC / Residents in Neighbourhood Plans and similar documentation. In the Settlement sustainability study 2018 Little Aston recieved an overall score of 13. It is my view that the score for public transport is significantly overstated and the general level of scores over the other categories ignores the geographical spread of Little Aston. Looking at evidence available do not consider Little Aston meets the criteria set out to be classified as a Level 3 village. Provides transport evidence to support this view.	Comments and preferences in relation to the settlement heirarchy noted. Comments related to the Settlement Sustainability Study for Little Aston noted.
POPD662	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mrs E sketchley	11	Do not agree that increase in densities should be due simply as a way of reducing the land requirement - should relate to thie specific environment and what is appropriate in a particular areas and the type of development that is being brought forward. No confidence that this policy wold be refined enough to particular areas of the district. diverse villages and character and density. This type of policy can assist in acheiving reasonable densities but this should not try to be over specific.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD663	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mrs E sketchley	14	land for economic development needs to be made available at the larger service village - expressly Mile Oak Fazeley - settlements to retain and enhance employment provision of appropriate parcels of land for employment. Take advantages of transport locations and existing clusters of employment land. This will require release of Green Belt. in some locations. Requirements to ensure balanced communities reducing need to travel provision stimulus to there local services.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evideance that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for empoyment development needs.
POPD664	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mrs E sketchley	22	Preferred Option Figure 22.1 which are the sustainable settlements in the hierarchy. This broadly supported subject to the comments made in questions 3.	Noted see responses to chapter 22 and question 3.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD665	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mrs E sketchley	23	Notes that any fundamental evidence base documents that underpin the review are not yet available Review being one of the most important. It is crucial that the Council consultation these documents when they are produced so that any issues can be commented on early in the plan process, to potentially avoid disagreement and conflict at the Local Plan examination about methodology site scoring. Should be done either as a separate exercise or as part of a consultation on the draft plan once the overall housing numbers are known.	Noted.
POPD666	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mrs E sketchley	Whole Document	Preferred Option Figure 22.1 which are the sustainable settlements in the hierarchy. This broadly supported subject to the comments made in questions 3.	Support noted. Further comments submitted against question 3 regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy have been noted within that section.
POPD667	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mrs E sketchley	Whole Document	Notes that any fundamental evidnence base docuements that underpin the review are not yet availble Green belt review being one of the most important. It is crucial that the Council consulation these documents when they are produced so that any issues can be commented on early in the plan process, to potentially avoid disagreement and conflict at the Local Plan examination about methodolgy site scoring. Should be done either as a seperate exercise or as part of a consultation on the draft plan once the overall housing numbers are known.	Comments noted. The District Council will continue to undertake consultation on the Local Plan Review in accordance with the stages set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD668	Ieuan Davies	3	1. Proposed development South of Highfields Road, North of M6 Toll, East of Pool Lane and West of Pool Lane in Green Belt which were not designated for M6 Toll Road. 2. Removal of St Matthews Estate from Green Belt area - understandable if you consider existing housing development. 3. Proposed development east of Farewell Lane will move boundaries fo Burntwood closer to those of Lichfield and will open the way to providing a continous swathe of housing. 4. Development north of Meg Lane will abut Gentleshaw Common and impact adversely on the SSI 5. Scale of development will place an increased strain on the already inadequate infrastrucutre. Transport will continue to be by private vehicles which will discourage people from cycling within the area. 6. No assessment of the impact that having an increased population will have on the community. Increased population density, loss of green space and congested roads are factors known to adversely health. Given the points above, do not regard this allocation of housing to be the most appropriate strategy for development.	Comments noted. No sites have been allocated for development within the District at this stage.
POPD669	Edingale Parish Council	Chapter 5	Agree with the issues, vision and strategic objectives set out in the document Concur with the rural issues set out in Section 6. The parish council have concerns about the availability of affordable homes to enable local people to live in the village. Wish to address the lack of public transport which has meant funding a taxi to enable vulnerable people to reach shops and services. Agree with strategic objective and priority 2: Rural Communities Accepts the conclusions on growth in Section 22.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated / assembled in realtion to housing needs and settlement hierarchy which includes access to services and facilities.
POPD670	Edingale Parish Council	Chapter 6	Agree with the issues, vision and strategic objectives set out in the document. Concur with the rural issues set out in Section 6. The parish council have concerns about the availability of affordable homes to enable local people to live in the village. Wish to address the lack of public transport which has meant funding a taxi to enable vulnerable people to reach shops and services. Agree with strategic objective and priority 2: Rural Communities. Accepts the conclusions on growth in Section 22.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated / assembled in realtion to housing needs and settlement hierarchy which includes access to services and facilities.
POPD671	Edingale Parish Council	Chapter 7	Agree with the issues, vision and strategic objectives set out in the document Concur with the rural issues set out in Section 6. The parish council have concerns about the availability of affordable homes to enable local people to live in the village. Wish to address the lack of public transport which has meant funding a taxi to enable vulnerable people to reach shops and services. Agree with strategic objective and priority 2: Rural Communities Accepts the conclusions on growth in Section 22.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated / assembled in realtion to housing needs and settlement hierarchy which includes access to services and facilities.
POPD672	Edingale Parish Council	Chapter 8	Agree with the issues, vision and strategic objectives set out in the document Concur with the rural issues set out in Section 6. The parish council have concerns about the availability of affordable homes to enable local people to live in the village. Wish to address the lack of public transport which has meant funding a taxi to enable vulnerable people to reach shops and services. Agree with strategic objective and priority 2: Rural Communities Accepts the conclusions on growth in Section 22.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated / assembled in relation to housing needs and settlement hierarchy which includes access to services and facilities.
POPD673	Misselke for Elford Homes Court Drive Shenstone	3	Promoting site at Shenstone. Support spatial strategy based upon identified settlement hierarchy. Spatial strategy should seek to deliver housing growth to sustainable locations. Support inclusion of Shenstone as Larger Service village as provides a wide range of services and facilities	Comments and support for settlement hierarchy noted.
POPD674	CT Planning on behalf of Essington Park	16	Promotes land to the west of A38 as Roadside Service Area and hotel / overnight accommodation Support the preferred policy approach relating to tourism particularly the proposal to identify preferred locations for hotel / overnight stay accommodation the District. Previously submitted land was available and suitable for allocation as Road Service Area. Sufficient land within the site to make provision for a hotel / overnight stage. The site is strategically located adjacent the A38. Seeking allocation of the site as Roadside Service Area and a hotel / overnight accommodation. The Service Area could replace Ivy Garage in Alrewas providing an opportunity to remove HGV traffic from the Village and redevelop Ivy Garage	Duly Noted
POPD675	Misselke for Elford Homes Court Drive Shenstone	9	Support proposed policy direction for housing provision. Agree strategic policy for housing should set the overall level of housing growth and should set sufficient supply upto 2036. Agree present requirement of 6,600 based on standard methodology may change. Support testing for 3,000 - 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting unmet needs from outside Lichfield.	Comments and support testing options 4 and 5 noted.
POPD676	Misselke for Elford Homes Court Drive Shenstone	Chapter 22	Support Preferred options for housing growth particularly the identification of Shenstone as a location for new housing. Support review of green belt boundaries. Propose inclusion of land at Court Drive Shenstone for upto 70 dwellings, density 17.36 dw/ha. Adj public transport, walking distance ot services and facilities, scale not cause harm to existing village character, nor significant car borner trips to adversely affect conservation area.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD677	CT Planning on behalf of Essington Park	8	Promotes land to the west of A38 as Roadside Service Area and hotel / overnight accommodation Supports the preferred policy direction for sustainable transport and the proposed focus on providing improvements to the existing road network and the consideration of the need for overnight lorry parking facilities in the District. Previously submitted land was available and suitable for allocation as Road Service Area. Sufficient land within the site to make provision for a hotel / overnight stage. The site is strategically located adjacent the A38. Seeking allocation of the site as Roadside Service Area and a hotel / overnight accommodation. The Service Area could replace Ivy Garage in Alrewas providing an opportunity to remove HGV traffic from the Village and redevelop Ivy Garage	Duly Noted The additional evidence base will identify futre priorities.
POPD678	Wigginton & Hopwas Parish Council	22	Agrees with the policy to concentrate growth in more sustainable settlements it would not wish to see a change to the green belt to allow more growth in Hopwas beyond infill development. There should be no building on the flood plain. There should be no coalescence of settlements in the parish with Tamworth. Therefore there should be no further growth permitted on the boundaries of Tamworth in the vicinity of Wigginton or Hopwas. Any growth north of Tamworth should only be permitted if the required infrastructure and facilities are available, especially through improvements to the local road network and provision of schools and medical facilities. Parish Council agrees with the issues, vision and strategic objectives.	Noted see responses to chapter 22 and question 3.
POPD679	Lichfields for Taylor Wimpey	Whole Document	Welcome opportunity to ensure housing needs over current plan period can be addressed whilst enabling Council to address housing needs over longer term upto 2037 and contribute to the very substantial unmet housing need from the GBHMA. Site at Hospital Road, Burntwood is approx 35 hectares and is largely open agricultural land within the Green Belt. PROW dissects the site, majority of site in Flood Zone 1, although parts in Flood Zone 2 and 3. No listed buildings. not in conservation area. close proximity to range of local facilites and services. Given role of Burntwood as an other large centre this site is considered to represent a suitable and sustainable location for housing and would make a significant contribution to meeting the need for market and affordable housing.	Comments and preferences noted. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD680	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mr Bliss Messrs Argyle	2	Agree with 8.4, Agree with objective 1 Growth of housing and employment and social facilities will assist in the creation of balanced communities. Agree broadly with Objective 2 This objective will support settlements and communities that have not so far been included as growth locations in the settlement hierarchy. Broadly Agree with Objectives 7 & 8 This objective should say that this will include the allocation of land to ensure this objective is met. Broadly agree with Objective 10 specially the provision of new facilities for tourist accommodation.	Comments noted. The objectives and policies are strategic. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD681	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mr Bliss Messrs Argyle	3	Strategy should include the allocation and delivery of small and medium sized sites which are a very important part of the sites portfolio - acknowledged in para 59 NPPF talks about variety of land coming forward para 68 expressly identifies small and medium sized sites to accommodate at least 10% of the overall housing requirement. This type of site is readily available in the key villages and in some of the rural villages and this express requirements should influence the spatial strategy to ensure that small and medium sized sites. Comment on the revised hierarchy - fully support inclusion of Hopwas into the settlement hierarchy. It is located in a close relationship with Tamworth and can accommodate development in a sustainable manner. Land is available at Hopwas to allow for the organic growth of the settlement. Hopwas is included within levels 4 and 5 of the settlement hierarchy and this is clearly a mistake as inclusion in level 4 would atomically omit a settlement from level 5. The hierarchy should be altered to reflect the above comments.	Comments regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy noted.
POPD682	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mr Bliss Messrs Argyle	9	At this stage the Preferred options cannot indicate the amount of housing that is required for Lichfield in the new plan period. The base line figure of 333 is the only figure that can currently be calculated as there is not information on the additional requirements for the HMA or indeed for any economic uplift that may need to be built. Table 14.2 sets out various housing scenarios with a range of alternatives the Council say that they are testing 3000 to 4500 scenarios giving total of between 9660 and 11160 dwellings over the new plan period. The draft policy says that the housing need will be finalised based on local needs and the needs of the HMA - it is difficult to agree/disagree a strategy when the overall requirement figure remains opaque at best. Our view is the plan should be subject to further consultation before submission. When the overall quantum of development is clear and that can be viewed against the proposed distribution.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out a number of growth scenarios and identifies the preferred growth options to be tested. The next stages of the local plan will be informed by a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. It is anticipated the Council will consult on the next stage of the Local Plan in accordance with the timescales set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD683	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mr Bliss Messrs Argyle	11	Do not agree that increase in densities should be due simply as a way of reducing the land requirement - should relate to the specific environment and what is appropriate in a particular areas and the type of development that is being brought forward. No confidence that this policy would be refined enough to particular areas of the district. diverse villages and character and density. This type of policy can assist in achieving reasonable densities but this should not try to be over specific.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD684	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mr Bliss Messrs Argyle	14	Land for economic development needs to be made available at the larger service village settlements to retain and enhance employment provision of appropriate parcels of land for employment. Take advantages of transport locations and existing clusters of employment land. This will require release of Green Belt. in some locations. Requirements to ensure balanced communities reducing need to travel provision stimulus to these local services.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs.
POPD685	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mr Bliss Messrs Argyle	22	If there is a requirement for Masterplans - should be limited to strategic scale - unnecessary for small and medium sized developments. Requirements should be clear in terms of site size numbers to trigger. Consider 300 dwelling to not require a masterplan.	Noted.
POPD686	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mr Bliss Messrs Argyle	23	All of this is clearly set out in the NPPF is there any real need to replicate all of this but in a slightly different way?	Noted. The Local Plan provides the opportunity to transplate the national guidance to be locally relevant where justifiable.
POPD687	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mr Bliss Messrs Argyle	Whole Document	Preferred Option Figure 22.1 which are the sustainable settlements in the hierarchy. This broadly supported subject to the comments made in questions 3.	Support noted. Further comments submitted against question 3 regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy have been noted within that section.
POPD688	Janet Hodson on behalf of Mr Bliss Messrs Argyle	Whole Document	Notes that any fundamental evidence base documents that underpin the review are not yet available the Green Belt Review being one of the most important. It is crucial that the Council consultation these documents when they are produced so that any issues can be commented on early in the plan process, to potentially avoid disagreement and conflict at the Local Plan examination about methodology site scoring. Should be done either as a separate exercise or as part of a consultation on the draft plan once the overall housing numbers are known.	Comments noted. The District Council will continue to undertake consultation on the Local Plan Review in accordance with the stages set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD689	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Neachell	2	Agree with 8.4, Agree with objective 1 Growth of housing and employment and social facilities will assist in the creation of balanced communities. Agree broadly with Objective 2 This objective will support settlements and communities that have not so far been included as growth locations in the settlement hierarchy. Broadly Agree with Objectives 7 & 8 This objective should say that this will include the allocation of land to ensure this objective is met. Broadly agree with Objective 10 specially the provision of new facilities for tourist accommodation.	Comments noted. The objectives and policies are strategic. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review
POPD690	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Neachell	3	Strategy should include the allocation and delivery of small and medium sized sites which are a very important part of the sites portfolio - acknowledged in para 59 NPPF talks about variety of land coming forward para 68 expressly identifies small and medium sized sites to accommodate at least 10% of the overall housing requirement. This type of site is readily available in the key villages and in some of the rural villages and this express requirements should influence the spatial strategy to ensure that small and medium sized sites. Comment on the revised hierarchy - Unclear how additional development can be assimilated into Lichfield itself without serious compromise to the historic setting of the town and fundamental green belt purposes. Larger villages are capable of taking additional development and specifically at Mile Oak fazeley land is available. Location preferable to further development to the north of Tamworth where transportation issues are a limitation on current development locations identified in the adopted plan and delivery is questionable. It is not clear why adjoining settlements are included in the hierarchy table when they are outside the district, the larger villages that are in close proximity to nearby towns Mile oak and fazeley in close proximity to Tamworth. Streethay should be recognised as a separate settlement to Lichfield as it is now physically linked to Lichfield through new development it hardly qualifies as an additional settlement.	Comments regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy includes neighbouring towns and settlements as these settlements offer a range of services and facilities and are located adjacent to the district.
POPD691	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Neachell	9	At this stage the Preferred options cannot indicate the amount of housing that is required for Lichfield in the new plan period. The base line figure of 333 is the only figure that can currently be calculated as there is not information on the additional requirements for the HMA or indeed for any economic uplift that may need to be built. Table 14.2 sets out various housing scenarios with a range of alternatives the Council say that they are testing 3000 to 4500 scenarios giving total of between 9660 and 11160 dwellings over the new plan period. The draft policy says that the housing need will be finalised based on local needs and the needs of the HMA - it is difficult to agree/disagree a strategy when the overall requirement figure remains opaque at best. Our view is the plan should be subject to further consultation before submission. When the overall quantum of development is clear and that can be viewed against the proposed distribution.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out a number of growth scenarios and identifies the preferred growth options to be tested. The next stages of the local plan will be informed by a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. It is anticipated the Council will consult on the next stage of the Local Plan in accordance with the timescales set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD692	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Neachell	11	Do not agree that increase in densities should be due simply as a way of reducing the land requirement - should relate to the specific environment and what is appropriate in a particular areas and the type of development that is being brought forward. No confidence that this policy would be refined enough to particular areas of the district. diverse villages and character and density. This type of policy can assist in achieving reasonable densities but this should not try to be over specific.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing density.
POPD693	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Neachell	14	Land for economic development needs to be made available at the larger service village settlements to retain and enhance employment provision of appropriate parcels of land for employment. Take advantages of transport locations and existing clusters of employment land. This will require release of Green Belt. in some locations. Requirements to ensure balanced communities reducing need to travel provision stimulus to these local services.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs.
POPD694	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Neachell	22	If there is a requirement for Masterplans - should be limited to strategic scale - unnecessary for small and medium sized developments. Requirements should be clear in terms of site size numbers to trigger. Consider 300 dwelling to not require a masterplan.	Noted.
POPD695	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Neachell	23	All of this is clearly set out in the NPPF is there any real need to replicate all of this but in a slightly different way?	Noted.
POPD696	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Neachell	Whole Document	Preferred Option Figure 22.1 which are the sustainable settlements in the hierarchy. This broadly supported subject to the comments made in questions 3.	Support noted. Further comments submitted against question 3 regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy have been noted within that section.
POPD697	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Neachell	Whole Document	Notes that any fundamental evidence base documents that underpin the review are not yet available the Green Belt Review being one of the most important. It is crucial that the Council consultation these documents when they are produced so that any issues can be commented on early in the plan process, to potentially avoid disagreement and conflict at the Local Plan examination about methodology site scoring. Should be done either as a separate exercise or as part of a consultation on the draft plan once the overall housing numbers are known.	Comments noted. The District Council will continue to undertake consultation on the Local Plan Review in accordance with the stages set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD698	Lichfields for Taylor Wimpey at Hospital Road, Burntwood	3	Settlement hierarchy is appropriate in principle. Supports identification of Burntwood as a level 2 settlement as it has good access to a range of existing services and facilities. Broadly agree with balanced growth across the District with focus on sustainable settlements of Lichfield City and Burntwood. Additional growth on level 1 and level 2 settlements would ensure that development is distributed in a sustainable manner. Hospital road is considered to be in a sustainable location. Acknowledge District is heavily constrained by Green belt and review of Green Belt imperative. as unlikely to provide sufficient land for housing from urban capacity. When considering Green Belt release all reasonable options should be explored, consideration should be given to land which is previously developed and/or well served by public transport. Concern that review of Green Belt through Neighbourhood Plans would impede housing delivery especially in the short term. hammerwich parish Council is currently preparing a Neighbourhood Plan which does not facilitate Green Belt release and it is considered could become quickly out of date as the Local Plan progresses.	Comments and support in principle for settlement hierarchy is noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD699	Janet Hodson on behalf of Shipley Estates Baxter Estates	2	Agree with 8.4, Agree with objective 1 Growth of housing and employment and social facilities will assist in the creation of balanced communities. Agree broadly with Objective 2 This objective will support settlements and communities that have not so far been included as growth locations in the settlement hierarchy. Broadly Agree with Objectives 7 & 8 This objective should say that this will include the allocation of land to ensure this objective is met. Broadly agree with Objective 10 specially the provision of new facilities for tourist accommodation.	Comments noted. The objectives and policies are strategic. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD700	Janet Hodson on behalf of Shipley Estates Baxter Estates	3	Strategy should include the allocation and delivery of small and medium sized sites where are a very important part of the sites portfolio - acknowledged in para 59 NPPF talks about variety of land coming forward para 68 expressly identifies small and medium sized sites to accommodate at least 10% of the overall housing requirement. This type of site is readily available in the key villages and in some of the rural villages and this express requirements should influence the spatial strategy to ensure that small and medium sized sites. Comment on the revised hierarchy - Unclear how additional development can be assimilated into Lichfield itself without serious compromise to the historic setting of the town and fundamental green belt purposes. Larger villages are capable of taking additional development and specifically at Mile Oak fazeley land is available. Location preferable to further development to the north of Tamworth where transportation issues are a limitation on current development locations identified in the adopted plan and delivery is questionable. It is not clear why adjoining settlements are included in the hierarchy table when they are outside the district, the larger villages that are in close proximity to nearby towns Mile oak and Fazeley in close proximity to Tamworth. Streethay should be recognised as a separate settlement to Lichfield as it is now physically linked to Lichfield through new development it hardly qualifies as an additional settlement.	Comments regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy includes neighbouring towns and settlements as these settlements offer a range of services and facilities and are located adjacent to the district.
POPD701	Janet Hodson on behalf of Shipley Estates Baxter Estates	9	At this stage the Preferred options cannot indicate the amount the amount of housing that is required for Lichfield in the new plan period. The base line figure of 333 is the only figure that can currently be calculated as there is not information on the additional requirements for the HMA or indeed for any economic uplift that may need to be built. Table 14.2 sets out various housing scenarios with a range of alternatives the Council say that they are testing 3000 to 4500 scenarios giving total of between 9660 and 11160 dwellings over the new plan period. The draft policy says that the housing need will be finalised based on local needs and the needs of the HMA - it is difficult to agree/disagree a strategy when the overall requirement figure remains opaque at best. Our view is the plan should be subject to further consultation before submission. When the overall quantum of development is clear and that can be viewed against the proposed distribution.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out a number of growth scenarios and identifies the the preferred growth options to be tested. The next stages of the local plan will be informed by a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. It is anticipated the Council will consult on the next stage of the Local Plan in accordance with the timescales set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD702	Janet Hodson on behalf of Shipley Estates Baxter Estates	11	Do not agree that increase in densities should be due simply as a way of reducing the land requirement - should relate to the specific environment and what is appropriate in a particular areas and the type of development that is being brought forward. No confidence that this policy would be refined enough to particular areas of the district. diverse villages and character and density. This type of policy can assist in achieving reasonable densities but this should not try to be over specific.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD703	Janet Hodson on behalf of Shipley Estates Baxter Estates	14	Land for economic development needs to be made available at the larger service village settlements to retain and enhance employment provision of appropriate parcels of land for employment. Take advantages of transport locations and existing clusters of employment land. This will require release of Green Belt. in some locations. Requirements to ensure balanced communities reducing need to travel provision stimulus to there local services.	Duly Noted the Housing and emplyment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidance that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for empyoment development needs.
POPD704	Janet Hodson on behalf of Shipley Estates Baxter Estates	22	If there is a requirement for Masterplans - should be limited to strategic scale - unnesscary for small and medium sized developments. Requirements should be clear in terms of site size numbers to trigger. Consider 300 dwelling to not require a masterplan.	Noted.
POPD705	Janet Hodson on behalf of Shipley Estates Baxter Estates	23	All of this is clearly set out in the NPPPF is there any real need to replicate all of this but in a slightly different way?	
POPD706	Janet Hodson on behalf of Shipley Estates Baxter Estates	Whole Document	Preferred Option Figure 22.1 which are the sustainable settlements in the hierarchy. This broadly supported subject to the comments made in questions 3.	Support noted. Further comments submitted against question 3 regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy have been noted within that section.
POPD707	Janet Hodson on behalf of Shipley Estates Baxter Estates	Whole Document	Notes that any fundamental evidence base documents that underpin the review are not yet available Green Belt Review Review being one of the most important. It is crucial that the Council consultation these documents when they are produced so that any issues can be commented on early in the plan process, to potentially avoid disagreement and conflict at the Local Plan examination about methodology site scoring. Should be done either as a separate exercise or as part of a consultation on the draft plan once the overall housing numbers are known.	Comments noted. The District Council will continue to undertake consultation on the Local Plan Review in accordance with the stages set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD708	Lichfields for Taylor Wimpey Hosptial Road, Burntwood	6	Promoting land at Hospital Road, Burntwood. Broadly agrees with preferred policy direction for flood risk. Flood risk should not preclude development potential without a detailed consideration of the potential for mitigation and flood risk management. Plan should build in a level of flexibility with regards the location of new development and flood risk.	Comments noted
POPD709	Lichfields for Taylor Wimpey Hosptial Road, Burntwood	9	Promoting land at Hospital Road, Burntwood. MHCLG's standard methodology equates to the baseline demographic need generated by the 2014-based Sub-National Household Projections [SNHP] uplifted to reflect worsening affordability ratios represents an annual reduction of 30% when compared to the housing requirement figure set in the adopted Local Plan (478dpa). This figure is defined as the 'minimum' annual local housing need figure for an area and the PPG sets out the scope for an authority to go above and beyond this. Concern that current approach does not explore the actual housing need in the District and fails to acknowledge the high demand for housing as a result of very high levels of net in-migration and other factors such as affordable housing need, the growth ambitions of the wider area and previous delivery levels. The Council has not explored all the circumstances where an uplift to the LHN generated by the standard methodology may be appropriate. Concern that the Council is retrofitting its evidence base and no analysis has been undertaken of alignment to growth strategies or strategic infrastructure requiements that may result in increases in housing need. There is a clear risk that where the labour force supply is less than the projected job growth, this could result in unsustainable commuting patterns and reduce the resilience of local businesses, resulting in a barrier to investment, congestion, increased carbon emissions. It is imperative that the District does everything it can to ensure that it is contributing to the wider GBHMA shortfall and supporting the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Taylor Wimpey's site at Hospital Road, Burntwood, is in a sustainable location and allocation of this site could make a significant contribution to unmet housing need. Agree Option 1 does not contribute to the wider need identified need identified in the GBHMA and is therefore not appropriate. Option 4 is not consistent with the Government's aspirations for growth as it unlikely to provide for enough housing to meet local needs alongside its contribution to meeting the GBHMA shortfall it is an arbitrary figure not evidence based. No evidence has been provided regarding the level of affordable housing needed, and therefore it is impossible to comment on the extent to which the LHN should be uplifted to help meet any unmet need.Option 5 is an appropriate starting point to consider local housing need and the wider Greater Birmingham HMA need.	Comments and support for Option 5 noted. The next stages of the local plan will be informed by a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities in the HMA in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD710	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Wiseman	2	Agree with 8.4, Agree with objective 1 Growth of housing and employment and social facilities will assist in the creation of balanced communities. Agree broadly with Objective 2 This objective will support settlements and communities that have not so far been included as growth locations in the settlement hierarchy. Broadly Agree with Objectives 7 & 8 This objective should say that this will include the allocation of land to ensure this objective is met. Broadly agree with Objective 10 specially the provision of new facilities for tourist accommodation.	Comments noted. The objectives and policies are strategic. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review
POPD711	Lichfields for Taylor Wimpey Hosptial Road, Burntwood	10	Promoting land at Hospital Road, Burntwood. Welcomes the preferred approach, particularly the recognition that any policy which sets out the housing mix and thresholds and levels of affordable housing will need to be viability tested. Assessment for affordable housing should be robust and should consider if requirement should vary across the District. Consideration should be given to the broader definition of affordable housing which now contains starter homes and other affordable routes to home ownership. The local need for these types of affordable housing product should be considered together with the impact upon viability. Housing mix should be informed by uptodate housing needs assessment. and should recognise housing mix may be partly determined by external factorsd such as character of the surroundings and should be applied flexibly. Suggest that the Council prepares individual policies for affordable housing and housing mix.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD712	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	1	The vision should be extended to confirm that whatever sites and development supported in the new local plan must be capable of being delivered within a satisfactory timeframe.	Comments noted
POPD713	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	2	Five of the strategic objectives and priorities list are considered of significance. 2: Rural communities - within the objective the creation of new employment developments, should be seen as a key target. Creating opportunities in this location will not only contribute towards the prosperity of the local community and contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, it will also reduce the need to travel as far as might otherwise be case or through use of sustainable communities. 5: Sustainable Transport - directing growth towards the most sustainable locations is a sensible and policy compliant objective, though it sometimes makes sense to promote improvements to public transport. 7: Economic Prosperity - supports any local plan initiative that promote measures which enable the local economy to thrive and adapt. By reference to Drayton Manor Business Park (DMBP) the emerging local plan should ensure existing employment assets are made the best use of and the plans supports and encourages their growth, this through ensuring that each has an appropraite employment allocation. DMBP is within Green Belt which makes a nonsense of the policy when one considers its broad objectives and criteria for designation. 8:Employment Opportunities - ensure employment opportunities within the district are created through the development of new enterprise and support the diversification of existing businesses to meet the identified needs and the aspiration of our communities. Emerging Local Plan encourages the use, growth and diversification of sites already in employment use, so make best use of existing developed resources, particularly those which have the status of brownfield land. 15: High Quality Development: Generally supportive but conscious that the planning system should not place unjustifiable obstacles in a way of development and growth, which could be the outcome of setting the bar too high with regard to the quality of development that is required.	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD714	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Wiseman	3	Strategy should include the allocation and delivery of small and medium sized sites which are a very important part of the sites portfolio - acknowledged in para 59 NPPF talks about variety of land coming forward para 68 expressly identifies small and medium sized sites to accommodate at least 10% of the overall housing requirement. This type of site is readily available in the key villages and in some of the rural villages and this express requirements should influence the spatial strategy to ensure that small and medium sized sites. Comment on the revised hierarchy - Its is unclear how much additional development can be assimilated into Lichfeild itself without serious compromise to the historic settling and green belt purposes. The larger villages are capble of taking additional development and speciallay Shenstone is identified as a location that is highly sustainable and where land is available to deliver medium sized sites as shown on map inculded. Not considered Streethay should be recognised as a seperate settlement to Lichfeild as it is now physically linked to Lichfeild through new development it hardly qualifies as an additional settlement.	Comments regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy noted.
POPD715	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	3	Spatial strategy based on the identified settlement hierarchy seems appropraite as long as it makes better use of second tier and third tier settlements because many of them offer potential to be grown and developed in a sustainable way, including by reference to employment opportunities they offer, for example in Fazeley. There is a large amount of existing employment land in Fazeley. The preferred policy direction notes that the spatial strategy might need to give consideration to the Green Belt within the district including whether boundaries should be redefined. DMBP is defined as green belt but once benefitted from major development site in the Green Belt status. The designation currently impacts to a massive degree on how the site can be used, operated, adapted and grown. Considers inappropriate for communities to determine boundaries through neighbourhood plans as most communities have no desire to see Green Belt boundaries changed. Consider this should be addressed as part of the local plan rather than neighbourhood level.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be consistent with national policy and local policy.
POPD716	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Wiseman	9	At this stage the Preferred options cannot indicate the amount the amount of housing that is required for Lichfield in the new plan period. The base line figure of 333 is the only figure that can currently be calculated as there is not information on the additional requirements for the HMA or indeed for any economic uplift that may need to be built. Table 14.2 sets out various housing scenarios with a range of alternatives the Council say that they are testing 3000 to 4500 scenarios giving total of between 9660 and 11160 dwellings over the new plan period. The draft policy says that the housing need will be finalised based on local needs and the needs of the HMA - it is difficult to agree/disagree a strategy when the overall requirement figure remains opaque at best. Our view is the plan should be subject to further consultation before submission. When the overall quantum of development is clear and that can be viewed against the proposed distribution.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out a number of growth scnarios and identifies the the preferred growth options to be tested. The next stages of the local plan will be informed by a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. It is anticipated the Council will consult on the next stage of the Local Plan in accordance with the timescales set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD717	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Wiseman	11	Do not agree that increase in densities should be due simply as a way of reducing the land requirement - should relate to the specific environment and what is appropriate in a particular areas and the type of development that is being brought forward. No confidence that this policy wold be refined enough to particular areas of the district. diverse villages and character and density. This type of policy can assist in achieving reasonable densities but this should not try to be over specific.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD718	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Wiseman	14	Land for economic development needs to be made available at the larger service village settlements to retain and enhance employment provision of appropriate parcels of land for employment. Take advantages of transport locations and existing clusters of employment land. This will require release of Green Belt. in some locations. Requirements to ensure balanced communities reducing need to travel provision stimulus to there local services.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidance that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for empoyment development needs.
POPD719	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Wiseman	22	If there is a requirement for Masterplans - should be limited to strategic scale - unnesscary for small and medium sized developments. Requirements should be clear in terms of site size numbers to trigger. Consider 300 dwelling to not require a masterplan.	Noted.
POPD720	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Wiseman	23	All of this is clearly set out in the NPPPF is there any real need to replicate all of this but in a slightly different way?	
POPD721	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Wiseman	Whole Document	Preferred Option Figure 22.1 which are the sustainable settlements in the hierarchy. This broadly supported subject to the comments made in questions 3.	Support noted. Further comments submitted against question 3 regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy have been noted within that section.
POPD722	Janet Hodson on behalf of M Wiseman	Whole Document	Notes that any fundamental evidence base documents that underpin the review are not yet available the Green Belt Review being one of the most important. It is crucial that the Council consultation these documents when they are produced so that any issues can be commented on early in the plan process, to potentially avoid disagreement and conflict at the Local Plan examination about methodology site scoring. Should be done either as a separate exercise or as part of a consultation on the draft plan once the overall housing numbers are known.	Comments noted. The District Council will continue to undertake consultation on the Local Plan Review in accordance with the stages set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD723	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	4	Does not wholly agree with preferred policy approach towards sustainable development. Concerned there is limited mention of employment and its importance in sustainability terms in the preferred strategic policy. Whilst bullet point 3 discussed about the need to promote social cohesion and inclusion, reduce inequalities etc. More appropriate to make specific mention to overall benefits of employment, including best use of existing resources, including safeguarding local jobs. Necessary for the strategic policy to have a greater focus on sustainable development and employment.	Comments noted. The preferred policy approach for economic growth is set out within Chapter 15.
POPD724	Lichfields for Taylor Wimpey at Hospital Road Burntwood	11	Support land being used in an efficient and effective manner.Should include a range of density standards specific to particular areas of the District. So density reflects character of site and surrounding area. Should apply realistic density assumptions to ensure sufficient land will be delivered. Consideration as to whether imposing higher density levels would make the sites less attractive for some of the volume housebuilders delivering the larger allocations, and who may be seeking to provide larger family/executive housing at necessarily lower densities. It is therefore considered that the policy relating to density should identify instances in which development below a density of 35 dph may be appropriate.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD725	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	5	Sustainability standards should be included within the new local plan and follow national guidance and related policy and should not impose standards that raise the bar above those required by adopted guidance. Key purpose of the planning system is to deliver new development, new standards can be over the top and difficult to enforuce and can impact on new developments being delivered.	Comments noted.
POPD726	Lichfields for Taylor Wimpey at Hospital Road Burntwood	12	Accepts that new development should contribute to achieving an appropriate mix of housing. Any requirement for self-build and custom-build should be justified by robust evidence. Would like to avoid this initiative being imposed on large house builders due to the impact that it could have on the delivery of sites. Council should consider identifying standalone sites which are specifically allocated for self-build and custom build development should the evidence base suggest there is sufficient need.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses
POPD727	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	6	No comments other than any policy relating to this matter and planned to be included in the local plan should reflect guidance and advice in the NPPF	Comments noted.
POPD728	Lichfields for Taylor Wimpey at Hospital Road Burntwood	20	Broadly agrees with the proposed approach to natural resources and recognises the importance of managing and enhancing the landscape character and green spaces within the district. Whilst there is a clear need to protect the natural environment, the benefits gained from appropriate and sensitive development in the right locations can often outweigh the loss of a feature of sub-standard importance within the natural environment. New developments can often help to conserve or enhance the natural environment through the creation of new landscaped areas and open space, encouraging biodiversity. Important that policies relating to specific environments and natural resources set out sufficient protection from inappropriate development. Policies should recognise the potential benefits that new development can have in making improvements to the local environment and increasing biodiversity. Detailed comments on strategic Green Belt policies are set out in the response to Questions 3 and 9.	Agree, further policy setting our biodiversity net gain will be prepared.
POPD729	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	7	Local Plan needs to identify areas where air quality is poor and designate them as air quality management areas or equivalent. Any related policies need to confirm these are areas where initatives will be supported to improve quality and where new development must demonstrate that it will not further adversley impact on air quality.	Comments noted. The preferred policy direction relating to air quality will be in accordance with national planning policy and planning practice guidance for air quality.
POPD730	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	8	Lack of focus on needs of employment including good quality and reliable sustainable transport - something that was acknowledged in the previous plan. Encourage the emerging plan to look in greater detail at how services can be encouraged that support or provide access to existing well established and new employment opportunities.	Duly Noted
POPD731	Lichfields for Taylor Wimpey at Hospital Road Burntwood	22	Supports the inclusion of a policy that promotes high quality design. The preferred policy currently covers many elements which are already addressed in other policy directions i.e. historic environment, amenity and sustainable travel. It is important that the Council avoids the duplication of policy to prevent any confusion. Does not define what the Council considers to be a strategic development, nor does it set out at what stage it is expecting the masterplan to be prepared and who is responsible for its preparation. For strategic allocations, the preferred approach should be to develop site specific policies to avoid any delay in bringing a site forward. For small and medium sites, it is not clear who is responsible for producing the area wide design assessments that would guide development and consider unlikely to assist in bringing forward sites. Must not be overly onerous or too prescriptive as this could have adverse implications on the viability and deliverability so should be considered robustly in the viability assessment.	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process.
POPD732	Harris Lamb for Muller Property Group	Whole Document	Promoting site in Kings Bromley. Consider Kings Bromley is a sustainable location that would assist in meeting the housing needs of the District, whilst also contributing to meeting the unmet needs of Birmingham.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD733	Harris Lamb for Muller Property Group	1	Generally agree.	Noted
POPD734	Harris Lamb for Muller Property Group	2	Generally supportive. Particularly welcome Objective 1 and 6. Consider no additional objectives required.	Comments noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD735	Harris Lamb for Muller Property Group	3	Promoting site at Kings Bromley. No objections in principle.The larger and more sustainable settlements should accommodate more development than the smaller settlements and should direct a proportionate amount of development to all tiers of the settlement hierarchy depending on the level of existing service provision and availability of services and access to public transport. In order to increase delivery, distribution around the District would be preferable rather than seeking to direct it to the south of District, on the edge of the built up area of Birmingham.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD736	Harris Lamb for Muller Property Group	9	Whilst standard method is the starting point for assessing local housing need, we question whether such a significant reduction would still enable the Council to achieve its economic growth and job creation objectives may want to consider whether there are exceptional circumstances that warrant consideration of an alternative approach. May also change with outcome of 'technical consultation on updates to the NPPG' on whether to use 2014 or 2016 projections, Council should clarify which projections are being used. Welcome the fact that it is considering different options for the amount of Birmingham's unmet needs, testing whether the District could accommodate between 3,000 and 4,500 dwellings is welcomed. The exact level will need to be agreed between the District, Birmingham City and the other authorities depending on how much and how willing these are to meet Birmingham's needs. To minimise the extent of any additional land to be released from the Green Belt as part of the Local Plan review, settlements outside of the Green Belt, such as Kings Bromley, could make a positive contribution to meeting future needs and should be considered before further amendments to the Green Belt are proposed.	Comments noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process.
POPD737	Harris Lamb for Muller Property Group	10	The imposition of a blanket housing mix, with no scope to vary this will be resisted, and could result in sites not coming forward and thereby, undermining the delivery of new housing in the District.	Comments noted
POPD738	Harris Lamb for Muller Property Group	11	In principle no objection . However, there may be circumstances where either a higher or lower density may be appropriate and the Council should, therefore, be able to apply this flexibly.	Comments noted.
POPD739	Harris Lamb for Muller Property Group	Chapter 20	Promoting site in Kings Bromley. Support growth option 2, as part of this growth option Kings Bromley is considered a suitable and is not constrained by the Green Belt. Lland to the north of Alrewas Road, Kings Bromley remains available for development, and is not subject to any technical or environmental constraints that would prevent its development and is considered deliverable and could contribute to the supply of housing in the first five years of the Plan.	Comments noted. Site specific propsoals will be considered as part of the local plan review
POPD740	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	Whole Document	Promoting site in Burntwood. Plan should reasonably be seeking to deliver a higher annual requirement to ensure needs within Lichfield District are met in addition to the unmet need from other authorities. On this basis, a total minimum requirement of at least 11,160 dwellings (option 5) would seem achievable. To deliver an aspirational plan, full consideration should be given to the potential to set the requirement to a minimum of 16,660 dwellings (883 dwellings per annum)(option 6). Burntwood is identified as a sustainable location and should accommodate a sizeable and positive level of growth as its contribution to housing needs. Release of Green Belt land is essential and comprehensive green belt review is necessary.	Comments and support for growth option 5 and 6 noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review. The evidence base will inform the next stages of the local plan.
POPD741	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	1	General sentiment supported.It should confirm the commitment to meeting a proportion of the unmet need and be updated to acknowledge the requirement for release of green field Green Belt land to plan positively for this level of growth.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate regarding Green Belt review and meeting housing needs.
POPD742	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	2	Reference should be added to SO12 to acknowledge the need for release of Green Belt land in order to plan positively for Lichfield's housing need and a proportion of the unmet need for the HMA. SO 6 should be amended to be more explicit, that housing need covers both the requirements of Lichfield District and unmet housing need for the housing market area.	Comments noted . The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated. The need for the wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document.The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate regarding Green Belt review and meeting housing needs. Site specific suggestions and concerns received will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review
POPD743	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	3	Supports the settlement hierarchy with Burntwood identified as Level 2. Can provide a mix and range of properties at values which will be of demand in the market and such development can bring about and facilitate positive infrastructure improvements to the Town which could be valued locally by new and existing residents alike. Release of Green Belt land is essential. The requirement for a comprehensive Green Belt review is supported and should be undertaken as a matter of necessity. Progressing green belt review through neighbourhood plans could lead to further delay to the delivery of housing due to the substantial time and resources required for a neighbourhood plan. A neighbourhood plan need to be based on clear policy within the Local Plan on the scale of growth that is required to be accommodated within Green Belt release sites and the areas where Green Belt release is required.	Comments and support for the preferred spatial strategy noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD744	Fradley West Consortium	3	Fradley should be a higher tier settlement than level 3 due to its unique offer of significantly greater and unique scale of housing and employment opportunities. There should also be a distinction between rural settlements that lie within the Green Belt and those rural settlements that lie outside of the Green Belt. Approach would be inconsistent with NPPF firstly considering previously developed land before Green Belt release.. At present the strategy has no sequential approach which is inconsistent with Green Belt release.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD745	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	4	The re-use of previously developed land which is supported in principle. Reference should be added to the potential need for development on green field and Green Belt sites where it is demonstrated as being sustainable development and contributing to meeting the substantial housing requirements for the District and/or wider housing market area. In Burntwood development of sustainable Green Belt sites can enhance the overall sustainability of a settlement by increasing its population and demand for goods and services which may be struggling in part due to viability.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence which will inform the next stages of the plan this includes a comprehensive Green Belt Review.
POPD746	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	9	The appropriate level of housing growth for Lichfield District should be determined in the context of the findings of the GL Hearn 2018 Strategic Growth Study. It is essential that Lichfield District Council and adjoining authorities comprehensively address the unmet housing need of the Greater Birmingham HMA which is evidenced in the study. to deliver an aspirational plan, full consideration should be given to the potential to set the requirement to a minimum of 16,660 dwellings (883 dwellings per annum) (option 6). Should establish how the unmet need will be distributed across the HMA, prior to further consultation on the draft Local Plan. Historic under delivery should not be used as a reason to limit the future housing requirement as that is not the purpose of the Housing Delivery Test. The policy states a 'focus on the delivery of brownfield sites before greenfield sites' this should also be infromed by a green belt review. Identification of suitable Green Belt land to meet needs must be a key aspect of the Review Plan. Should not restrict delivery of Green Belt sites in sustainable locations to meet the substantial housing need, particularly in the context of the need to address past under delivery of housing. Inevitable that Green Belt release will be required, following a substantial Green Belt Review, but this is also likely to be the case for other Authorities in providing for their reasonable share of the unmet need. Parcels to the east and south east (namely the land within Wallace's control) of the settlement which offer little to the function or purpose of the Green Belt and are otherwise free from constraint and thus form logical and sustainable locations for growth.	Comments and preferences noted. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD747	Fradley West Consortium	4	Concern at approach above minimum standards which can affect viability and deliverability of proposals. New study proposed should be extended to assess the impact on the deliverability of proposals if going above national building regualtion requirements.	Comments noted. The policy seeks to ensure all new development are located and designed to maximise energy efficiency.
POPD748	Fradley West Consortium	5	Concern at approach above minimum standards which can affect viability and deliverability of proposals. New study proposed should be extended to assess the impact on the deliverability of proposals if going above national building regualtion requirements.	Comments noted.
POPD749	Fradley West Consortium	9	Agrees that meeting shortfall in Birmingham HMA is a cross boundary matter which also identified unmet need from the Black Country Authorities. Strategic Growth Study inadequate and out of date as it uses 2016 household projections not 2014 projections advised by Government. Statement of Common Ground needs to be signed across Birmingham authorities.Local Plan Review should set out the quantum of unmet needs from each neighbouring authority and how these will be met. Housing numbers should be adjusted upawards from the standard methodology calculation to realise strateigic objectives 6 & 7. Strategy needs to be suitably flexible to meet likley increased requirements. Lichfield has the phical and market capacity to deliver far in excess of the maximum figure of 11,50, including having regard to delivery rate in the early years of the 21st Century. Option 5 is therefore urged with delivery of 650 per annum.	Comments and support for Option 5 noted. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities in the HMA in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD750	Janet Hodson on behalf of Walton Homes	2	Agree with 8.4, Agree with objective 1 Growth of housing and employment and social facilities will assist in the creation of balanced communities. Agree broadly with Objective 2 This objective will support settlements and communities that have not so far been included as growth locations in the settlement hierarchy. Broadly Agree with Objectives 7 & 8 This objective should say that this will include the allocation of land to ensure this objective is met. Broadly agree with Objective 10 specially the provision of new facilities for tourist accommodation.	Comments noted. The objectives and policies are strategic. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review
POPD751	Janet Hodson on behalf of Walton Homes	3	Strategy should include the allocation and delivery of small and medium sized sites where are a very important part of the sites portfolio - acknowledged in para 59 NPPF talks about variety of land coming forward para 68 expressly identifies small and medium sized sites to accommodate at least 10% of the overall housing requirement. This type of site is readily available in the key villages and in some of the rural villages and this express requirements should influence the spatial strategy to ensure that small and medium sized sites. Comment on the revised hierarchy - Unclear how additional development can be assimilated into Lichfield itself without serious compromise of the historic setting and fundamental green belt. The larger villages are capable of taking additional development specifically Handsacre and in the level 4 villages Elford. Nor clear why adjoining main settlements are included in the hierarchy when they are outside the district. Larger service villages that are close proximity to those areas should be recognised as the growth locations in close proximity to nearby towns Armitage with Handsacre in close to Rugley where land is available for development as shown in attached plan. Does not consider Streethay should be recognised as a separate settlement to Lichfield as it is now Physically linked to Lichfield. Elford should be included within Level 4 Elford has a level of facility that will enable it to grow in a sustainable manner.	Comments regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy includes neighbouring towns and settlements as these settlements offer a range of services and facilities and are located adjacent to the district.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD752	Janet Hodson on behalf of Walton Homes	9	At this stage the Preferred options cannot indicate the amount the amount of housing that is required for Lichfield in the new plan period. The base line figure of 333 is the only figure that can currently be calculated as there is not information on the additional requirements for the HMA or indeed for any economic uplift that may need to be built. Table 14.2 sets out various housing scenarios with a range of alternatives the Council say that they are testing 3000 to 4500 scenarios giving total of between 9660 and 11160 dwellings over the new plan period. The draft policy says that the housing need will be finalised based on local needs and the needs of the HMA - it is difficult to agree/disagree a strategy when the overall requirement figure remains opaque at best. Our view is the plan should be subject to further consultation before submission. When the overall quantum of development is clear and that can be viewed against the proposed distribution.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out a number of growth scenarios and identifies the the preferred growth options to be tested. The next stages of the local plan will be informed by a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. It is anticipated the Council will consult on the next stage of the Local Plan in accordance with the timescales set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD753	Janet Hodson on behalf of Walton Homes	11	Do not agree that increase in densities should be due simply as a way of reducing the land requirement - should relate to the specific environment and what is appropriate in a particular areas and the type of development that is being brought forward. No confidence that this policy wold be refined enough to particular areas of the district. diverse villages and character and density. This type of policy can assist in achieving reasonable densities but this should not try to be over specific.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD754	Janet Hodson on behalf of Walton Homes	14	Land for economic development needs to be made available at the larger service village settlements to retain and enhance employment provision of appropriate parcels of land for employment. Take advantages of transport locations and existing clusters of employment land. This will require release of Green Belt. in some locations. Requirements to ensure balanced communities reducing need to travel provision stimulus to there local services.	Duly Noted the Housing and emplyment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidance that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for empoyment development needs.
POPD755	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	10	Supported. Affordable housing requirement to be established in this policy should be informed by evidence and include sufficient flexibility to enable sites to come forward where the policy requirement cannot be delivered for reasons of viability.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD756	Janet Hodson on behalf of Walton Homes	22	If there is a requirement for Masterplans - should be limited to strategic scale - unnesscary for small and medium sized developments. Requirements should be clear in terms of site size numbers to trigger. Consider 300 dwelling to not require a masterplan.	Noted.
POPD757	Janet Hodson on behalf of Walton Homes	23	All of this is clearly set out in the NPPPF is there any real need to replicate all of this but in a slightly different way?	
POPD758	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	11	Density within the same policy as affordable housing requirement is supported. Not support a broad or blanket approach to increasing densities, as from experience, a ‘one size fits all’ approach will not appreciate the true extent of site specific circumstances or constraints, or reflect market demand for different types, sizes, and tenures in different locations, and therefore density is more appropriately established on site by site basis.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD759	Janet Hodson on behalf of Walton Homes	Whole Document	Preferred Option Figure 22.1 which are the sustainable settlements in the hierarchy. This broadly supported subject to the comments made in questions 3.	Support noted. Further comments submitted against question 3 regarding site size, preferences for growth and the settlement hierarchy have been noted within that section.
POPD760	Janet Hodson on behalf of Walton Homes	Whole Document	Notes that any fundamental evidence base documents that underpin the review are not yet available Green Belt Review being one of the most important. It is crucial that the Council consultation these documents when they are produced so that any issues can be commented on early in the plan process, to potentially avoid disagreement and conflict at the Local Plan examination about methodology site scoring. Should be done either as a separate exercise or as part of a consultation on the draft plan once the overall housing numbers are known.	Comments noted. The District Council will continue to undertake consultation on the Local Plan Review in accordance with the stages set out in the Local Development Scheme.
POPD761	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	14 and 15	Promoting site in Burntwood. Support. Critical that sufficient housing sites are identified in proximity to employment sites to support their continued viability through provision of sufficient workforce. Burntwood is a location where additional housing would provide valuable support to the long-term viability of existing and new businesses in terms of a sustainably located workforce, as well as bringing about and facilitating positive infrastructure improvements .	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing a HEDNA as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD762	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	20	Promoting land in Burntwood. Should be amended to acknowledge the need, and express support, for some sites within the countryside that are sustainably located to be released as greenfield sites and Green Belt land will be fundamental for the delivery of sufficient housing.	Noted. Not relevant to this question.
POPD763	Fradley West Consortium	10	Approach supported but need to acknowledge viabilty considerations may alter approach to housing mix and needs to be considered through the review	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will supported by a plan wide viability assessment.
POPD764	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	22	Promoting land in Burntwood. The principle of a policy which aspires to deliver high quality developments is supported. Masterplans can be helpful to the delivery of strategic sites, policy should not be prescriptive in requiring all strategic developments to be supported by a masterplan. An approved masterplan principles does not allow for schemes to adapt and change in response to the residential market, policy should be revised to state that consideration should be given to the use of a masterplan for strategic sites, where appropriate.	Comments noted
POPD765	Fradley West Consortium	11	Density policy should not be unduly prescriptive, a character led approach should be adopted. This also ensures development is more able to reflect mix. 35 per HA as a minimum is too and what the market delivers or reflective of demand.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD766	Planning Prospects for Wallace Land Burntwood	Chapter 22	Promoting land in Burntwood.Welcome focus housing to sustainable settlements. Should seek to provide a more even distribution of growth between Lichfield and Burntwood, either via a number of medium – large site allocations or urban extensions, which would enable a substantial level of growth to occur. Burntwood has a particular role to play in our view given the limited level of growth which has been directed to or delivered in the town in the recent past as part of the current Local Plan Strategy. The release of Green Belt land is pertinent to this option to ensure that adequate land is available during the Plan period. To ensure sufficient sites are allocated to meet the need and can be delivered at a sufficient rate, changes to Green Belt boundaries and allocation of relevant sites should be confirmed upfront through the Plan rather than through Neighbourhood Plans. Given the level of growth which is likely to be required in the future a combination of Sustainable Urban Extensions (500 units plus) and medium-scale (up to 500 units) developments would be the most logical choice for delivery. The infrastructure costs and implementation of these type of schemes would be more manageable provided there is a mix of site sizes. A new settlement would have significant lead times due to not only the planning application process but also the high infrastructure costs and timeframes associated with delivery.This approach would therefore not directly assist in providing the unmet housing need and shortfalls which the District already faces, let alone the known unmet need of Tamworth and the need yet to be distributed from the Greater Birmingham HMA within the timescales, i.e. 2031/2036.Wallace Land Investments are actively promoting two sites on the edge of Burntwood, which we believe would form logical extensions to this settlement.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD767	Fradley West Consortium	12	Not always possible to provide custom and self build homes on sites depending on existing land agreements and caharctersits. Policy should be flexible. Identifying parts of allocations for self build is likely to prove difficult to administer and deliver and should be removed.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD768	Fradley West Consortium	14	Generally supportive but not clear if correlation with level and distribution of housing growth. Also not stated if employment provsion will be increased to reflex increased housing requirement, otherwise there could be unsustainable commuting.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidance that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for empoyment development needs.
POPD769	Fradley West Consortium	22	Approach is supported . Clarification required in terms of small and medium sized sites.	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations.
POPD770	Mervyn and Wendy Taylor	Whole Document	Greenbelt around Hammerwich and Burntwood - should remain as important. Narrow in places especially near M6TOLL few fields left between Hammerwich and Burntwood. Future housing in greenfield elsewhere in the district - any more on Burntwood and Hammerwich unsustainable already taken growth - LDC are aware of the reasons - will not repeat here.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supproted by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD771	Fradley West Consortium	Chapter 19	Supports focussed development around existing town centres and key rural settlements (Residential Growth Option2) and that there may be need to consider sites for growth beyond the existing villa settlement boundaries.Only key rural settlements outside Green Belt are Fradley and Alrewas. Land at Fradley junction could readily deliver development on brownfield land including affordable housing and community facilities. Distinction should be made between key rural settlements inside and outside Green Belt. Fradley should be included alongside Lichfield and Burntwood for housing growth in same way it is a focus for employment growth. Para 22.4 considred inconsistent with NPPF. Does not take sequential approach to Green Belt release. Strategy changes needed to ensure consistency with Para 137. Fradley West site should be given priority as not Greenfield and is PDL. The vision document submitted sets out a consistent approach and potnetial masterplanning for whole area. It is consitent with Local Plan Strategy and sustainability.	Comments and preferences noted. Comments regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan and will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD772	Amanda Waldron	Whole Document	No to question 3. Burntwood infastructure not adequate. Poor transport other than bypass, re-development of the Town Centre Snakeys Corner should provide appropaite size of amenities, unless the whole of the Mount Road site is redesignated for housing theis insufficcient previously used land to provide significant number of new homes. Burntwood urban sprawl unto surrounding countryside All of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well being of its residents. No faith in green belt review. Alternative strategy new settlement - no exceptional circumstances for use of Burntwood green belt should plan for new settlements at West of the A38 Brookhay, Alrewas Quarry East of A38, Packington Hall Farm Tamworth road, any other suitable and susainable locations outside of the Green Belt. Burntwood neglected of schools parks soctors bus routes cut abandoning the dying shopping areas. Housing development si Lichfeild Little Hay have shcools andx parks These are bais amanies we have rights too.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan
POPD773	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	9	Nature and profile of Lichfield means it offers good potential for growth including in the context of housing. This extends to meeting its own housing requirements and taking some of neraby local authoritieis areas which might require a review of the Green Belt boundary. Key component of any sustainable area is ensuring new housing benefits from nearby employment. Consider DMBP is a key employment facility and the wider area of Fazeley and adjoining settlements could be grown further to create a fully sustainable ubran zone	Comments noted. The Council will prepare a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the Local Plan Review.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD774	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	14	Generally supportive of the proposed policy direction but has comments on two areas - focus on brownfield sites before greenfield sites and the potential change to green belt boundary if additional employment growth is required beyond the existing identified employment areas. DMBP has been established for light and general industrial use, warehousing and distribution and offices. The site offers considerable potential to be improved and expanded. The site is designated Green Belt which makes no sense as it contributes nothing to delivering the objectives of Green Belt policy. The site could contribute towards employment and economic development objectives of the emerging local plan therefore there is a strong justification to take it and the adjoining areas of land of the Green Belt and reallocate the land as an employment site.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs.
POPD775	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	15	Broadly supportive of preferred policy approach in the sense that the policy seeks to protect all centres. Conscious that current trends in retailing and other trends affecting leisure industry don't sit well with the objectives of this policy and a more flexible approach is needed. What this is and how it will deal with key issues is subject of further research and work but protecting and enhancing local employment and facilities that deliver it including on sites like DMBP should remain a key focus of emerging policies.	Duly Noted the evidence base is being reviewed.
POPD776	DPP on behalf of FI Real Estate Management	22	This approach can deliver benefits with regard to large sites being promoted for major mixed use development or urban extensions, such an approach is not justified with regard to small scale schemes including those regarded as medium scale. Such initiatives add cost to the development process and make development less viable and reduce flexibility.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process.
POPD777	CT Planning on behalf of Elford Homes (N Misselke)	3	Promotes land at Church Farm, Back Lane, Whittington Agree the spatial strategy is based on an identified settlement hierarchy would help deliver sustainable development. The strategy should seek to deliver housing growth across the District by directing new developments to sustainable locations. Support the inclusion of Whittington as Level 3 - Larger Service Village. It is entirely appropriate that this village is recognised as a sustainable settlement and retains its Key Village status.	Comments and support for the settlement hierarchy noted.
POPD778	CT Planning on behalf of Elford Homes (N Misselke)	9	Support the preferred policy direction for housing provision. Agree the Strategic Policy for Housing should set out the overall level of housing growth and it should ensure a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land in the District over the plan period. Recognise the need for 6,600 new dwellings over the plan period may change with any revision to the Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need. Support the Council testing the ability of the district to accommodate between 3,000 - 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting unmet needs from the HMA.	Comments and support for testing between options 4 and 5 noted.
POPD779	CT Planning on behalf of Elford Homes (N Misselke)	22	Promotes land at Church Farm, Back Lane, Whittington. Support the preferred option for housing growth particularly the identification of Whittington as a location for growth. Support the review of Green Belt boundaries in the District as part of the identification of locations for housing allocations. Land at Church Farm is well located in terms of its scale and location to the existing settlement of Whittington. The site is at a scale that would not cause harm to the existing village. The site area is 2.2 hectares and capable of accommodating up to 55 dwellings.	Noted. Not relevant to this question
POPD780	CT Planning on behalf of Little Aston Golf Club	3	Promotes land off Little Aston Hall Lane Agree the spatial strategy is based on an identified settlement hierarchy would help deliver sustainable development. The strategy should seek to deliver housing growth across the District by directing new developments to sustainable locations. Support the inclusion of Little Aston as Level 3 - Larger Service Village. It is entirely appropriate that this village is recognised as a sustainable settlement and retains its Key Village status.	Comments and support for the settlement hierarchy noted.
POPD781	CT Planning on behalf of Little Aston Golf Club	9	Support the preferred policy direction for housing provision. Agree the Strategic Policy for Housing should set out the overall level of housing growth and it should ensure a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land in the District over the plan period. Recognise the need for 6,600 new dwellings over the plan period may change with any revision to the Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need. Support the Council testing the ability of the district to accommodate between 3,000 - 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting unmet needs from the HMA.	Comments and support for testing between options 4 and 5 noted.
POPD782	CT Planning on behalf of Little Aston Golf Club	22	Promotes land off Little Aston Hall Lane. Support the preferred option for housing growth particularly the identification of Whittington as a location for growth. Support the review of Green Belt boundaries in the District as part of the identification of locations for housing allocations. Land off Little Aston Hall Lane is well located in terms of its scale and location to the existing pattern of development including residential development off Little Aston Hall Lane. The site is 0.8 ha and can accommodate up to 14 dwellings.	Noted. Not relevant to this question
POPD783	CT Planning on behalf of Southmill Country Properties	3	Promotes land off Eastern Avenue, Lichfield Agree the spatial strategy is based on an identified settlement hierarchy would help deliver sustainable development. The strategy should seek to deliver housing growth across the District by directing new developments to sustainable locations. Support identification of Lichfield City as Level 1 - Strategic Centre. It is entirely appropriate that Lichfield is recognised as a sustainable settlement of the District.	Comments and support for the settlement hierarchy noted.
POPD784	CT Planning on behalf of Southmill Country Properties	9	Support the preferred policy direction for housing provision. Agree the Strategic Policy for Housing should set out the overall level of housing growth and it should ensure a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land in the District over the plan period. Recognise the need for 6,600 new dwellings over the plan period may change with any revision to the Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need. Support the Council testing the ability of the district to accommodate between 3,000 - 4,500 additional dwellings to assist in meeting unmet needs from the HMA.	Comments and support for testing between options 4 and 5 noted.
POPD785	CT Planning on behalf of Southmill Country Properties	22	Promotes land off Eastern Avenue, Lichfield. Support the preferred option for housing growth particularly the identification of Whittington as a location for growth. Support the review of Green Belt boundaries in the District as part of the identification of locations for housing allocations. Land off Eastern Avenue comprising of 0.41 ha is available for allocation for residential development of approximately 15 dwellings or specialist housing provision and deliver up to 71 care beds.	Noted. Not relevant to this question
POPD786	CT Planning on behalf of Southmill Country Properties	22	Promotes land off Eastern Avenue, Lichfield. Paragraph 22.5 refers to the fact a number of settlements within the preferred settlement hierarchy are located in Green Belt, therefore to deliver the strategy it will be necessary to re-visit green belt boundaries. Support the proposed comprehensive review of Green Belt boundaries. Land off Eastern Avenue between Grange Lane to the east and Stafford Road to the west should be deleted from Green Belt. Given the uses on site retaining these uses in Green Belt serves no planning purpose. The area identified to be deleted from Green Belt shown on the plan lies adjacent to the development boundary of Lichfield. All of land uses within the area identified are uses that are not appropriate within Green Belt. The site can be released from Green Belt without undermining its purposes in this location. The release of the site from Green Belt would represent a logical extension to the built up area of Lichfield.	Noted. Not relevant to this question
POPD787	Fisher German for Boston	Whole Document	Promoting land at Longdon. The site is bounded by the village of Longdon to the south, the A51/Hood Lane to the west, and existing boundary planting to the north and east, just over 5ha in area. Site does not perform well against the five purposes of the Green Belt. No known environmental constraints which would prevent development of the site.	Comments and preferences for growth noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD788	Fisher German for Boston	3	Promoting land at Longdon. Does not give sufficient weight to distance to sustainable centres, nor has been adequately informed by the availability of sites, particularly those settlements within the Green Belt. We consider that the option proposed by Residential Growth Option 2 and 3 to be the preferable approaches, ensuring dispersed growth, assisting in protecting rural communities from a deterioration in service provision. Longdon is particularly vulnerable and needs sufficient levels of growth to ensure the viability of services. Longdon is not the most sustainable location, it does benefit from being within close proximity to Armitage/Handsacre (1.5km), Brereton/Rugeley (2.9km) and Lichfield (4.5km), which provide significant services and employment. Settlements in close proximity to larger centres are likely to be more sustainable, regardless of whether or not there is a bus route. There are large areas of Green Belt and sites of low value in less sustainable locations area should be available for development. Also support Residential Growth Option 3 as ensures all settlements are able to receive a proportionate level of development to ensure the continued viability of services and facilities and allows people to stay in the communities they have grown up in. Longdon should be elevated to a level 4 settlement (smaller service village).	Comments and preferences noted. The proposed settlements hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District.
POPD789	Fisher German for Boston	9	Promoting land at Longdon. All GBHMA Authorities should be working to deliver considerable additional levels of growth to compensate for this shortfall. We agree with the Council that the District should look to make a significant contribution to meeting the unmet needs of the wider GBHMA. Consider that the Council can and should be looking to deliver a greater quantum of the wider HMA requirement. Concerned therefore that the Council have not fully examined reasonable alternatives should have looked at 6,000 and 7,000 dwellings. We consider that in excess of 6,000 dwellings is likely to be a deliverable housing requirement for the District and would serve to make a more equitable contribution to meeting the wider HMA requirement. Do not believe that a blanket increase on density is appropriate nor justified. It will serve to create poor quality, overly urbanised developments, not the high quality developments. Should look to tackle the issue by allocating sufficient land could introduce a stepped housing requirement to allow sufficient time for the market to begin delivering at higher levels, particularly allowing strategic sites to come forward. Smaller sites in the urban and rural areas could ensure continuity in delivery, supported by the stepped trajectory. Good practice to have a varied portfolio of allocations of different sizes and in different locations. 10% of the housing requirement should be delivered on smaller sites below 1ha.	Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities in the HMA in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process.
POPD790	Fisher German for Boston	10	Promoting land at Longdon. Endorse para 14.35 wherein it states that "any policy which sets housing mix and appropriate provision for affordable homes will need to be tested to ensure this does not render developments unviable" Plan should not be overly restrictive and policies should allow for discussion during the application phase of the most appropriate mix for each scheme, dependant on local circumstances, character, local need and the market.	Comments noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD791	Fisher German for Boston	11	In some circumstances increased density could be appropriate. Consider that 35 dwellings per hectare should be expressed as a target rather than an absolute requirement. Density of housing development should be informed by each site's opportunities and constraints and the development of the masterplan informed by neighbouring housing and overall localised character. Wider HMA should look to deliver additional sites, rather than to increase the density of the sites to ensure future developments are of a suitable design, appropriate for the sites location and neighbouring character.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD792	Fisher German for Boston	12	Not necessary to include a specific policy on self and custom build housing where this is against the wishes of the land owner. Urge the Council to be cautious assuming positive and quick delivery on sites predominantly being delivered through self-build, given the complications associated with such methods of delivery. Object to a policy which looks to enforce the delivery of self/custom build housing as a proportion of major developments, such requirements may impede development unnecessarily, adding to developer burden without even delivering additional housing units. It is not our experience that self-builders want to buy serviced plots within or adjacent to a modern housing development. Our experience is that for the most part that they are instead looking for more bespoke rural opportunities. Therefore, we consider the application of such policies entirely unjustified and ineffective and potentially damaging to the delivery of housing where it is applied.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD793	Fisher German for Boston	22	A masterplan would be a requirement of the application process of such sites regardless. Not considered practical or likely to deliver masterplans for small and medium sites in advance of the application process. Any requirements of development should be realistic and proportionate. Requirements on development should have regard for viability and deliverability. Planning policies should not, as an unintended circumstance, render development unviable, through overly onerous application of design policies.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process.
POPD794	Clive Pearson	Whole Document	Disappointed by the lack of new houses to buy or rent in Whittington and this is probably one of the reasons that businesses are closing at a rapid rate thus giving diminishing facilities for old and new tenants. At this rate of decline unless more provision is given to new build projects Whittington will keep on declining with the younger population leaving and the population shrinking.	Comments noted. Any site specific proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review and updated evidence base including in relation to housing need
POPD795	Turleys on behalf of Barratt David Wilson and Florence Emily James	Whole Document	<p>Promotes land south west of Limburg Avenue Site measures 23.55ha and could deliver approximately 425 - 500 market and affordable dwellings with significant public open space. Confirms Barratt David Wilson are on board and are currently delivering other schemes in the District.</p> <p>Vision Welcomed that the vision provides a commitment to meet the District's housing needs however it could be more explicit in providing assurances the plan will contribute to the GBHMA shortfall. Support the vision to local development in the most sustainable locations including Lichfield which is identified as Level 1 Strategic Centre. Exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release to meet the District's future housing needs. Vision should recognise that Green Belt release is inevitable to accommodate the District's housing need, particularly at Lichfield City.</p> <p>Housing Needs Support the recognition that LPR will be required to address District's local needs and contribution to unmet needs of the GBHMA. This is welcomed as a positive and proactive step to ensure that the needs of GBHMA are met in full. Strongly support the commissioning of the HEDNA which will assess housing need alongside employment need. Barrat Wilson are keen to take an active role in contribution to this study.</p> <p>Housing Mix and Density Housing density should be determined through assessing the character and context of the surrounding area and ensuring it responds to the needs of area. It will depend on viability of proposed development and therefore should not be necessary to apply a blanket density policy across the entire District. If the Council wants to include a density policy it should provide sufficient flexibility to ensure each site can respond to its own centre.</p>	Comments and preferences noted. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a HEDNA and a plan wide viability assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD796	R Craythorne	Whole Document	Does not consider the Spatial Strategy to be the most appropriate for delivering sustainable development, Burntwood infrastructure does not cater for the current huge urban sprawl, the traffic congestion at times is horrendous. Need to keep green belt for the future of our children and grand children. Request look for new other settlements, no faith in any new green belt review.	Noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and urban capacity assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD797	R Cox	2	Shenstone railway station is used mainly for connections to Birmingham and Lichfield Trent Valley, rather than anywhere else.	Comments noted. Shenstone is identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD798	R Cox	3	Shenstone is predominantly green belt, and should not be further developed on any large scale.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD799	R Cox	5	The railway line north of Lichfield Trent Valley should be reopened for passenger traffic.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD800	R Cox	14	Shenstone industrial estate already causes problems with large HGVs going through the village on roads that were not designed for them, some way of addressing this would be welcome.	Duly Noted
POPD801	Quod for Evans Property Group	Whole Document	Promoting land at Fradley. The Site lies to the west of Fradley Airfield, extending to c. 15ha in a broadly rectangular shape. Bound to the east by Gorse Lane and adjoins the Fradley Strategic Development Allocation (SDA). It is a logical and sustainable extension of this area with a high proportion of the site is previously developed (brownfield) land. Potential to make a sizeable contribution to the Council's future housing need (c. 300 homes), including market and affordable housing. It is entirely within the ownership of Evans Property Group and is available and suitable for residential development during the plan period; it is, therefore, a deliverable site. Whilst these representations promote the Site for development independent of the remainder of SHLAA site 838, they do not object to this wider area of land. Technical reports and responses to previous consultation provided.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD802	Quod for Evans Property Group	9	Support. Council must undertake further evidence to understand the local housing need. Must have regard to the standard methodology and NPPF, unless exceptional circumstances dictate otherwise. Should identify strategic allocations for residential development. Should be a focus on the delivery of brownfield sites before greenfield sites.	Comments noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process. The next stages of the Local Plan Review will be informed by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment.
POPD803	Quod for Evans Property Group	Chapter 22	Promoting site at Fradley. Support. Fradley is an appropriate and sustainable settlement that can accommodate future residential growth, without prejudicing its function as a 'Key Rural Settlement' in the settlement hierarchy. Fradley is also an appropriate location to accommodate additional levels of housing beyond its hierarchy position. The level of growth apportioned to each settlement should reflect the level of services present at the current time, alongside a consideration for the potential future expansion of such facilities. Does not lie within the Green Belt. Land should not be removed from the Green Belt unnecessarily or without good foundation, particularly when a deliverable brownfield location exists. Site is therefore well positioned as a logical and sustainable extension to Fradley. Its allocation and development would ensure that the Draft Plan accords entirely with the NPPF.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD804	L Whitehouse	Whole Document	Do not support Preferred spatial strategy, should be replaced with a strategy which focuses on new settlements outside the Green belt. Do not agree with the Green Belt review.	Duly Noted
POPD805	Gladman	Whole Document	<p>Plan provides the opportunity to ensure that the development plan is consistent with the most up-to-date national policy. Welcomes review, provides scope for development requirements and the spatial strategy to be updated in alignment with the most recent evidence. It also provides a vehicle in which the much-discussed unmet needs of Birmingham and the Black Country can be met. Gladman submits a site at Wigginton Lane, Tamworth for consideration as housing allocation within the Local Plan Review. The Review therefore would be subject to the policies of the revised NPPF (2019).</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan's preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan's proposals on sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives. Should ensure that the results of the SA process conducted through the Review clearly justify any policy choices that are ultimately made, including the proposed site allocations (or any decision not to allocate sites) when considered against 'all reasonable alternatives' it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed and others have been rejected. Decision making, and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.</p>	Comments and preferred approach noted. The District Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to assist in meeting the GBHMA shortfall as part of the Duty to Cooperate. The SA will inform the plan making process.
POPD806	Gladman	3	A spatial strategy based on the identified settlement hierarchy would generally be appropriate, however it would not allow for a new settlement to be proposed if that were deemed to be an appropriate means of accommodating some of the District's housing requirement. Supports the inclusion of neighbouring towns and settlements within the hierarchy and in particular supports the recognition that Tamworth represents an extremely sustainable location for growth.	Comments noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD807	Gladman	9	Preferred policy direction for housing is currently unclear. Policy should state minimum housing requirement plus number of additional dwellings to assist in meeting unmet need elsewhere in the housing market area. The reference on the Preferred Policy direction to “A focus on the delivery of brownfield sites before greenfield sites” is contrary to national policy.	Noted. The consultation document sets out a number of growth scenarios and identifies the the preferred growth options to be tested. The next stages of the local plan will be informed by a range of evidence including an Urban Capacity Assessment and comprehensive Green Belt Review.
POPD808	Gladman	10	Preferred policy approach should focus on ensuring that the needs of families, older people and self-build are provided for, rather than prescribing a site-specific housing mix policy requirements should not cumulatively render developments to be unviable.	Comments noted
POPD809	Gladman	11	Increasing densities of development is a logical way to increase housing supply, however it is important that the local character and context is also taken into consideration.	Comments noted.
POPD810	Gladman	12	Agrees with the principal of providing self-build properties subject to evidence of demand. Appropriate for the Local Plan to allocate sites specifically for self/custom build, would object to a blanket requirement for the provision of self-build plots on major development sites as this would not boost housing supply but merely change the delivery mechanism.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD811	Gladman	Chapter 22	Promoting land to the north of Tamworth for residential development. The site has the ability to deliver in the region of 500-700 new homes as part of a Sustainable Urban Extension to Tamworth. Development of this site respected the rural character and setting of Wigginton currently liaising with Staffordshire CC Highways, amongst other statutory authorities, to establish a scope for highways testing and improvements in the area.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD812	CT Planning on behalf of Hugh Lillington	Chapter 22	Support proposal to undertake additional work and evidence to further define Strategic Growth Options including potential new locations for growth. One such location is at Thorpe Constantine on land owned by Thorpe Estate comprising of 1175 ha. The land is available for consideration for new housing growth. Land in excess of 120 ha is available under one ownership to deliver around 5000 new dwellings and associated facilities.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process.
POPD813	Clare Beesley	Whole Document	Objection to any plans for Greenbelt situated in or around Burntwood to be re-designated as not important and made available for development. The intention for LDC making a 'call for land' and giving land landowners opportunity to offer land for development is in direct conflict with government legislation for Greenbelt. Housing White Paper makes clear that any request for property development on Greenbelt is only permissible in exception circumstances and every effort should be made to preserve greenbelt through development of brownfield sites. References the Council's brownfield register and questions since permissioned brownfield sites are available how does LDC justify making a 'call for land' which allows Greenbelt landowners the opportunity to offer their land for development. BAG have repeatedly raised this issue and supply well thought out alternatives. LDC rejection of these proposals has been swift and slim in justification for example Mount Road. Brownfield sites in and around Burntwood are available and permission.	The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy. The approach will be informed having regard to national guidance.
POPD814	Louise Flowith	Whole Document	The two specific areas identified for further exploration to the north east of Lichfield City and north of Tamworth is understandable. The north east of Lichfield location alone has sufficient capacity to address LDC and HMA mid range housing requirement options without any requirements to release Green Belt land elsewhere. Little Aston is not one of the six key rural districts in the spatial strategy and therefore important at this stage to consider whether the suggestion that Little Aston is sustainable settlement is correct. This is not correct, Little Aston lies on the bundary of Birmingham and all 'potential' land lies within the most sensitive Green Belt corridor. Any Green Belt development is contrary to Neighbourhood Plans. The Little Aston / Sutton to Shenstone Green belt strategic gap is one of the most important in the GBHMA. It meets the NPPF criteria. Villages outside of the Green Belt should be considered for small scale development first. There is the issue of viability to consider.	Comments and preferences noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Little Aston. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD815	Mr and Mrs Craddock	Whole Document	Support the campaign to save Green Belt land in Burntwood and to argue against any proposals to build new housing on this land. Do not consider the spatial strategy based on the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy. Burntwood roads aren't maintained, the conurbation is now gridlocked at many times of the day. The road network has been under maintained for decades and is not fit for the current population never mind an increased population in this area. Burntwood District has a higher population density than Lichfield District. Air pollution would be bad as sites north of the M6 Toll, west of Pool Lane and east of Pool Lane. Land south of Highfields Road would involve building access roads which would add to the grid locking in High Street. Mears Farm is a site for rare birds and lizards. Shops and local infrastructure are inadequate for the population. The few green open spaces left are a valuable asset and need to be preserving for mental and physical health and well being of future generations.	Noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and urban capacity assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD816	Robert Birch	Whole Document	Concerned about the threat to Green Belt that surrounds our towns and which are an under appreciated amenity for our already built up areas. Green Belt serves many roles but it but protects us from urban sprawl and maintains the boundaries of our towns. It provides recreation, open space and havens for wildlife. There is a distinct lack of housing in Burntwood but this cannot be solved by making swathes of countryside available for executive housing. Green Belt is one of the local amenities and should be looked on as a resource for food production, employment through agriculture and countryside management, a wildlife habitat and a leisure facility.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and urban capacity assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD817	Jo Smith	1	The green belt to the south of the district provides very special space between Lichfield and the sprawl of the West Midlands conurbation. The council should put great emphasis on Green characteristics as this will continue to ensure the area is a welcoming happy and healthy place to live. The growth proposals for Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston contradict the proposed Local Plan Vision. These areas have strong characteristics and the scale of growth could put the vision completely at risk. The needs of the villages to the South of Lichfield need to be quantified. Any housing need to be met by LDC and the wider HMA needs to be fully justified.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate regarding Green Belt review and meeting housing needs. Site specific suggestions and concerns received will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review
POPD818	Jo Smith	2	Justification includes Shenstone and Little Aston is flawed. The main metric used is proximity to Cross City line railway stations giving Shenstone and Little Aston very high scores for housing growth potential because of their access to bus service or railway station 'serving 5 main centres.' These railway connections along the length of the cross city line only and no actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Little Aston or Shenstone are identified. Strategic Priority 11 and Strategic Priority 12 should be higher up the priority list.	Comments noted. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. The number order of priorities is not an indicator of greater or lesser importance.
POPD819	Jo Smith	3	The what evidence tells us shows potential growth in Shenstone has more negatives than positives, Stonnall as a balance and Little Aston has more positive, however there is strong evidence of inappropriateness of selecting Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall for growth. Lichfield housing growth should be focussed on alternative areas that are identified in the proposed spatial strategy i. brownfield sites no longer viable ii. existing urban areas with a good range of established services iii the two potential strategic growth communities north east of Lichfield and north of Tamworth. The data platform for the preferred options spatial strategy assumptions is incomplete.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD820	Jo Smith	4	The preferred policy towards sustainable development is acceptable in that it seeks to protect our natural environment which is the District's greatest asset combined with its heritage assets. The SHLAA shows a number of sites in Little Aston and Stonnall as not developable. This is considered a positive classification by residents. Role of Neighbourhood Plan in the identification and upholding of sustainable development should be made clear as it is not identified.	Comments noted. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated on an annual basis and will inform the local plan review process.
POPD821	Jo Smith	5	Identification of sustainability standards is important. Local Plan should identify where best potential housing growth exists using this criteria. Electrification of underused railway line running north east of Trent Valley would strengthen the case for the A38 Fradley - Alrewas corridor strategic housing growth option which is outside of green belt	Comments noted.
POPD822	Jo Smith	6	FRA data was obtained during neighbourhood plan process. The data places limits on what level of housing can be built without increasing the flooding risk	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD823	Jo Smith	7	Any housing growth should not increase pollution. A new rail station would be required for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option north east of Lichfield to reduce impact of increased vehicle movements.	Comments noted.
POPD824	Jo Smith	8	Sustainable transport with the greatest potential that provides the greatest opportunity is to electrify the railway line to the north east of Lichfield adding a new station with car parking near Wall Island Business Park	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD825	Jo Smith	9	Preferred policy direction is not comprehensive in that it proposes a way forward for housing provision without identifying housing requirements, any Green Belt review, only commits to understanding travellers requirements not other categories of need and brownfield analysis having been completed.	Comments noted. The Council will prepare a suite of evidence based documents including a comprehensive Green Belt Review, an Urban Capacity Assessment and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD826	Jo Smith	10	Policy direction seeks to meet all housing needs of the District through all levels of affordable and market housing options. All Neighbourhood Plans have considered these issues. The recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying affordable and market needs at the neighbourhood level with agreed housing sizes and bedroom mix ratios should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of any new preferred policy direction	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD827	Jo Smith	11	Recognition of neighbourhood plans in identifying the appropriate density at the neighbourhood plan level should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of the policy direction.	Noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD828	Jo Smith	12	A register of sites suitable for self-builders in the whole of Lichfield District would assist those who wish to build their own home.	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD829	Jo Smith	13	Lichfield haven't met targets for current targets for pitch provision and has not for many years refreshed its needs assessment in this area.	Noted
POPD830	Jo Smith	14	Employment and economic development focus on Lichfield City, Burntwood and Fradley Park is welcome. LDC employment policy should be further strengthened by identifying what the council will do to support the older employment areas which have larger industrial uses with location and site viability features that challenge their long term future.	Duly Noted The Employment Land availability assessment (ELAA) will direct policy direction in addition the Our Spatial strategy will consider future housing locations. The Preferred policy direction; Our employment and economic development "seeks to maintain and enhance a diverse local economy and encourage opportunities for inward investment."
POPD831	Jo Smith	15	Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall are included in the preferred options report as 'Rural Centres' catering for the day to day needs of the village and the wider rural area around.	Duly noted
POPD832	Jo Smith	16	Yes I agree	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD833	Jo Smith	17	Green space amenity adjoining the villages within the district must be maintained so that residents can for a walk without the need to drive to a location. Green field amenity land which clearly adds to overall community well being should not be considered for housing. They should be preserved for future generations to enjoy.	Noted
POPD834	Jo Smith	18	Councils strategy to support arts and cultural provision is very good especially within Lichfield City	Noted
POPD835	Jo Smith	19	Integration of requirements within one or a number of other strategic policies eg Healthy and Safe Communities alongside Tourism	Noted
POPD836	Jo Smith	20	Any area of special environmental merit / community Green Space has been identified in the Neighbourhood Plans of Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD837	Jo Smith	21	Provision of high quality housing development is being reduced by the introduction of CIL in that the consultation on what Lichfield CIL strategy is to invest in is not open to broad, regular consultation about quality priorities and the CIL introduction has limited developers resources left for Section 106 contributions	
POPD838	Jo Smith	22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan. This should be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD839	Jo Smith	23	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan. This should be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment.
POPD840	Fradley West Consortium	Whole Document	Welcomes review of Brownfield Land Register to be consistent with other evidence produced. SHLAA should be redrafted. Assessment of site not being achievable is not based on evidence. The definition of achievable should be yes. Highways England has considered suitability of Hillrds Cross Junction, Site Allocations Plan now allocated all land East of Gorse Lane, meaning development of Fradley Junction West of Gorse Lane would naturally follow.	Comments noted. The District Council maintains its Brownfield Register in accordance with national policy. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis.
POPD841	LHCRT (Luke Walker)	Chapter 3	Support the view that strategic policies should be used to ensure all types of infrastructure are provided. This is vital for Lichfield Canal where the restoration programme extends over a significant period to achieve completion and the delivery of the full range of facilities and benefits that completion will bring.	Comments noted
POPD842	LHCRT (Luke Walker)	Chapter 5	Paragraph 5.20 - the proposed continuous footpath alongside the restored through route of Lichfield Canal provides an excellent opportunity for the physical activity of walking - and the health and fitness benefits gained thereby. Paragraph 5.31 - Feel that restored Lichfield Canal should be mentioned in this context as a tourist attraction which will bring more people to the district Paragraph 5.36 - Errors in the wording here, the restored Lichfield Canal will connect through Lichfield and the existing navigable canal network north of Brownhills. The project is to restore the complete Lichfield Canal so the words 'a further section of' need to be deleted. The reference to Burntwood should be corrected to read Brownhills. Paragraph 5.40 - Feel that the restored Lichfield Canal should be mentioned in this context.	Comments noted
POPD843	LHCRT (Luke Walker)	1	Feel that the words expressing the vision should also refer to the opportunities for flood risk alleviation by elements of Green Infrastructure	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues.
POPD844	LHCRT (Luke Walker)	6	The restoration of the Lichfield Canal will bring opportunities for flood risk alleviation and this should be specifically mentioned in the wording of the proposed policy. Developers of proposals in the vicinity of the canal route should look to the canal for opportunities for flood risk alleviation	Comments noted.
POPD845	Ian Harris	Whole Document	Has a scoring matrix for the sustainability of the preferred spatial strategy, but does not contain a comparative assessment of the sustainability of the four options for residential growth. Question continued preference for option 2 when almost certainly will require release from Green Belt. Admission in SA the process is imprecise, relies on assumptions and subjective judgement. Choice of spatial option 2 has not considered the effect on Burntwood's Green Belt and Landscape. Further erosion will be detrimental to health and wellbeing. No faith developer contributions will make significant impact. Scoping report 2017 identified crime increase. Crowding will be increased, high commuting and congestion will occur, development could harm landscape and townscape character. Burntwood has poor public transport. Once land allocated near Burntwood TC, inevitable will be more Green Belt release. Option 4 far more logical. Not much difference in the sustainability of options 2 and 4 regarding non car travel and if PT enhanced for option 4 could be equal or greater. Option 4 more sustainable compared to development on Green Belt. Endorse need to explore Growth Option 4 and sites in the strategic growth study. Option 7 is not sustainable. Do not agree that mixed housing benefits provision of homes to meet local needs or that 40% affordable homes requirement is more likely to give educational access in appropriate locations for a sector of the population. Do not agree will be a significant positive effect on access to health facilities. Number of objectives statements in SA 2019 not accepted and consider they discredit the document.	Comments and preferred approach noted. The consultation document sets out the option assessment assumptions in Table 4.1 and specifies that this is a high level assessment considering other factors including the SA. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Sustainability Appraisal which will inform the next stage of plan process.
POPD846	LHCRT (Luke Walker)	Chapter 12	Paragraph 12.10 - welcome the intention that LDC will support relevant agencies and organisations in the provision of infrastructure and expect that this will translate into increasingly active support for the restoration of the Lichfield Canal.	Comments noted
POPD847	LHCRT (Luke Walker)	14	Policy statement mentions the provision of needed infrastructure for such developments as are proposed. Understand this will include Green Infrastructure within such areas.	Duly Noted
POPD848	LHCRT (Luke Walker)	16	Paragraph 15.26 mentions tourist attractions in the District but should also mention the restored Lichfield Canal as an attraction being progression and would become more of an attraction. The reference to 'the Canal Network' might be interpreted as referring only to the existing navigable canal network so a reference to the Lichfield Canal would be helpful and future proof.	Duly Noted
POPD849	LHCRT (Luke Walker)	17	LHCRT expect to participate in the proposed study of Green Infrastructure and opportunities in the District	Comments noted.
POPD850	LHCRT (Luke Walker)	23	As written the policy is aimed at mainly preventing damage and protecting heritage assets but does not look to the possibilities for heritage assets to deliver benefits for the future, given appropriate restoration. The policy should draw attention to positive opportunities for developers to add value to heritage assets to enable those assets to be brought into meaningful use for the future.	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations.
POPD851	Mr and Mrs Pritchard	1	The vision completely disregards the local communities. This growth would fundamentally change these villages and make them a place their current inhabitants would not have chosen to live in.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated including in respect of growth needs and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate
POPD852	Mr and Mrs Pritchard	2	Growth of Little Aston and Shenstone will not benefit the current population of the villages and will not have any benefit to other stops along the cross city line.	Comments noted. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD853	Mr and Mrs Pritchard	3	The plan shows more red and ambers than green and surely cannot be justified.	Comments noted.
POPD854	Mr and Mrs Pritchard	4	Policy is to protect our natural environment, building on green belt and enforcing growth to areas does not support this. It is not justifiable	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a wide range of evidence which will inform the next stages of the plan making process including a Green Belt Review.
POPD855	Mr and Mrs Pritchard	5	There are clearly much better options in the A38 corridor.	Comments and preferences noted
POPD856	Mr and Mrs Pritchard	6	Flood Risk is already high in parts of Shenstone. Expansion of the village must assess this in full	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD857	Mr and Mrs Pritchard	7	Air quality can only deteriorate if expansion goes ahead. Clearly not good.	Comments noted.
POPD858	Mr and Mrs Pritchard	8	Better option is electrify line north east of Lichfield	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD859	Mr and Mrs Pritchard	9 to 23	The question is unclear but we are completely against building in green belt and destroy local communities.	Comments noted though not supported by justification.
POPD860	Matthew Price	1	Proposed vision contradicts local area plans. The vision wishes to see residents proud of their communities but then there is a statement with regards to rate of growth which puts this at risk.	Comments noted. The is provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated including in respect of growth needs and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate
POPD861	Matthew Price	2	The justification is flawed and would bring no economic benefit to any of the areas. Access to railway travel scores highly but doesn't take into account the current network is seriously over capacity in its present format. Parking at local stations is also over capacity.	Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD862	Matthew Price	3	Shenstone has more negatives than positives within the strategy. There has been no brownfield site assessment and urban areas with established services would be better options.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD863	Matthew Price	4	The approach towards sustainable development is acceptable and wouldn't change communities beyond recognition as currently proposed. The current approach in partnership with parish councils has already proved successful.	Comments noted.
POPD864	Matthew Price	5	Further proposals that assess the volume of traffic in the area should be assessed. The local plan preferred options should identify where the best potential housing growth exists.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out the preferred settlement hierarchy and growth option.
POPD865	Matthew Price	6	Flood plain data has already been collected and must be acknowledged in any future housing development proposals.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD866	Matthew Price	7	Air quality and the standard is vital. Proposed housing growth would damage this adding further congestion to already busy roads.	Comments noted.
POPD867	Matthew Price	8	The railways in these areas are already over capacity and addition services or larger trains should be considered.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD868	St Philips	Whole Document	Key issue will be how the district will respond to the cross boundary issue of unmet need principally arising from Birmingham. Imperative that Council is fully and demonstrably engaged with the Greater Birmingham authorities. A credible plan to deal with the issue of unmet need to ensure that the Council satisfies its plan-making obligations pursuant to duty to cooperate. Supports Option 2 as most sustainable approach. Notes that main opposition to option 2 is potential loss of Green Belt, but Fradley outside of GB so not subject to exceptional circumstances being demonstrated. Should reduce reliance of GB release and ensure opportunities for strategic growth for the north of the district are robustly explored. Para 22.4 supports growth north east of Lichfield city area. clarification required if includes Fradley. There remains an absence of detail as to the specific quantum and location of residential development distributed across the settlement hierarchy, though acknowledge key based assessment are to be progressed. Level of unmet need principally arising from Birmingham remains undetermined, so a clear preferred policy direction. Needs to be resolved expediently.	Comments and support for Option 2 noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan. The District Council will continue to engage with neighbouring authorities within the HMA as part of the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD869	Matthew Price	9	Do not agree with the policy direction. There is no analysis on brownfield and no greeneblt review.	Comments noted. The Council will prepare a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD870	Matthew Price	10	All neighbourhood plans have considered these issues. These should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly preferred policy direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD871	Matthew Price	11	This should be referenced and acknowledged from the neighbourhood plans	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD872	Matthew Price	12	A register of sites suitable for self builders for the whole of Lichfield would assist those seeking to build their own home. This should also be related for large landowners, where building will not impact residents.	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD873	Matthew Price	13	The consultation document does not actually identify how the new criteria will do this given the history in this area this needs to be significantly clarified.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD874	Matthew Price	14	The development of industrial areas in Burntwood, Lichfield and Fradley are welcome. These areas also have the infrastructure to sustain this growth.	Duly Noted
POPD875	St Philips	3	Supports the principle of option 2. Need balanced distribution of growth and an appropriate proportion of unmet need from the wider HMA. In absence of sufficient previously developed land, need to allocate greenfield sites that are located on the edge of existing settlements in locations that are sustainable and not subject to sensitive environmental constraints. Need to protect high performance Green Belt means not all housing met through large scale urban extensions to the highest tier settlements of Lichfield and Burntwood. Council not able to rely on a case for exceptional circumstances to justify sizeable Green Belt release when there are sustainable sites including Fradley Lane. Support view that Fradley be identified as a level 3 - larger service village due to existing facilities and service provision, accessibility and scope to accommodate proportionate level of housing. Other level 3 villages such as Shenstone are sensitive. Absence of GB around Fradley provides propensity to accommodate higher levels of growth proportionate to settlement. Agrees neighbouring towns and settlements should be removed from the hierarchy table as settlements not assessed within the settlement sustainability study and therefore evidence limited to support their extension within LDC area. Growth of Lichfield and Burntwood limited due to GB. Scope of Sutton Coldfield / Birmingham limited through Green belt release as performing well against 5 purposes.	Comments and support for growth option 2 noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process. The proposed settlement hierarchy includes neighbouring towns and settlements as these settlements offer a range of services and facilities and are located adjacent to the district.
POPD876	Matthew Price	15	Stonall, Little Aston and Shenstone are identified as rural centres, while this is true it doesn't justify any future growth capacity.	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD877	Matthew Price	16	Support this policy approach with increasing tourism this is another reason why maintaining a rural feel to the area is essential. HS2 will encourage local people to go elsewhere if Lichfield becomes a building site for new homes.	Duly Noted
POPD878	Matthew Price	17	Green field should not be considered for housing as has previously. Local facilities should be accessible for local people.	Noted. Links to policies on infrastructure provision and transport.
POPD879	Matthew Price	19	No overarching approach would be more beneficial.	Noted
POPD880	Matthew Price	20	Agree with this approach but feel it is vital the local area plans are taken into consideration.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD881	Matthew Price	21	The provision of high quality housing is being reduced by the introduction of CIL. CIL has limited developers resources to add quality improvements where specific housing development is approved.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process.
POPD882	Matthew Price	22	Neighbourhood plans should have a stronger role in any future option plan.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD883	St Philips	9	Preferred policy direction for housing provision does not identify any preferred housing requirement. St Philips concurs with the Council's view that option 1 represents the local housing need for the plan period. Council's approach to addressing unmet need elsewhere in HMA requires clarification. Council draws on Strategic Growth study and concluded level of unmet need could be 48,000 across the HMA if densities and supply of urban sites were increased. Needs to be handled with caution. No timetable for review of BDP. Not apparent from the consultation document sufficient dialogue to draw meaningful assumptions as to how much the unmet need is. Arbitrary assumptions appear applied as to the proportion of unmet need that the district could potentially accommodate. Greater clarity required of appropriate methodology for apportionment informed by analysis of commuting flows and migration patterns between district and relevant authorities in HMA. The Council cannot develop a preferred strategic policy on housing provision until a sound mechanism has been agreed for the distribution of unmet need and agreement reached as to what the actual level of unmet need arising from Birmingham is for plan-making purposes. The latter is not sufficiently clear from the Greater Birmingham HMA Strategic Growth Study Position Statement (September 2018)	Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD884	St Philips	10	Need to ensure viability not undermined. Council needs to not be overly prescriptive to setting housing mix. Ability to negotiate an appropriate mix of dwellings on a site by site basis important. Flexible approach needed to respond to changing needs. Needs to be informed by up to date evidence. The Council must ensure that its policy-led approach does not inadvertently constrain the deliverability of sustainable development by impacting on viability. Developers must retain the ability to negotiate affordable housing provision in accordance with paragraph 62 of the NPPF 2019.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD885	St Philips	11	Agrees minimum density of 35 dph whilst welcoming flexibility to demonstrate why lower density may be appropriate in certain circumstances	Comments noted.
POPD886	St Philips	12	Self build / custom build within mix must not be mandatory. Avoid overly prescriptive approach with ramification for deliverability of development sites	Comments and preferred approach noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD887	St Philips	22	Notes it seeks to impose a requirement for all strategic development to be supported by a masterplan. Doesn't identify whether specific strategic and non strategic allocations will need to be delivered in a ccordance with a single masterplan document. Should constitute a high level document that remains flexible. Considers their proposals will accord with Council focus on high quality sustainable design.	Comments noted
POPD888	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero Developments (Robert Pearson)	Whole Document	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington for low carbon custom build residential development for 10 dwellings. Support the Council in continuing with a review of the Local Plan to 2036. The proposed timescales will ensure that an up to date Local Plan for the District will be in place to support growth and meet future development needs.	Comments and support for timescales noted.
POPD889	Sarah Williams	1	The growth proposals for Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston contradict the vision. Scale of growth, location and type of growth will put vision at risk. Review of housing needs is not comprehensively assessed. Need to be met from the wider west midlands needs to identified and justified. Impact of pressures not identified in the consultation document.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD890	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero Developments (Robert Pearson)	1	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington Noted that the vision remains broadly the same as the adopted Local Plan Strategy and it is considered that this remains relevant and is supported. Welcome the reference to the District exceeding national targets for reducing carbon emissions.	Noted
POPD891	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero Developments (Robert Pearson)	2	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington Considered the Strategic Objectives & Priorities remain broadly relevant for Local Plan Review. It is noted that in updating the Strategic Priorities the Council has chosen to remove specific reference to particular settlements at this stage. In relation to Strategic Objective & Priority 6 - Czero consider it should be amended to refer to meeting the unmet housing needs of the wider GBBCHMA. Strategic Objective has been broadened to include meeting the needs of 'existing and new residents' and this is welcomed. In relation to Strategic Objective & Priority 13 - consider this should be entitled Natural Resources and Climate Change. There should be a full stop after the word 'area' in line and a new setence added to read: 'To give preference to new development that reduce carbon emissions to a greater extent than building control requirements and support initiatives that help provide renewable energy to lower emissions from the build envrionment."	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated. The need for wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD892	Sarah Williams	2	Justification for Strategic Priority 1 which includes Little Aston and Shenstone is flawed. Scores highly because of access to bus or rail station serving 5 main centres. These are simply connections of a cross city line and no verifiable social or economic benefits are identified.	Comments noted. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD893	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero Developments (Robert Pearson)	3	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington Continuation of the strategy is supported. The Settlement Sustainability Study recognises a significant disparity in level of services and facilities across the settlements within the District and concludes Whittington is one of the sustainable villages. Support the outcomes for Whittington identified within the Settlement Sustainability Study 2018 and identification fo Whittington as a Level 3 settlement. The preferred policy direction for the spatial strategy will result in delivery of sustainable development. The level of growth required in the District to 2036 would require a number of sustainable extension to existing settlements including Whittington. Land outside the current settlement boundary at Whittington lies in the Green Belt. The review of Green Belt to inform the Local Plan remains relevant but noted this needs to be updated in light of the proposed changes to the settlement hierarchy. Exceptional circumstances exist to remove land from Green Belt at Whittington, this will allow necessary growth at Whittington, provide an opportunity to promote sustainable patterns of growth in line with the Settlement Hierarchy, assist in supporting existing and proposed services and facilities.	Comments and support for the continuation of the strategy noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD894	Sarah Williams	3	Evidence shows Shenstone has more growth potential negatives, Stonnal is balanced negative and positive and Little Aston is more positives, however SHLAA for Little Aston and Stonnall shows sites non developable. The strategy for settlement hierarchy for these communities which are primarily in the Green Belt should be revised. Priorities should be based on unused industrial land, urban areas and two new growth settlements. Preferred options have been published without brownfield site assessment been completed or a Green belt Review or the other Wesst Midlands authorities indicating they wll accomodate additional growth. Data platform for preferred options therefore incomplete	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process. The SHLAA is a living document and reviewed and updated on an annual basis.
POPD895	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero Developments (Robert Pearson)	9	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington Government has confirmed the use of 2014 sub national household projections to provide the demographic baseline for the short term. The baseline figure represents a minimum and does not account for additional housing demand or meeting neighbouring authorities needs. Support the intention to undertake a HEDNA and this could consider whether there is a justified alternative to the standard method for calculating need a local level. It is not clear how the figure of 4,500 dwellings presented within the Preferred Options document as 'Option 5' has been derived. Assuming a mid point for the provision of two urban extension would result in a housing requirement that includes 9,000 dwellings (450 dpa) towards wider shortfalls from the GBHMA. Therefore, at present Option 5 only assumes one of the three identified areas of search to be tested. Concerned with the inconsistent approach to meeting the identified housing shortfall being taken through the local plan reviews within the GBBCHMA. Compares approaches taken by South Staffs DC and Cannock Chase DC. If a consistent approach were taken by Lichfield the following contribution towards meeting GBBCHMA shortfall would need to be taken - 10,000 dwellings in respect of the new settlement recommended area of search and 3,000 dwellings in respect of sustainable urban extension recommended areas. Concerned the option of Local Housing Need plus 13000 consistent with the approach taken in other emerging Local Plans is not considered within the document. Whilst it is welcomed that the Council is looking to contribute towards the delivery of unmet housing need of the GBHMA the LPR needs to include a more definite commitment to accommodating development rather than simply committing to a 'test' as the Local Plan is formulated. The contribution should not be an aspiration but an integral element of the overall housing requirment. LDC should test an option that would equate to meeting local housing need, plus the minimum requirement of the recommended areas of search within the Strategic Growth Study. The strategic policy on housing provision should include a specific reference to self and custom build to encourage growth in these sectors and assist in boosting the supply of housing. LDC should test an option that would equate to meeting local needs plus minimum requirement of the recommended areas of search within the Strategic Growth Study this would equate to 19,660.	Comments and suggestions noted. Table 14.2 sets out the housing requirement options and explains each option in detail. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD896	Sarah Williams	4	Preferred policy towards sustainable development is acceptable. Notes sites for Little Aston and Stonnall in SHLAA not developable. Role of Neighbourhood Plan in identification and upholding sustainable development should be made clear.	Comments noted. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis and will inform the local plan review process. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD897	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	Whole Document	Introduction: Relates land at Hay End Lane Fradley See Appendix 1 (rep POPD901), One parcel secured permission application 13/0633/OUTM Phase 1 Reserved Matters - further interest in land to the west of this app site know as Hay End Lane Phase 2. Background document submitted as part of Scope Issues and Options Consultation, resubmitted as Appendix 2 in this rep. Rep framed in the context of the requirements of the NPPF para 35, positively Prepared, Jsutified, effective and consistent with National Policy.	Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD898	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	Whole Document	Planning Policy Context: Supports the review to 2036 opportunity for a comprehensive review. Revised NPPF review once every five years. Proposed timescales in LDS will ensure that the Local Plan is up to date . This consultation follows previous, current document is a high level assessment of different growth options and sets out preferred options focusing homes in the most sustainable settlements identified in the preferred settlement hierarchy - includes Fradley as a larger service village. Supports Council approach to continue review to support growth to 2036 genuinely plan led. Fradley Neighbourhood Plan made 12th Feb 2019 seeks to address challenges faced by the community including inadequate sports provision and the lack of health recreational and community facilities. Plan includes objective provide appropriate mix of community leisure and retail facilities that are accessible to both Fradley Village and South to address the growing needs. Hay End Lane Phase 2 lies beyond village settlement boundary, Policy FRANP3 states that proposals for new and/or improved community facilities within or adjacent to village settlements boundaries that would respect local character and residential amenity and which do not result in harm to highway safety will be supported. WBD previously engaged with Parish and demonstrated how Hay End Lane Phase 2 and associated housing development could deliver the new sports facilities the community are seeking - Appendix 2 gives details.	Comments and support for timescales noted.
POPD899	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero Developments (Robert Pearson)	10	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington It is most appropriate for housing mix to continue to be guided by market signals as defined within the most up to date SHMA. The Local Plan should not seek to establish a specified mix for all development across the District recognising that needs differ across the sub housing market areas, needs are likely to change over the plan period and site specific considerations are often pertinent to the mix of homes appropriate on a site. The policy should consider how custom build housing can support the provision of starter homes and downsizer bungalows with some cross subsidy from larger family homes. Housing needs from neighbouring authorities should be a key consideration in the determination of the most appropriate mix to be achieved.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD900	Sarah Williams	5	Preferred Options should identify where the best housing growth exists using sustainability standards criteria. Electrification of Lichfield Trent Valley Station would strengthen A38 corridor for growth outside of Green belt and be complemented by new park and ride north of Wall.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out the preferred settlement hierarchy and growth option. Locations for growth will be considered as the local plan progresses.
POPD901	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	Whole Document	Appendix A - Site Plan for Hay End Lane Phase 2.	Noted
POPD902	Sarah Williams	6	Flood risk assessment data was obtained for Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall during their Neighbourhood Plan preparation periods. The data places limits on what can be housing development built without risk. This needs to be continued to be acknowledged	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD903	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero Developments (Robert Pearson)	11	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington Supports the efficient use of land, however the introduction of a District wide minimum density standard is not supported. Necessary for sites to be considered on a site by site basis. Lichfield District is diverse in terms of housing density across the District therefore if density standards are incorporated then these should be minimum standards determined by reference to the character of the local area and housing mix as determined by local needs and Neighbourhood Plan policies.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD904	Sarah Williams	7	Housing growth should not increase pollution. New rail station for A38 corridor required to reduce traffic from strategic housing proposal.	Comments noted.
POPD905	Sarah Williams	8	Greatest opportunity is to electrify the railway line north east of Lichfield	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD906	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero Developments (Robert Pearson)	12	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington NPPF supports policies which would plan for a mix of housing based on the needs of different groups in community, including people wishing to commission or build their own homes. Czero consider that proposed policy direction is only aimed at meeting the Councils minimum legal requirements and does not seek to promote and boost Custom Build numbers in the area and provides little support for Custom Build enablers to help deliver greater numbers. Lichfield's self build register is currently identified as having 34 people but CZero consider this significantly understates the current market demand and provides no measure for potential demand. CZero have 28 registrations for one site of 10 plots in Whittington. This has not been marketed to the general public so the registrations are just from local consultation listing on Czeros web site. Recommended that sites are specifically allocated as self-build / custom build housing sites within the LPR document.	Comments noted. The Council maintains a self build register and monitors demand for self build plots within the District in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD907	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero Developments (Robert Pearson)	Chapter 20	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington Whilst Czero broadly agrees with the factors presented as being key in informing the spatial distribution of growth, in respect of Green Belt the purposes should be assessed at the site level from the earliest possible stage rather than across broad parcels of land. It should be clear that the assessment of residential options is separate from the SA process. Spatial distribution mainly accords with Option 2. This combined option is considered to be appropriate option for delivering housing growth across the District and would allow a range of sites to come forward. SA notes that this option cumulatively will have positive effects on the SA objectives. Supports the preferred option for housing growth. A key advantage will be that it will be able to meet housing needs close to where they arise and provide housing in sustainable locations. This will assist with meeting a number of the strategic objectives and priorities. Noted many settlements identified in the preferred option are Green Belt, therefore to deliver the spatial distribution consideration should be given to the release of Green Belt sites on the edge of settlements to provide long term options for housing and employment growth. Welcome reference to the need to consider Green Belt boundaries in some locations. Whilst the detail of changes could be made through neighbourhood plans, it is strongly suggested that these boundaries should be re-defined as necessary through the review process. Considered the delivery of a new settlement would have a number of disbenefits requiring significant investment in new infrastructure, long lead in times. There is scope for a wide range of sites to be spread across the District without the need to rely on the possible inclusion of a new settlement.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. Site specific suggestions will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. The SA processes is interactive with the Local Plan Review process.
POPD908	Sarah Williams	9	The preferred policy direction is not comprehensive. It doesn't identify requirements from West Mids Housing Market area, Green Belt review or brownfield analysis	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review, Urban Capacity Assessment and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD909	Sarah Williams	10	The recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying affordable and market needs at the neighbourhood level with agreed house sizes and bedroom mix ratios should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of any preferred direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD910	Sarah Williams	11	Recognition of neighbourhood plans in identifying the appropriate density at the neighbourhood plan level should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of the policy direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD911	Sarah Williams	12	A register would assist those who wish to build their own home	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD912	Sarah Williams	13	LDC has not met its targets. The gap in planning and provision has impacted on Stonnall area. Important that the new criteria in respect of the A5 and A38 corridors do actually enable a proactive approach to provision. The criteria doesn't say how this will be done, so clarification is required.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD913	Sarah Williams	14	Employment and economic development focus on Lichfield City, Burntwood and Fradley Park is welcome. LDC employment policy should be further strengthened by identifying what the council will do to support the older employment areas which have larger industrial uses that have a challenging long term future. Shenstone industrial estate for example. Need for incentives for those wishing to relocate.	Duly Noted The Employment Land availability assessment (ELAA) will direct policy direction in addition the Our Spatial strategy will consider future housing locations. The Preferred policy direction; Our employment and economic development "seeks to maintain and enhance a diverse local economy and encourage opportunities for inward investment."
POPD914	Sarah Williams	15	While a rural centre, this does not automatically justify growth capacity,	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD915	Sarah Williams	17	Greenfield amenity land adding to overall well-being should not be considered for housing.	Noted
POPD916	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	1	Note Vision remains broadly the same as adopted and considers remains relevant	Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD917	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	2	Remain broadly the same but notes the specific references to particular settlements. In terms of Objective 6 notes that this has been updated as previously only made reference to need in Lichfield residents - reflects comments made in previous re- include housing market area. Note Objective 6 removes reference to just Lichfield residents this is welcomes but maintain that this should be strengthened to refer to GBHMA. Fundamental need fulfil duty to cooperate and this should be made explicit.	Comments noted .The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated. The need for wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate. Duty to cooperate is referenced elsewhere in the document and is a legal requirement .
POPD918	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	3	Spatial Strategy: Scope Issues Options concluded need for significant amendments or replacement via review process. LPS strategy concentrates growth to the most sustainable settlements particular focus on Lichfield Burntwood key settlements service villages areas close to neighbouring authorities - WBD support the continuation of this strategy and may be appropriate to include other sustainable rural settlements to benefit from proportionate housing growth. A focus on sustainable locations would be the primary driver for influencing the spatial strategy. Note that the evidence has been updated. Settlement Sustainability Study Oct 2018 recognises a significant disparity in the level of services and facilities concludes Fradley is one the most sustainable rural settlement in the District classifying it as a Level 3 - Larger Service Village with a comparative overall score of 10 one of the sixth most sustainable settlements in the District, along with Alrewas and Whittington. Note Made Neighbourhood Plan for Fradley makes that further sports recreation and community are proposed in Fradley which will enhance sustainability further. WBD support outcomes identified for Fradley in the Settlement Sustainability Study 2018 and support the identification of Fradley as a level 3 settlement within the hierarchy. WBD consider the preferred policy direction for the spatial strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy would result in the delivery of suitable development. Clear that the level of growth required within the District to 2036 would require a number of sustainable extensions to existing settlements including Fradley as opportunities for development within the existing settlement boundary are both limited and finite.	Comments and support for the continuation of the strategy noted. Comments related to the Settlement Sustainability Study for Fradley noted.
POPD919	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	20	Any area of environmental merit has been identified in neighbourhood plans. The strategy should recognise the contribution of neighbourhood plans.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment /contribute.
POPD920	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	9	<p>Government has confirmed the use of 2014 sub national household projections to provide the demographic baseline for the short term. The baseline figure represents a minimum and does not account for additional housing demand or meeting neighbouring authorities needs.</p> <p>Support the intention to undertake a HEDNA and this could consider whether there is a justified alternative to the standard method for calculating need a local level. It is not clear how the figure of 4,500 dwellings presented within the Preferred Options document as 'Option 5' has been derived. Assuming a mid point for the provision of two urban extension would result in a housing requirement that includes 9,000 dwellings (450 dpa) towards wider shortfalls from the GBHMA. Therefore, at present Option 5 only assumes one of the three identified areas of search to be tested. Concerned with the inconsistent approach to meeting the identified housing shortfall being taken through the local plan reviews within the GBBCHMA. Compares approaches taken by South Staffs DC and Cannock Chase DC. If a consistent approach were taken by Lichfield the following contribution towards meeting GBBCHMA shortfall would need to be taken - 10,000 dwellings in respect of the new settlement recommended area of search and 3,000 dwellings in respect of sustainable urban extension recommended areas. Concerned the option of Local Housing Need plus 13000 consistent with the approach taken in other emerging Local Plans is not considered within the document.</p> <p>Whilst it is welcomed that the Council is looking to contribute towards the delivery of unmet housing need of the GBHMA the LPR needs to include a more definite commitment to accommodating development rather than simply committing to a 'test' as the Local Plan is formulated. The contribution should not be an aspiration but an integral element of the overall housing requirement. LDC should test an option that would equate to meeting local housing need, plus the minimum requirement of the recommended areas of search within the Strategic Growth Study.</p> <p>LDC should test an option that would equate to meeting local needs plus minimum requirement of the recommended areas of search within the Strategic Growth Study this would equate to 19,660.</p>	Comments and suggestions noted.Table 14.2 sets out the housing requirement options and explains each option in detail. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD921	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	10	WBD submit that housing mix should be guided by market signals and defined within the SHMA which should be routinely updated across the plan period. Local Plan should not establish a District mix, recognising, different sub market housing areas, change over plan period, site specific conditions. Housing mix need in Lichfield will only form part of the need key consideration is that housing need from outside the district will require a different housing mix. specified mix for all development	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD922	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	11	Support efficient use of land, does not support district wide minimum density standard sites should be considered individually regard to local character context and other planning considerations. Lichfield is diverse in terms of housing density - if standards are incorporated should be seen as minimum-variety of standards for different locations.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD923	Sarah Williams	21	The provision of high-quality housing development is being reduced by the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in that (i) the consultation on what the Lichfield CIL strategy is to invest in is not open to broad, regular consultation about quality priorities, and (ii) the CIL introduction has limited the developers resources left for Section 106 contributions to add quality improvements when a specific housing development is approved.	
POPD924	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	Whole Document	Residential Growth Options: Should be made clear in the Preferred Options document assessment is different to the Sustainability Appraisal. SA which accompanies the Preferred Options states that the Councils identification of a Preferred Option for Growth is based on the findings of the SA. Preferred Option SA notes the cumulatively this will have a positive effect on the SA objectives and result in a critical mass tof development enabling contributions to community and transport infrastructure. Consider the preferred options will bring forward a number of benefits including consolidating the sustainability of existing settlements and contribute to the creation of a balanced and sustainable communities - assisting in achieving Objective 1. However due to GBBCHMA council need to increase housing numbers accordingly . therefore LP should consider all options that would be required to deliver Lichfield share of BBCHMA. Preferred options key advantage would enable delivery of a wide range of housing types and tenures mix in line with Objective 6. Preferred Option wide housing choice in sustainable locations recommended by Growth Study. Help maintain services and facilities. Preferred Options would assist in delivering Objective 2 including Fradley helping to delivery houses and maintain settlements improving transport and services. Increase the opportunities for sustainable travel and assist in delivering Objective 3,4, and 5. Preferred option increase opportunities to delivery green space Objective 11. Preferred option enable the reuse of brownfield land within urban areasutilising existing infrastructure may also enable protection and enhancement of historic environment Objective 12. Therefore consider Preferred Growth Options offers a variety of benefits and will assist in achieving many of the Objectives and assist in sustaible development.	Comments and preferences relating to residential options noted. The consultation document sets out the option assessment assumptions in Table 4.1 and specifies that this is a high level assessment considering other factors including the SA. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of plan process. The District Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities within the HMA as part of the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD925	Sarah Williams	22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan. This should be a stated recommendation	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the local plan.
POPD926	Sarah Williams	23	This question is about how Lichfield protects local heritage and the answer is for neighbourhood plans to have a stronger role	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD927	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	Whole Document	Promoting site north of Bassetts Pole for Strategic employment. Supports LDC in review of LP, but the review must consider employment needs, to ensure flexibility of supply and meet croos boundary needs. The West Midlands Strategic Employment Study will be important to understand Market signals for growth and demand across the region. The Local Plan review must be extended to consider this issue. In conclusion , the review is supported, it will be necessary to accomodate future employment growth with a range of sites. Level of growth should be firstly established and then consideration given to new sites including Bassetts Pole. GB review should include further appraisal of sites including Basette Pole site	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD928	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero	5	<p>Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington</p> <p>Noted that CfSH has been withdrawn however BREEAM can still be used for new residential and other buildings/ There is no mandatory requirement for such an assessment and therefore it should be left to the discretion of he developer rather than included within local planning policy. Reference paragraph 150 b) of the NPPF. Agree that the proposed approach of not replacing this policy to set local sustainability standards is appropriate.</p> <p>Support approach towards identifying locations for renewable energy developments on the local plan map. Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Capacity study is omitted from Appendix A.</p>	Comments in relation to BREEAM and preferences towards the proposed approach noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD929	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero	6	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington The preferred policy direction for flood risk is appropriate and in line with national planning policy guidance.	Comments noted
POPD930	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero	7	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington The preferred policy direction for air quality is appropriate and in line with national planning policy guidance.	Support noted.
POPD931	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero	8	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington Approach of updating Sustainable Transport policy to reflect key transport schemes and priorities for the district is fully supported. Considers that proposals which include provision for electric car charging points should be considered favourably	Duly Noted ,
POPD932	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero	14	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington Policy should consider live work units as an exception in rural areas	Duly Noted
POPD933	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero	20	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington Green Belt is not a natural resource but an artificial constraint and therefore should not be included within a policy on natural resources. It is agreed countryside is a natural resource and an area irrespective of whether it lies in Green Belt, it is considered that a policy which seeks to impose a blanket protection for the countryside does not comply with national guidance. Landscapes Institutes References recent caselaw regarding the meaning of valued in relation to landscapes. The GLVIA identifies various factors that may be relevant in the assessment of landscape value. The preferred policy direction implies all landscapes / countryside is valued. This is not justified or evidenced against the GLVIA criteria and if all landscape / countryside demonstrated the same qualities it would be valued as these would be the inherent 'norm' or baseline.	Noted
POPD934	Fusion Building Consultancy Ltd (Pegasus)	Whole Document	The POPD identified 2 alternative options. One on expansion of existing employment sites and other considering new employment locations. Preferred approach focusses on existing employment areas. Support review but consider employment land should be located adj Drayton Manor to ensure flexibility of supply and meet cross boundary needs.	Comments and preferences noted
POPD935	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	1	Vision supported in terms of meeting the needs of the district, but needs to be more ambitious. Should commit to have more than just 'have regard' to the needs arising from within the market area and look to boost economic links with the sub-region to create prosperity.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues.
POPD936	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero	21	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington Policy direction appropriately includes reference to the five spires of Lichfield City and Czero agrees that important views containing these spires should be protected through planning policy.	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD937	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero	22	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington. Propose that custom build sites use a design code to ensure a high quality sustainable development. Czero have provided significant amounts of information through the Development Plan Process including an illustrative masterplan within the Whittington Site Proposals document to demonstrate that the proposed scheme is deliverable. The proposed development on Common Lane would facilitate an improvement to the built environment in the southern part of the village within the same ownership, could be utilised as potential parking area for school traffic.	Comments noted
POPD938	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	2	POPD Strategic Objectives & priorities remain broadly relevant, but need to recognise other strategic priorities which will include cross boundary issues. Suggest amendment to SO's and Ps 7 and 8 placing greater emphasis on the promotion of economic prosperity for the district by seeking opportunities to meet cross-boundary needs and attract regional investment. Site promoted could fulfill role	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities through the duty to cooperate.
POPD939	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero	23	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington. It is considered that the requirement for a heritage statement should be included within validation guidance rather than be enshrined in Local Plan Policy.	Noted. The requirement for a heritage statement is currently a requirement of the local validation process.
POPD940	Pegasus (Liz Boden) on behalf of Czero	Whole Document	Promotes land west of Common Lane, Whittington Agree the vision and strategic priorities remain broadly relevant. Regards to housing requirement option concerned the options test 13,000 dwellings has not been included. An option to test local need plus minimum requirement recommended from strategic study should be tested. Support the preferred growth option. Whittington is a sustainable settlement and its status as a Level 3 settlement is fully supported. In order to accommodate growth a Green Belt review should be undertaken. Land west of Common Lane, Whittington is within the control of Czero and would contribute to meeting housing needs within the village especially for custom build units and able to deliver 10 dwellings. There are no known constraints.	Comments and preferences noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a HEDNA which will test the preferred growth scenarios. The evidence base will inform the next stages of the local plan.
POPD941	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	3	Employment growth should be located close to the greatest source of labour and skills. Promoted site is suited. Recognised lies in GB. GB evidence update needed for proposed changes in settlement hierarchy, but also as no GB assessment of site has been included. Consider there are special circumstances for site release to meet housing requirements and deliver cross-boundary needs. Support for identified settlement hierarchy but also need to consider strategy should allow for provision of wide choice of employment sites for local and in-coming businesses.	Comments noted. Chapter 15 sets out the preferred approach towards employment growth. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD942	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	14	Policy direction supported in part, but LPR should consider options for meeting cross boundary employment needs eg Birmingham & Tamworth. Preferred direction has been determined prior to the overall level of jobs employment land required to 2036 being established. Whilst HENA planned, its premature to determine the spatial strategy for employment in balancing housing and employment growth as more sites may be required. Consider full replacement ELR required not just update. Should consider 2016 jobs data. Should consider past trends and policy on scenarios. GB review should include land north of Bassetts Pole. Regarding Employment Growth Options, broadly agree with factors informing spatial distribution of growth but green belt purposes should be assessed at site level rather than across broad parcels of land or options due to site specific factors. Should also make clear high level assessment is separate to SA process. Focus for new employment on existing areas could lead to increased trips, less sustainable forms of transport and additional commuting and not deliver quantum of land required. Negatives noted for heritage and ecology of Lichfield, Burntwood and Fradley. More sites would lessen impact on these 3 areas. Level of need should be established ahead of strategy. For the Employment Land Availability Assessment to conclude land at Bassetts Pole is not available simply because it is in the Green belt without any GB assessment would be unsound.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs.
POPD943	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	4	Consider Preferred Policy approach to be reflective of national planning policy	Comments noted.
POPD944	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	5	Code from Sustainable Homes has been withdrawn, BREEAM can still be used for new residential as well as other buildings. However not mandatory therefore should be left to the discretion of the developer, further para 150b of NPPF is reflect of this stance.	Comments in relation to BREEAM and preferences towards the proposed approach noted.
POPD945	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	6	Policy Appropriate and in line with National planning policy guidance.	Comments noted
POPD946	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	7	Policy appropriate and in line with National planning policy guidance.	Support noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD947	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	8	WBD in agreement with preferred approach once the evidence base has been updated.	Duly Noted
POPD948	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	17	It is considered that Hay End Lane Phase Two offers considerable opportunities to meet the aspirations of the local community by providing new recreational facilities in the form of a cricket field and sports pitch. Full details Appendix 2.	Noted
POPD949	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	20	Green Belt is not a natural resource but an artificial constraint and therefore should not be included within a policy on natural resources. It is agreed countryside is a natural resource and an area irrespective of whether it lies in Green Belt, it is considered that a policy which seeks to impose a blanket protection for the countryside does not comply with national guidance. Landscapes Institutes References recent caselaw regarding the meaning of valued in relation to landscapes. The GLVIA identifies various factors that may be relevant in the assessment of landscape value. The preferred policy direction implies all landscapes / countryside is valued. This is not justified or evidenced against the GLVIA criteria and if all landscape / countryside demonstrated the same qualities it would be valued as these would be the inherent 'norm' or baseline.	Noted
POPD950	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	21	Policy direction appropriately includes reference to the five spires of Lichfield City and Czero agrees that important views containing these spires should be protected through planning policy.	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD951	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	22	Requiring a masterplan for all small and medium scale developments to onerous and may actually slow done the development process. However in practice illustrative schemes are often produced to as site at pre app - should be done on a site by site basis and not as a policy requirement. WBD has significant amounts of information through the Development plan Process including Appendix 2 to demonstrate that the proposed scheme is deliverable. The community of Fradley has identified that it would benefit from development which would bring forward sports and community facilities as is proposed in Hay End Lane Phase 2 site - in line with Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process.
POPD952	Pegasus (David Onions) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	23	Evidence should be included in validation guidance rather than be enshrined in policy.	Noted. The requirement for a heritage statement is currently a requirement of the local validation process.
POPD953	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	4	Supported.	Noted
POPD954	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	5	BREEAM sustainability assessment of development in line with government approach should be left to discretion of the developer, therefore approach of not replacing the policy to set local sustianability standards is appropriate. With regard to renewable energy approach is supported. Intention to commision new study noted. Appendix A referred to regarding timescales, but then is omitted from appendix A.	Comments in relation to BREEAM and preferences towards the proposed approach noted.
POPD955	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	6	Supported	Support noted
POPD956	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	7	Supported	Support noted.
POPD957	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	8	Supported once evidence base updated	Duly Noted
POPD958	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	20	Green Belt is not a natural resource but an artificial constraint and therefore should not be included within a policy on natural resources. It is agreed countryside is a natural resource and an area irrespective of whether it lies in Green Belt, it is considered that a policy which seeks to impose a blanket protection for the countryside does not comply with national guidance. Landscapes Institutes References recent caselaw regarding the meaning of valued in relation to landscapes. The GLVIA identifies various factors that may be relevant in the assessment of landscape value. The preferred policy direction implies all landscapes / countryside is valued. This is not justified or evidenced against the GLVIA criteria and if all landscape / countryside demonstrated the same qualities it would be valued as these would be the inherent 'norm' or baseline.	Noted
POPD959	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	22	Requiring a masterplan for all small and medium scale developments to onerous and may actually slow done the development process. However in practice illustrative schemes are often produced to as site at pre app - should be done on a site by site bases and not as a policy requirement. WBD has significant amounts of information through the Development plan Process including Appendix 2 to demonstrate that the proposed scheme is deliverable. The community of Fradley jas identified that it would benefit from development which would bring forward sports and community facilities as is proposed in Hay End Lane Phase 2 site - in line with Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process.
POPD960	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	1	Support.	Noted
POPD961	michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	2	Generally support, suggest amendments to Strategic Objective & Priority 1 & 4 . Policy 1 - wording should be expanded to include ref to the potential for new development in proximity to existing settlements in neighbouring authorities. Policy 4 should be expanded to include reference to the opportunity for development being able to fund improvements to existing infrastructure, including where appropriate adjacent to Lichfield District.	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. The role of neighbouring settlements is identified in the settlement hierarchy in chapter 10 and will be considered as part of the duty to cooperate process.
POPD962	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	3	Support hierarchy but should focus particuarly on where unmet need from neighbouring authorities could be delivered within Lichfield District. Where this is the case, sustianable locations close to the boundary of the district should be considered where thy look to be provided as part of the delivery of housing need form adj authorities. Particularly where access to existing services and facilities are available. Suggests land north of Birmingham / Sutton Coldfield around Blake Street Station.	Comments and support for settlement hierarchy noted.
POPD963	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	4	Generally agree with preferred policy. Policy should take account of cross boundary opportunities to support development on edge of district. Can realise sustianable development.	Comments noted.
POPD964	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	8	Broadly agree . Development in locations north of Birmingham / Sutton Coldfield should be promoted as can use existing infrastrucutre and make improvements. Blake St station highlighted in Lichfield Transport Strategy. Consider opportunites to connect into sustainable transport infrastructure on edge / outside district should be taken into account.	Duly Noted and further referance Preferred strategic policy: Sustainable development priciples.
POPD965	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	9	Broadly agree. Policy should be amended to make clear that a priority in relation to housing provision should be the provsion of housing to provide unmet need from neighbouring Las. Or wider Birmingham HMA.	Comments noted. The preferred policy direction makes reference to understanding and underpinning local housing need for the distrct and the level of housing to be accommodated to assist in meeting the unmet needs arising from the HMA. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD966	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	10	Support, however, we would like to see clearer evidence that housing mix including homes to meet specific needs will be considered on a site by site basis, rather than a blanket approach being applied.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD967	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	11	Disagree, density should be considred on a site by site basis. Policy should be less onerous to allow for information on the types of housing to be provided to be set out at the application stage to allow for characteristics of individual sites. Recongition should be given to range of site constraints and opportunities before site density for future development confirmed.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD968	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	12	Broadly supportive. Concern on large allocations control by single developer risk could slow down delivery. Also practical issues mean onerous requirement on larger strategic sites. Provision should be left to discretion of the developer based on market trends. On larger sites, should be left to developer's discretion. Council could idnetify specific sites or smaller sites where opportunities made be more deliverable or better managed.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD969	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	22	Support the requirement for masterplans, but should be flexible to ensure decsion on detail can be taken at outline and RM application stages	
POPD970	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	Chapter 19	Support reference of land to the north of Little Aston / Sutton Coldfield under Residential Growth Options 1 and 2 being identified as a “potential other option”, and would like to emphasise that the proposals for bringing land forward in this area remain flexible. Option 3 could include land to the north of Little Aston / Sutton Coldfield in the dispersed growth option.	Comments and preferences noted. Comments regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review.
POPD971	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd	Chapter 20	Support reference of land to the north of Little Aston / Sutton Coldfield under Residential Growth Options 1 and 2 being identified as a “potential other option”, and would like to emphasise that the proposals for bringing land forward in this area remain flexible. Option 3 could include land to the north of Little Aston / Sutton Coldfield in the sispersed growth option.	Comments and preferences noted. Specifc sites will be considered as part of the local plan review process.
POPD972	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	Whole Document	Rep to support site at Plantation Lane, Fazeley framed within context of Para 35 of NPPF. Support continuing review. To deliver a broadly consistent vision and strategic priorities, Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill should accommodate growth to consolidate the sustainability of the village and ensure locally derieved housing needs are met to assist infrastrucure needs. Concern there is an inconsitent approach compared to other plans re housing requirement options as option to test 13,000 houses not included. Supports Council's preferred growth option. Supports Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill as level 3 settlement. Need to review GB around settlement to meet Greater Birmingham and Black Country Shortfall. Site will not fundamentally undermine purpose of GB. Site proposals and merits outlined.Vision document attached.	Comments and support for Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill as a Level 3 settlement noted.
POPD973	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	1	Supported	Noted
POPD974	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	2	Note updated Strategic priorities remove reference to particular settlements. SO &P 6 should be amended to also refer to meeting unmet housing need in wider Birmingham and Black Country HMAs. Welcome approach removing ref to just Lichfield District Resideents and broadened to include existng and new residents. Supports evidence and identification of Fazeley/Mile Oak and Bonehill in the settlement hierarchy. Notes Tamworth inserted after Burntwood highlights relevant to district.	Comments noted .The need for wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate
POPD975	Pegasus (Mark Dauncey) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	Whole Document	Promotes land off Lynn Lane. Identified in Appendix 1, approx. 80 houses 2.62 hectares. Rep is framed of the Local Plans including the Allocations Documents to be legally compliant and sound. Also gives consideration to the legal and procedural requirements associated with the plan - making process.	Noted
POPD976	Pegasus (Mark Dauncey) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	Whole Document	Support the review of the Local Plan to 2036, this is in line with the NPPF and will ensure and up to date plan to support growth and meet future development needs. However also consider that the review must consider employment land needs to ensure flexibility of supply and meet cross boundary needs. Aware That Avison Young have been commissioned by Staffordshire County Council to pull together the West Midlands strategic Employment Study. This work will be important to understand market signals for growth and demand across the region. The scope of the Local Plan Review therefore must be extended to consider this issue.	Comments and support for timescale noted.
POPD977	Pegasus (Mark Dauncey) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	1	The vision needs to be more ambitious. It should commit to have more regard to the needs arising from within the market areas and look to boost economic links with the sub region which in turn will create prosperity across the District.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD978	Pegasus (Mark Dauncey) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	2	There needs to be recognition of other strategic priorities which will include cross-boundary issues e.g. meeting housing and employment needs. Amendment to strategic Objective & Priorities 7 & 8 placing greater emphasis on the promotion economic prosperity for the District. Land Identified in Appendix 1 south of Lynn Lane could accommodate employment which would create new employment opportunities and enable a thriving economy for the District and meeting strategic employment needs. Objective 6 notes that this has been updated to include existing and new residents which is welcomes but we maintain that this should be strengthened to refer to meeting the unmet housing needs of the GBHMA.	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated. The need for wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document.The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities through the duty to cooperate to address cross boundary issues.
POPD979	Pegasus (Mark Dauncey) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	3	Supports the outcomes of the Settlement Sustainability Study Oct 2018 - outcomes for Shenstone identified as a Level 3 settlement within the Settlement Sustainability Study. Agree preferred policy direction of the spatial strategy would result in the delivery of sustainable development. Clear the level of growth required would require a number of sustainable extensions to existing settlements including Shenstone. Recognised that land outside the current settlement boundary of Shenstone includes land within the West Midlands Green Belt. Vitally important to update the evidence in light of the proposed changes to the Settlement Hierarchy and development Strategy i.e. meeting GBHMA needs. NPPF para 136 clear Green Belt boundaries can only be amended in exceptional circumstances, these are not defined but are a matter for decision matters to determine using sound planning judgement. Their view that alterations to Green Belt are fully justified. Established that there is s need to meet growth in respect of market and affordable hosing which is an exceptional circumstance to amend Green Belt applicable to Lichfield 60% Green Belt. Given Shenstone is excellent rail and road connections with the conurbation it is ideally suited to meeting cross boundary housing and employment needs. Contend that there is no alternative settlement hierarchy that the Council could consider, reflects sustainability of existing settlements with the District and forms an effective tool to determine the appropriate apportionment of growth across District to 2036.	Comments and support for the preferred spatial strategy noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD980	Pegasus (Mark Dauncey) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd	9	The baseline figure represents a minimum figure and does not account for housing demand related to economic growth, or meeting housing need arising from GBBCHMA authorities. Preferred Options standard methods - 333 dwellings but PPG 2a-003-20190220 identified that a justified alternative can be used for plan making. Support ref in para 14.00 intention to complete a housing and economic development needs assessment - can be consideration as a justified alternative to the standard methods for calculating need at the local level. Option 1 Unsound and fails to recognise established and evidenced cross boundary needs. Option 2 reflecting past rates into the future is not sound and would compound existing issues of undersupply and would not meet the government objective - significantly boosting the supply of homes. Option 3 - broadly reflects the Local Plan requirement which does not reflect an appropriate quantum of growth to 2036. Option 4- 3,000 as a reasonable significant contribution towards the unmet need this statement is disputed as this figure represents less than 5% of the unmet need arising from the GBBCHMA. Option 5 questions if those option provides a mid-point for the two recommended areas of search for urban extensions. In addition fail to take account of the recommended area of search for a new settlement identified within the Strategic Growth Study. Option 6 - it doesn't represent a mid - point in the scale range in line with option 5 a mid point in the range for a new settlement would equate to 12,500 additional dwellings plus services and employment. Option 7 - equates to a mid point in the range for the urban extension and a minimum level of growth at a new settlement options as identified within the Strategic Growth Study. GBBCHMA identifies three areas of further search North of Tamworth, urban extension east of Lichfield new settlement Shenstone. Two urban extension areas are considered to have potential to deliver 1,500 and 7,500 dwelling new settlement 10,000 to 15,000 dwellings subject to further testing. Not clear how 4,500 presents (option 5) has been derived. Assuming a mid point requirement 9,000 450dpa towards wider shortfall - there fore at present Option 5 only assumes one of the three identified areas of search is to be tested. Smith Brother Farms is concerned that an inconsistent approach to meeting housing shortfall as across GBBCHMA. South Staffs proposing 4,000 dwellings based a upon the minimum levels of growth, Cannock Chase a similar approach and recognise that this approach would only work if all LPA in the HMA adopt a complementary approach - no agreement to date. if a consistent approach were to be taken in Lichfield = 10,000 new settlement 3,000 two sustainable urban extensions towards HMA. Concerned that the option of Local housing need plus 13,000 consistent with the approach taken in other emerging Local Plan within Staffordshire has not identified and considered. Concerned, 3,000 and 4,500 identified in Options 4 and 5 fail to take account of opportunities that are present within Lichfield - well located and free of significant physical and environmental constraints. Welcome that Lichfield is looking to contribute to GBHMA require a more definite commitment to accommodating development rather an simply committing to testing, contribution should not be an aspiration should form an integral element of the overall housing requirement. To ensure consistency with other emerging plans it is contended that Lichfield should test an option that would equate to meeting local needs plus the minimum requirement of the recommended areas of search within the SGS.	Comments and suggestions noted.Table 14.2 sets out the housing requirement options and explains each option in detail. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD981	Lichfield Civic Society	1	Vision should include protecting the Green Belt because it forms a vital part of the character of the District. Suggests additional wording.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD982	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	3	Supports. Level of growth to 2036 will require a number of sustainable extensions including Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill. Need for GB review update. Consider there are exceptional circumstances for removing land from the GB related to necessary growth of market and affordable housing, sustainable patterns of growth, only way to achieve proportionate growth and would assist in supporting existing and proposed services and facilities and improved infrastructure.	Comments and support for preferred spatial strategy noted.
POPD983	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	9	Notes updated PPG is a baseline figure not accounting for economic growth and housing need from GBBCHMA. HEDNA supported. Reviews the options. Considered Options 1 to 3 not sufficient. Disputes the 3000 additional dwellings are a reasonably significant contribution towards the unmet need. Represents less than 5% of the unmet need from GB&BCHMA. Disputes 4,500 additional dwellings is mid point in the range for the two recommended areas of search for urban extensions and fails to take account of the recommended area of search for a new settlement within SGS. Option 6 does not represent a mid point in the scale range in line with option 5.. A mid point would be 12,500. GBBCHMA Strategic Growth study identified 3 areas of search. Not clear how figure of 4500 as option 5 derived. Assumes only one area of search tested. Inconsistent with approach of other LAs, eg South Staffs and Cannock Chase. Consistent approach would suggest option of Local Housing Need plus minimum requirement of recommended areas of search in the SGS = 13,000. Concern 3000 to 4500 in options 4 and 5 fail to take account of opportunities to boost supply given strong geographical relationship with the adjoining major urban area of Birmingham and the Black Country and as free of physical and environmental constraints. Need to commit to accommodate development not just commit to a test as the plan is formulated.	Comments and suggestions noted. Table 14.2 sets out the housing requirement options and explains each option in detail. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD984	Lichfield Civic Society	2	Meeting the needs of an ageing population should be an explicit strategic objective. In considering policy alternatives, the deliverability of the Plan is critical. The Plan should address the supply of residential land to boost housing delivery when economic factors are restricting demand and capping the capacity of the market to absorb new homes. If more inward migration is to be encouraged, especially to address unmet housing needs, then the plan should address the feasibility of delivering new homes at reasonable prices relative to household incomes of inward migrants. Suggested wording change to strategic objective and priority 1	Comments noted
POPD985	Lichfield Civic Society	3	Great concern at option 1. Approach fails to develop a long term strategy for development within the District. It simply continues a trend of repeating previous policy and enlarging the City continuously, this ignores the critical issues raised in para 6.5 and brings pressure to remove Green Belt areas for development. Most critical issues from para 6.5 for Lichfield City are: 'protection of the character of the city from large scale development; limited supply of sites for development within the existing urban area including brownfield sites; existing social infrastructure including health provision and secondary school provision is unlikely to be able to accommodate further growth of the city' Also failure to acknowledge current levels of congestion. Option 2 not supported as with option 1 it would place unacceptable development pressure on Lichfield City. Cannot support option 3 as it would lead to sprawl, widespread harm to the character of the countryside and increased private vehicle usage to unacceptable levels. Service infrastructure provision at a proliferation of locations would be both uneconomic and impracticable. Option 4 should be given renewed consideration. As well as Brookhays, there is potential for a new or extended settlement to include areas of land adjoining Fradley and Alrewas. Strong view that release of Green Belt should only be considered when all potential non-Green Belt locations have been fully appraised. When Green Belt review is undertaken review will need to be tested against the expressed purposes of Green Belt. LCS consider the areas of Green Belt adjoining Lichfield City are vitally important and satisfy the requirements of the purposes, not least in relation to the protection and safeguarding of an historic town.	Comments and support for option 4 is noted.
POPD986	Lichfield Civic Society	4	Add phrase 'and waste storage containers' to 11th bullet point.	Comments and suggested amendment to wording noted
POPD987	Lichfield Civic Society	7	Support the inclusion of a policy. Policy could consider the need for and benefits of smoke control areas.	Support noted.
POPD988	Lichfield Civic Society	9	Little point setting housing targets which are justified in theory but undeliverable in practice. Should include proposals to prepare an action plan to address under delivery. In order to meet the pre 2000 delivery rates house prices in Lichfield would have to fall by about 30% and to encourage outward migration from Birmingham would also require a substantial fall in the price of new homes as Birmingham house prices (relative to earnings) are 50% lower than in Lichfield. This limits the District's ability to meet Birmingham's housing needs.	Comments noted. The next stages of the local plan will be informed by a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. In addition, the Local Plan Review will be informed by a range of evidence to ensure any housing targets are deliverable including a SHLAA.
POPD989	Lichfield Civic Society	10	Agree with sentiments expressed. Society expects that the macro economic environment will not support substantial increases in house building. See response to questions 2 and 11.	Comments noted.
POPD990	Lichfield Civic Society	11	Agree that the housing needs of ageing population mean that smaller homes should be increased substantially and should lead to a rise in housing density. Higher density may facilitate the redevelopment of smaller sites, especially brownfield sites in urban locations and will reduce the extent of new land allocations and may avoid further releases from the Green Belt. However - higher density may impact upon the historic environment and profit margins are higher on larger homes so to maintain economic viability developer contributions for schools etc would have to be reduced on high density developments. Examples of density policies from provided.	Comments and examples noted.
POPD991	Lichfield Civic Society	14	Considers there is a strong disconnect between creating jobs and developing 80 hectares of land with a shrinking workforce, falling inward migration due to unaffordable house prices and consumers and retailers moving online, i.e. away from the high street. Office accommodation - scale of need questioned and should be reduced. New employment allocations should not involve the release of sites in the Green Belt. Retail evidence - serious reservations about the conclusions of the report regarding potential demand from retailers being significantly overstated. Commercial to residential conversions - LCS expects surplus in employment land will drive planning applications to convert from employment to residential use which could provide a significant additional supply of housing sites.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs.
POPD992	Lichfield Civic Society	20	Support protection of supplies in Policy NR9: Water Quality. Bullet 4 should be amended to read 'water quality and minimisation of its use'	Noted, further detail will be added to the policy in subsequent iterations of the plan.
POPD993	Lichfield Civic Society	Chapter 18	concern that insufficient priority given in policy to unique and special character of the heritage asset of Lichfield City Centre along with overriding need to protect and enhance this character. Various examples of policies used elsewhere are provided and LCS considers there is scope to strengthen the policies on conservation issues. The Plan should define what precisely the heritage assets are, where they are, their character and then relate policies to these elements in order to ensure explicit requirements to preserve and enhance them. The Council should consider the preparation of an Area Action Plan or SPD for Lichfield City Centre and Burntwood Town Centre. As these have the potential to contain more detailed policies which would balance development proposals and environmental safeguards in a more effective manner. It could contain site specific conservation area enhancement policies as well as covering transport and access matters including car parking strategy, pedestrian and cycleway links and it could present the opportunity to improve the workings of the current city centre pedestrianisation. If a new settlement option is selected this could also be suited to an AAP to guide and support development. Note there is local support for an AAP from Burntwood.	The local plan provides a strategic role within a suite of documents that will seek to preserve and enhance heritage assets.
POPD994	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	10	Housing mix should be guided by market signals in line with up to date SHMA. Shouldn't specify mix across the district, instead reflect mix across sub areas, changing need over time and site specifics. Should also meet needs arising across boundaries.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD995	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	11	Does not support district wide minimum density standard. Should be considered on a site by site basis having regard to local character, context and other policy requirements or designations and constraints. If density standards are incorporated, then should be minimum standards determined by character and housing mix. May wish to consider variety of standards for different locations.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD996	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	12	Identification of specific sites for self build and custom build is favoured. Should be specifically allocated.	Comments and preferred approach noted.
POPD997	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	Chapter 20	Broadly agrees with the factors informing spatial distribution of growth but GB should be assessed on site by site basis rather than broad parcels of land due to site specifics. This assessment should be separate to SA process. Option 2 as combined with the dispersed option 3 is appropriate. Support the preferred growth option of the Council. Should consider release of Green Belt land in order to deliver the preferred spatial distribution. Support reference in POPD that there may be instances where there is a need to consider GB boundaries. Consider the delivery of a new settlement option has a number of disadvantages.	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy. The SA processes is interactive with the Local Plan Review process.
POPD998	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	4	Supported	Noted.
POPD999	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	5	code from Sustainable Homes has been withdrawn, BREAM can still be used for new residential as well as other buildings. However not mandatory therefore should be left to the discretion of the developer, further para 150b of NPPF is reflection of this stance. Location for renewable energy developments supported. Para 11.21 of POPD states intention to commission new study. Refers to appendix A but reference to study omitted from Appendix A.	Comments in relation to BREEAM and preferences towards the proposed approach noted.
POPD1000	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	6	Supported	Support noted
POPD1001	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	7	Supported	Support noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1002	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	8	Supported	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1003	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	10	Housing mix to be guided by market signals as defined by SHMA. Local plan should not seek to establish a specified mix for all development across the District - recognises sub housing regions, change over plan period site specific conditions. Housing needs arising from neighbouring authorities should also be a key consideration in the determination of the most appropriate mix	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis.
POPD1004	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	11	Support efficient use of land however a district wide minim density standard is not supported - it is necessary for site by site response. Should be a minimum standard - consider a variety of density standards for different locations.	Comments noted.
POPD1005	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	17	It is considered that the creation of Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) to settlements within Lichfield District will assist in providing green infrastructure, opportunities for the provision of indoor and outdoor sports and recreation facilities, support sustainable transport measures and contribute towards health care facilities, which will encourage healthy lifestyles and thereby assist in tackling obesity.	Noted
POPD1006	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	14	Whilst the component parts of the policy direction is strongly supported the policy goes not to identify that employment growth will be focused on current employment areas. Whilst is logical to meet the needs of the most sustainable settlements in the District the plan needs to consider the needs of Birmingham and Tamworth - this is not considered. The employment distribution has been determined prior to the overall level of jobs and employment land being established. Council committed to needs assessment but consider that in the absence of evidence it is premature to determine the spatial strategy option for employment and the balance of housing and employment. Are may be insufficient land for all need to be addressed in existing employment areas further sites may be required. Employment Evidence Base - Assumed that the Housing and economic needs assessment will replace ELR 2012 and 2014. Smith Brothers maintain that a full replacement of the ELR is required rather than just an update to inform the review. Given that numbers for 2016 are now available a full ELR will need to look at a completely new set of forecasts to gain an up to date picture of jobs growth. If update only forecasts rom 2012/2014 there is significant risk of under estimating employment change and the land requirements. At least two sets of forecasts are required, and baseline review looking at past trends and a policy on scenario which reflects aspirations in Lichfield and West Midlands. Employment evidence is based ion a new set of forecasts to ensure soundness. Green Belt - potential need for additional employment growth beyond existing identified employment areas may require Green Belt boundary changes - supportive it is essential that this comprehensive review is carried out and includes consideration of land south of Lyn Lane Shenstone.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidance that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs.
POPD1007	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	Whole Document	Employment Growth Options - agree with factors presented as being key in informing distribution. In terms of Green Belt should be assessed at site level rather than across broad parcels. It should be made clear that the high level assessment is a separate process to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The Sa concludes that the Preferred Economic options concludes that it would reduce the geographic spread of development and offers the nest opportunities to increase non-car travel. However they consider that focusing employment in existing could increase trip via less sustainable forms and encourage communing. Also increase pressure on existing infrastructure and services it may be that this options alone will not delivery the quantum of land required. The assessment of this option has flagged a negative impact on heritage assets. This will be dependant on location but if new employment locations were added to the strategy than this would lessen the potential of any adverse impacts on these assets. Lynn Lane Flood risk and areas of ecological importance are not constraints to development. Whereas Lichfield Burntwood Fradley are with in the zone of influence of ecological areas also impact on heritage assets . It is the case that new sites such as Lynn Lane within the preferred option would potentially lessen such impacts. para 21.10 to 21.22 Level of growth yet to be defined additional sites may be required strongly contend that the level of employment need should be determined before a spatial strategy is established. Alternative growth options are land at Seedy Mill, Land around Shenstone Employment Area and Land around BAssests Pole. It is considered that this new locations have certain advantages particularly land around Lynn lane Shenstone as this will delivery employment close to strategic transport network accommodate needs within the District and locations means it could meet needs of Tamworth and Birmingham.	Comments and preferences relating to employment options noted. The consultation document sets out the option assessment assumptions in Table 4.1 and specifies that this is a high level assessment considering other factors including the SA. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review, Ecological Appraisal which will inform the next stage of plan process.
POPD1008	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	20	Green Belt is not a natural resource but an artificial constraint and therefore should not be included within a policy on natural resources. It is agreed countryside is a natural resource and an area irrespective of whether it lies in Green Belt, it is considered that a policy which seeks to impose a blanket protection for the countryside does not comply with national guidance. References recent caselaw regarding the meaning of valued in relation to landscapes. The GLVIA identifies various factors that may be relevant in the assessment of landscape value. The preferred policy direction implies all landscapes / countryside is valued. This is not justified or evidenced against the GLVIA criteria and if all landscape / countryside demonstrated the same qualities it would be valued as these would be the inherent 'norm' or baseline.	Noted
POPD1009	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	21	Agrees that important views containing the spires should be protected. Views especially important when approaching Lichfield from the north and west. Policy should make reference accordingly.	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD1010	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	22	Considers reqing a masterplan for all small and medium scale developments is too onerous and may slow development. Improvements to the public realm including the conservation rea for Fazeley and Bonehill could be assisted by development of site at Plantation Lane.	Noted.
POPD1011	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	23	With regard to the preferred policy direction on 'Evidence supporting heritage proposals' it is considered that the requirement for a heritage statement should be included within validation guidance, rather than be enshrined in Local Plan Policy	Noted. The requirement for a heritage statement is currently a requirement of the local validation process.
POPD1012	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	Whole Document	Residential Growth Options: Broadly agree with factors presented in terms of Green Belt. It is submitted that assessment at site level should be completed rather than across broad parcels. Should be made clear that the SA is different process to the assessment. Preferred Option (Option 2) is considered to be an appropriate option for delivering housing growth across District to 2036allow for a range of sustainable sites to come forward. will bring forward a number of benefits including consolidating the exiting settlements achieving Objective 1. delivery a range of housing types Objective 6. Help to maintain services and facilities. Assist in delivering new houses Objective 2. Support rural communities Objective 2 and 3, 4 and 5, 12 and 14. In order to delivery there will been a requirement to release green belt on the edge of settlements (Shenstone) to provide long term options for housing and employment. There is a need to consider Green Belt Boundaries and changes through the Local Plan review. Preferred Option offers a variety of significant benefits which will assist in achieving many if the Councils Objectives and achieve the requirements within the NPPF. Alternative options is to consider a new settlement would have number of dis benfits = significant investment in infrastructure long led in times market saturation - new settlement should not be considered as an isolated solution. Reference to ur comments set out above in the housing requirements options it is however clear that there is scope for a wide range of sites spread across the District in accordance with the settlement hierarchy without the need to rely on the possible inclusion of a new settlement.	Comments and preferences relating to residential options noted. The consultation document sets out the option assessment assumptions in Table 4.1 and specifies that this is a high level assessment considering other factors including the SA. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review, Ecological Appraisal which will inform the next stage of plan process.
POPD1013	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	Whole Document	Promotes site at Coulter Lane Burntwood. Supports Local Plan Review.Supports preferred settlement hierarchy. Should review Green Belt boundary at Burntwood to meet housing needs and shortfall from wider Birmingham and Black Country HMA.Considers LDC taking inconsistent approach compared to other LAs regarding meeting unmet need. Should test option to meet local need plus min requirement of recommendaed areas of search in SGS. Local Need + 13,000.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered by the Local Plan Review.LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing and employment needs. The next stages of the local plan will be informed by a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios.
POPD1014	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	1	Supported	Noted
POPD1015	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	2	Supports Burntwood as level 2 settlement.	Noted
POPD1016	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	3	Supports preferred policy direction. Level growth needs to 2036 requires number of SUEs. Review of GB required as update. Considers there are exceptional circumstances that warrant further release of GB. Nameley allow for necessary growth, fits with sustainable hierarchy, only realistic way of further proportionate growth, assists existing and proposed services.	Comments and support for the policy direction noted.
POPD1017	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	9	Notes updated PPG is a baseline figure not accounting for economic growth and housing need from GBBCHMA. HEDNA supported. Reviews the options . Considered Options 1 to 3 not sufficient. Disputes the 3000 additional dwellings are a reasonbly significant contribution towards the unmet need. Represents less than 5% of the unmet need from GB&BCHMA. Disputes 4,500 additional dwellings is mid point in the range for the two recommended areas of search for urban exnsions and fails to take account of the recommended area of search for a new settlement within SGS. Option 6 does not represent a mid point in the scale range in line with option 5. A mid point would be 12,500. GBBCHMA Strategic Growth study identified 3 areas of search. Not clear how figure of 4500 as option 5 derived. Assumes only one area of search tested. Inconsistent with approach of other LAs, eg South Staffs and Cannock Chase. Consitent approach would suggest option of Local Housing Need plus minimum requirement of recommended areas of search in the SGS = 13,000. Concern 3000 to 4500 in options 4 and 5 fail to take account of opportunities to boost supply given strong geographical realtionship with the adjoining major urban area of Birmigham and the Black Country and as free of physical and environmental constraints. Need to commit to accomodate development not just commit to a test as the plan is formulated.	Comments and suggest approach noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing and employment growth scenarios. The HEDNA along with other evidence base documents including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment will inform the next stages of the local plan. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1018	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	10	Housing mix should be guided by market signals in line with up to date SHMA. Shouldn't specify mix across the district, instead reflect mix across sub areas, changing need over timeand site specifics. Should also meet needs arising across boundaries.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment.
POPD1019	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	4	Considered reflective of national policy	Comments noted.
POPD1020	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	5	No mandatory requirement for such assessments it is considered that this should be left to the discretion of the developer rather than in policy reflect of para 150 b NPPF. Identification of locations for renewable energy would be clearly in line with para 151b NPPF, and this would be supported. para 11.21 of the Preferred Options consultation document states council will commission a new study to update information relating to low carbon and renewable energy capacity to help identify areas sustainable for wind and solar energy development , and refers to Appendix A as including timescales for the collection of this evidence , it is noted that reference to this updated study is omitted form Appendix A	Comments noted.
POPD1021	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	20	Green Belt is not a natural resource but an artificial constraint and therefore should not be included within a policy on natural resources. It is agreed countryside is a natural resource and an area irrespective of whether it lies in Green Belt, it is considered that a policy which seeks to impose a blanket protection for the countryside does not comply with national guidance, quotes Stroud DC vs SSCLG (2015) EWHC 488 (Admin) is clear that whilst valued landscapes do not need to have a formal designation 'valued' means something more than just 'popular' Landscape is only valued if it has physical attributes which take it out of the ordinary. Quotes Landscape Institutes Guidelines. Preferred Policy direction implies that all the landscape countryside of the District is valued. This is not justified or evidenced against Landscape Institutes Guidelines and secondly if all landscapes countryside demonstrated the same certain qualities it would not be valued as those qualities would instead to the inherent norm or baseline as such this policy direction as written requires amendment as it fails to have regard to national policy.	Noted
POPD1022	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	22	Considers that requiring a masterplan for all small and medium scale developments would be took onerous and may actually slow down the development process rather than assist in bringing sites forward. However to is the case that illustrative schemes are often produced to assist with pre-application discussion as well as local plan allocations.	Noted.
POPD1023	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) for Smith's Brothers Farms Ltd	Whole Document	Conclusions = Supports the review process. Vision and Strategic Priorities agree remain broadly relevant. Preferred Growth Options supports this option considers it will deliver a number of significant benefits to those communities and is most aligned to the identified issues and the proposed Vision and Strategic Objectives and priorities that the council has identified. Shenstone is a suitable settlement and is a main settlement/one of a handful of key rural settlements within the District and the identification of this settlement as a level 3 settlement in the updated settlement in the updated settlement hierarchy is fully supported. The Green Belt review of boundary required. To 2036 Shenstone will need to retain a role in providing new homes to meet the housing needs arising within the District including GBBCHMA. Review provides opportunity for appropriate Green Belt boundary to ensure housing needs can be met to 2036 and well beyond. Notes Green Belt evidence produced highlights land at Shenstone will not fundamentally undermine the purpose of the Green Belt in this area. Smith Brothers Farms would welcome the opportunity to maintain a dialogue with the District Council through the process of reviewing the Lichfield District Local Plan.	Comments and concluding points noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of plan process.
POPD1024	Tim Speed	Whole Document	The origin of DtC is not set out in the document. Undertake a full investigation to ensure that GB have used all of their available sites and not just all of their easy to develop sites. Birmingham's lack of vision and ambition of wanting to build on surrounding reen belt instead of redeveloping its own polluted areas is pitiful. LDC should ensure development is sustainable and carbon neutral. It is essential that green belt as currently designated remains and is not eroded away when convenient to LDC or Greater Birmingham. Any suggestion of a new settlement of green belt is preposterous and should be dismissed. Set out their comments to the previous Scope, Issues & Options consultation opposing a new settlement in Shenstone.	Noted. The Duty to Cooperate is set out in the Localism Act. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and urban capacity assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1025	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	Whole Document	Promotes land off lane off Court Drive Shenstone Appendix 1 and 2 Site plan and MasterPlan. Response framed in the context of the requirement of the Local Plans inculding the Allocations documents and para 35 of the NPPF.	Comments and preferences noted
POPD1026	Mrs Gibson	Whole Document	Support the preferred strategic options for growth to the north- east of Lichfield City and to the north of Tamworth because they score more positively when compared to other options and are not within the green belt. Understand these areas have sufficient capacity to address Councils wider housing requirement and therefore remove the need to release any Green Belt elsewhere in the District. The preferred village options for growth are not acceptable ro sustainable. It is important to protect the green belt around Lichfield Villages and in the msot senstive areas such as between Lichfield and Sutton Coldfield. Green Belt development would be contrary to Neighbourhood Plans. Therefore do support the preferred strategic options for growth to the north east of Lichfield and Tamworth but do not agreed with the preferred village growth options.	Comments and preferenes noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1027	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	11	Support efficient use of land however a district wide minim density standard is not supported - it is necessary for site by site response. Should be a minimum standard - consider a variety of density standards for different locations.	Comments and preferences noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. This will be considered further as the Local Plan review progresses.
POPD1028	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	12	Identification of specific sites for self build and custom build is favoured. Should be specifically allocated.	Comments and preferred approach noted.
POPD1029	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	Chapter 20	Residential Growth Options: Broadly agree with factors presented in terms of Green Belt. It is submitted that assessment at site level should be completed rather than across broad parcels due to site specific characteristics. Should be made clear that the SA is different process to the assessment. Preferred Option (Option 2) is considered to be an appropriate option for delivering housing growth across District to 2036allow for a range of sustainable sites to come forward. Will bring forward a number of benefits including consolidating the exiting settlements achieving Objective 1. delivery a range of housing types Objective 6. Help to maintain services and facilities. Assist in delivering new houses Objective 2. Support rural communities Objective 2 and 3, 4 and 5, 12 and 14. In order to delivery there will been a requirement to release green belt on the edge of settlements (Burntwood) to provide long term options for housing and employment. There is a need to consider Green Belt Boundaries and changes through the Local Plan review. Preferred Option offers a variety of significant benefits which will assist in achieving many if the Councils Objectives and achieve the requirements within the NPPF. With regard to alternative options it is considered a new settlement would have number of disbenefits. That is significant investment in infrastructure, long led in times, market saturation - new settlement should not be considered as an isolated solution. It is however clear that there is scope for a wide range of sites spread across the District in accordance with the settlement hierarchy without the need to rely on the possible inclusion of a new settlement.	Comments and preferences noted. A wide range of evidence is being assembled including a Green Belt Review to support the review of the local plan and will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy. The SA processes is Interactive with the Local Plan Review process.
POPD1030	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	4	Considered reflective of national policy	Comments noted.
POPD1031	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	5	No mandatory requirement for such assessments it is considered that this should be left to the discretion of the developer rather than in policy reflect of para 150 b NPPF. Identification of locations for renewable energy would be clearly in line with para 151b NPPF, and this would be supported. para 11.21 of the Preferred Options consultation document states council will commission a new study to update information relating to low carbon and renewable energy capacity to help identify areas sustainable for wind and solar energy development , and refers to Appendix A as including timescales for the collection of this evidence , it is noted that reference to this updated study is omitted form Appendix A	Comments and preferences towards the proposed approach noted.
POPD1032	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	6	Supported	Comments noted
POPD1033	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	7	Supported	Support noted.
POPD1034	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	8	The preferred approach of updating the Sustainable Transport policy (CP5) of the adopted Local Plan to reflect the key transport schemes and priorities for the District, once the evidence base has been updated, is fully supported.	Duly Noted
POPD1035	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	17	It is considered that the creation of Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) to settlements within Lichfield District will assist in providing green infrastructure, opportunities for the provision of indoor and outdoor sports and recreation facilities, support sustainable transport measures and contribute towards health care facilities, which will encourage healthy lifestyles and thereby assist in tackling obesity.	Noted
POPD1036	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	20	Green Belt is not a natural resource but an artificial constraint and therefore should not be included within a policy on natural resources. It is agreed countryside is a natural resource and an area irrespective of whether it lies in Green Belt, it is considered that a policy which seeks to impose a blanket protection for the countryside does not comply with national guidance, quotes Stroud DC vs SSCLG (2015) EWHC 488 (Admin) is clear that whilst valued landscapes do not need to have a formal designation 'valued' means something more than just 'popular' Landscape is only valued if it has physical attributes which take it out of the ordinary. Quotes Landscape Institutes Guidelines. Preferred Policy direction implies that all the landscape countryside of the District is valued. This is not justified or evidenced against Landscape Institutes Guidelines and secondly if all landscapes countryside demonstrated the same certain qualities it would not be valued as those qualities would instead to the inherent norm or baseline as such this policy direction as written requires amendment as it fails to have regard to national policy.	Noted
POPD1037	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	21	Agrees that important views containing the spires should be protected. Views especially important when approaching Lichfield from the north and west. Policy should make reference accordingly.	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD1038	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	22	Considers that requiring a masterplan for all small and medium scale developments would be took onerous and may actually slow down the development process rather than assist in bringing sites forward. However it is the case that illustrative schemes are often produced to assist with pre-application discussion as well as local plan allocations and should be done on a site by site basis	Noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1039	Bloor Homes (Pegasus)	23	With regard to the preferred policy direction on ‘Evidence supporting heritage proposals’ it is considered that the requirement for a heritage statement should be included within validation guidance, rather than be enshrined in Local Plan Policy.	Noted. A heritage statement is currently a requirement of the local validation process.
POPD1040	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	Whole Document	Promotes land at Watford Gap, Shenstone Wood End. Comprises 3 parcels of land. Supports Local Plan Review.Supports preferred settlement hierarchy. Opportunity for SUE to Little Aston, Opportunity to consolidate pattern of Shenstone Wood and to create defined settlement (Currently lacking) and opportunity to form part of wider Strategic Extension to Sutton Coldfield and Greater Birmingham to meet strategic needs. Offers social, economic and green infrastrcuture for the area. Disputes previous SHLAA findings and sets out sustainability development arguments. Should review Green Belt boundary to meet housing needs and shortfall from wider Birmingham and Black Country HMA.	Comments and support for preferred settlement hierarchy noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1041	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	1	Supported	Noted
POPD1042	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	2	Remain broadly the same but notes the specific references to particular settlements. In terms of Objective 6 notes that this has been updated previously only made reference to need in Lichfield - reflects comments made in previous re- include housing market area. Note Objective 6 removes reference to just Lichfield residents this is welcomes but maintain that this should be strengthened to refer to GBHMA. Fundamental need fulfil duty to cooperate and this should be made explicit.	Comments noted .The need for wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate. Duty to cooperate is referenced in the Introduction & Context section and is a legal requirement.
POPD1043	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	Chapter 10	Support the oucomes for Little Aston identified within the Settlement Susatinability Study 2018 and support the identification of Little Aston as a Level 3 Settlement	Comments and support for Little Aston being identified as a Level 3 settlement noted.
POPD1044	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	3	Support the preferred policy direction for the Spatial Strategy. Level of growth to 2036 will require a number of SUEs inc Little Aston & Shenstone Wood. Need to update GB review. Consider there are exceptional circumstances for GB land release , ie necessary growth to meet market and Affordable housing needs, promotes sstutionable patterns of development, only realistic means of growth in Little Aston ans Shenstone Wood. Would be proportionate growth. Consider there is no altenrative settlement hierarchy.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1045	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	9	Notes updated PPG is a baseline figure not accounting for economic growth and housing need from GBBCHMA. HEDNA supported. Reviews the options . Considered Options 1 to 3 not sufficient. Disputes the 3000 additional dwellings are a reasonably significant contribution towards the unmet need. Represents less than 5% of the unmet need from GB&BCHMA. Disputes 4,500 additional dwellings is mid point in the range for the two recommended areas of search for urban extensions and fails to take account of the recommended area of search for a new settlement within SGS. Option 6 does not represent a mid point in the scale range in line with option 5.. A mid point would be 12,500. GBBCHMA Strategiic Growth study identified 3 areas of search. Not clear how figure of 4500 as option 5 derived. Assumes only one area of search tested. Inconsistent with approach of other LAs, eg South Staffs and Cannock Chase. Consitent approach would suggest option of Local Housing Need plus minimum requirement of recommended areas of search in the SGS = 13,000. Concern 3000 to 4500 in options 4 and 5 fail to take account of opportunities to boost supply given strong geographical realtionship with the adjoining major urban area of Birmigham and the Black Countrny and as free of physical and environmental constraints. Need to commit to accomodate development not just commit to a test as the plan is formulated.	Comments and suggestions noted.Table 14.2 sets out the housing requirement options and explains each option in detail. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD1046	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	10	Housing mix should be guided by market signals in line with up to date SHMA. Shouldn't specify mix across the district, instead reflect mix across sub areas, changing need over timeand site specifics. Should also meet needs arsing across boundaries	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix.
POPD1047	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	11	Support efficient use of land, however, a district wide minimum density standard is not supported - it is necessary for site by site response. If density stds incorporated, they should be a minimum standard with reference to local character and context. May wish to consider a variety of density standards for different locations.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD1048	Define for Bloor Homes at Fosseway	3	Promoting land at Fosseway, Lichfield. Settlement hierarchy at Table 10.1 provides a generally appropriate basis for delivery of sustainable development. Welcome Lichfield as the principal urban area. The City functions as the social and economic focus for the District and where significant housing need and demand is generated. Planning to meet those identified needs will ensure that residents do not have to move away from their home area as a result of a lack of provision, or unnecessarily increase commuting between the areas. Given its inherent sustainability the City should have a critical role as a location for future strategic growth. Further development should not be overlooked despite past delays in housing delivery.	Comments and support for the settlement hierarchy noted.
POPD1049	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	12	Identification of specific sites for self build and custom build is favoured. Should be specifically allocated.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD1050	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	Chapter 20	Broadly agree with factors informing spatial distribution of growth. Green Belt purposes should be assessed at site level not broad parcels due to site specific factors. Should make clear assessment separate from SA process. Supports preferred option in POPD for delivering housing growth, but should include growth to the North of Little Aston and Sutton Coldfield. Considered an alternative in line with SGS. Benefits in SA noted and considers proposal in line with SO6 and SO11, reuses BF land and in line with SO14 and achieving SO 12. Should release GB land to provide long term options. Alternative options including new settlement has disbenefits including requing significant investment in infrastructure, long lead in times and uncertainty over delivery. However, clear there is need for wide range of sites across the district.	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review.The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy. The SA processes is interactive with the Local Plan Review process.
POPD1051	Define for Bloor Homes at Fosseway.	9	Promoting land at Fosseway, Lichfield. It is essential that the market and affordable housing needs arising in the plan area over the period to 2036 are identified and fully provided for. The minimum number should be informed by a local housing needs assessment. It must also address unmet housing needs arising elsewhere in the HMA, especially from Birmingham and the Black Country. It is emphasised that a variety of development solutions will be required to address the housing need identified.Continued absence of an agreement as to the distribution of the shortfall is a real concern. Further unmet need arising from Tamworth is anticipated and Tamworth must be positively engaged with. Level of provision should be at least Option 5. A flexible contingency of 20% should be applied to the overall housing land supply so the Plan is sufficiently flexible to respond to rapid change and a continual supply of land. A review of the Green Belt will be required to release and allocate sites that are best placed to address needs and delivery can be assured and supported by new and enhanced infrastructure, notably highways, public transport and community. A flexible contingency of 20% should be applied to the overall housing land supply so the Plan is sufficiently flexible to respond to rapid change and a continual supply of land. No provision for prioritisation of previously developed land over greenfield sites in the NPPF that element of preferred polcy direction is therefore entirely inappropriate.	Comments and support for the provision of a minimum of option 5 is noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing and employment growth scenarios. In addition further evidence base documents including a comprehensive Green Belt Assessment will be prepared to inform the next stages of the Local Plan Review. The Council will continue to engage with neighbouring authorities as part of the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD1052	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	4	Reflects national policy, supported	Noted.
POPD1053	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	5	No mandatory requirement for such assessments. It is considered that this should be left to the discretion of the developer rather than in policy reflect of para 150 b NPPF. Identification of locations for renewable energy would be clearly in line with para 151b NPPF, and this would be supported. para 11.21 of the Preferred Options consultation document states council will commission a new study to update information relating to low carbon and renewable energy capacity to help identify areas sustainable for wind and solar energy development , and refers to Appendix A as including timescales for the collection of this evidence , it ia noted that reference to this updated study is omitted form Appendix A	Comments and preferences towards the proposed approach noted.
POPD1054	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	6	Supported	Support noted
POPD1055	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	7	Supported	Support noted.
POPD1056	Define for Bloor Homes at Fosseway	14	The preferred policy approach is generally supported, notably the link to housing need and the partial strategy.	Duly Noted No Further Action Required
POPD1057	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	8	The preferred approach of updating the Sustainable Transport policy (CP5) of the adopted Local Plan to reflect the key transport schemes and priorities for the District, once the evidence base has been updated, is fully supported	Duly Noted
POPD1058	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	17	It is considered that the creation of Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) to settlements within Lichfield District will assist in providing green infrastructure, opportunities for the provision of indoor and outdoor sports and recreation facilities, support sustainable transport measures and contribute towards health care facilities, which will encourage healthy lifestyles and thereby assist in tackling obesity.	Noted
POPD1059	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	20	Green Belt is not a natural resource but an artificial constraint and therefore should not be included within a policy on natural resources. It is agreed countryside is a natural resource and an area irrespective of whether it lies in Green Belt, it is considered that a policy which seeks to impose a blanket protection for the countryside does not comply with national guidance, quotes Stroud DC vs SSSCLG (2015) EWHC 488 (Admin) is clear that whilst valued landscapes do not need to have a formal designation 'valued' means something more than just 'popular' Landscape is only valued if it has physical attributes which take it out of the ordinary. Quotes Landscape Institutes Guidelines. Preferred Policy direction implies that all the landscape countryside of the District is valued. This is not justified or evidenced against Landscape Institutes Guidelines and secondly if all landscapes countryside demonstrated the same certain qualities it would not be valued as those qualities would instead to the inherent norm or baseline as such this policy direction as written requires amendment as it fails to have regard to national policy.	Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1060	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	21	Agrees that important views containing the spires should be protected. Views especially important when approaching Lichfield from the north and west. Policy should make reference accordingly.	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD1061	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	22	Considers that requiring a masterplan for all small and medium scale developments would be took onerous and may actually slow down the development process rather than assist in bringing sites forward. However to is the case that illustrative schemes are often produced to assist with pre-application discussion as well as local plan allocations. Considers Shenstone Wood End would benefit from improvements to the built enviornment and that the proposals will consolidate existing existings residential development to create a sense of place.	Noted.
POPD1062	Touch Developments (Pegasus)	23	With regard to the preferred policy direction on 'Evidence supporting heritage proposals' it is considered that the requirement for a heritage statement should be included within validation guidance, rather than be enshrined in Local Plan Policy.	Noted
POPD1063	Define for Bloor Homes at Fosseway	20	The proposed "protection" of the countryside is inconsistent with the NPPF that instead refers to "recognising". The Plan should not seek to impose a higher level of "blanket" protection that is inappropriate and unwarranted.	Noted
POPD1064	Define for Bloor Homes at Fosseway	Chapter 19	Table 19.1 is principally based on potential constraints, however the scope for mitigation should not be ignored, there is seemingly little regard for the consideration of transport and infrastructure matters that are critical to the deliverability of the broad options or the potential benefits that strategic growth can realise. The Position Statement issued by the GBHMA Authorities also emphasised that as large scale developments will take time to bring forward there will be circumstances where smaller-scale developments might be accommodated in the Green Belt to meet identified housing needs in the short to medium term. The "Preferred Strategic Options for Growth: as set out in Figure 22.1 should exclude the land to the north of Tamworth because of its known deliverability issues and include strategic growth to the south of Lichfield that can realise significant benefits for the area. Further information provided.	Comments noted. Comments regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan and will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy
POPD1065	CWC Group (CBRE)	2	Recommends expanding objective 6 to add "This includes meeting the future housing needs of our District and also assisting in meeting the unmet housing needs of the wider Greater Birmingham HMA."	Noted. The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated.The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated. LDC's requirement to contribution towards meeting wider HMA unmet need is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1066	CWC Group (CBRE)	9	Should use 2014 based housing projections in line with Government advice. Agree with direction of policy in so far that it seeks to plan for Lichfield's need in addition to the wider market area. Shortfall in Birmingham should be located near to Birmingham where possible. Land to north of Little Aston / Sutton Coldfield is an appropriate location and Little Aston could be considered a sustainable settlement. No preferred policies for that matter, therefore essential a consultation on a draft plan is carried out when the policies are formed based on up to date evidence and prior to submission consultation. Need to be calcuated and and informed by evidence including GB review and HEDNA which should be published for further consultation.	Comments noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing and employment growth scenarios. In addition further evidence base documents including a comprehensive Green Belt Assessment will be prepared to inform the next stages of the Local Plan Review.
POPD1067	Define for Bloor Homes at Fosseway	Whole Document	Promoting land at Foseeway, Lichfield for housing. Welcome plan period upto 2036 and proposal to address the needs ariaing in the plan area and the wider HMA. Lichfield is a sustainable location for further strategic growth. Land to the south of Lichfield at Fosseway Lane presents an excellent opportunity for the delivery of a strategic urban extension, extending the existing allocation site with limited impact and realising significant socio-economic benefits for the local area and wider District. Various additional reports submitted. Site is available, suitable and deliverable. It would make a significant contribution to meeting the identified market and affordable housing and employment needs within the plan period in a sustainable location, where residents will have direct access to, and provide support for, a range of local facilities and services and good access via public transport to higher level services and employment opportunities provided in Lichfield. The proposal, therefore, accords with the provisions of the NPPF and would constitute "sustainable development". Bloor Homes, therefore, encourage the District Council to embrace this significant opportunity and remove the site at Fosseway Lane to the south of Lichfield from the Green Belt and allocate it for the development of a strategic urban extension as a fundamental element of the Local Plan Review's spatial strategy to address the District's long term housing needs and unmet needs arising elsewhere in the GBHMA and neighbouring authorities.	Comments and preferences for growth noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process. The District Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities as part of the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD1068	CWC Group (CBRE)	Chapter 22	Note the Council's preferred strategic option for growth. Think a combination of options is required to encourage a range of sites to come forward for delivery. Support testing of availability for around 3000 - 4500 to meet unmet needs from Birmingham HMA. Consider well connected locations such as north of Sutton Coldfield will assist and maitain and enhance transportation and other infrastructure. smaller sites would assist in delivering growth in the short term. Larger sites also required to meet needs and unmet need. Further work should be done to identify sites to meet the needs of neighbouring authorities. An important part of that is to consider the locational advantages of areas well connected to adjoining sttlements and their proximity and connectivity to Birmingham to most effectively address needs from the wider HMA.	Comments noted. Specific site proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review process. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1069	Define for Bloor Homes at Mile Oak	3	Promoting land at Mile Oak, Fazeley. Settlement hierarchy at Table 10.1 provides a generally appropriate basis for delivery of sustainable development. Recognition of the great potential to deliver sustainable development adjacent to the urban areas is welcome. District must seek to accommodate a significant amount of development to address unmet needs arising elsewhere in the HMA, notably Tamworth. Addressing those needs as close as possible to where they arise will ensure residents don't move away from their home area or unnecessarily commute between areas. GBHMA SGS recognised potential of land to the north and west of Tamworth UE4 as a potential urban extension. No area of search defined, should include land to the south of the A5 at Mile Oak.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1070	Define for Bloor Homes at Mile Oak	9	Promoting land at Mile Oak Fazeley. It is essential that the market and affordable housing needs arising in the plan area over the period to 2036 are identified and fully provided for. The minimum number should be informed by a local housing needs assessment. It must also address unmet housing needs arising elsewhere in the HMA, especially from Birmingham and the Black Country. It is emphasised that a variety of development solutions will be required to address the housing need identified. Continued absence of an agreement as to the distribution of the shortfall is a real concern. Further unmet need arising from Tamworth is anticipated and Tamworth must be positively engaged with. Level of provision should be at least Option 5. A review of the Green Belt will be required to release and allocate sites that are best placed to address needs and delivery can be assured and supported by new and enhanced infrastructure, notably highways, public transport and community. No provision for prioritisation of previously developed land over greenfield sites in the NPPF that element of preferred polcy direction is therefore entirely inappropriate.	Comments and support for the provision of a minimum of option 5 is noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing and employment growth scenarios. In addition further evidence base documents including a comprehensive Green Belt Assessment will be prepared to inform the next stages of the Local Plan Review. The Council will continue to engage with neighbouring authorities as part of the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD1071	Define for Bloor Homes at Mile Oak	14	Support, notably the link to housing need and the partial strategy.	Duly Noted No Further Action Required
POPD1072	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	Whole Document	Promotes land at Lichfield Road Kings Bromley. Support continuing review of LP. To deliver a broadly consistent vision and strategic priorities, Kings Bromley should accommodate growth to consolidate the sustainability of the village and ensure locally dervied housing needs are met to assist infrastrucure needs and aspirations. Concern there is an inconsitent approach compared to other Local Authority plans re housing requirement options as option to test 13,000 houses not included. Supports Council's preferred growth option. Supports Kings Bromley as level 4 settlement. Need to review current settlement boundary to contribute in meeting Greater Birmingham and Black Country Shortfall. Site proposals and merits outlined.Vision document attached.	Comments and support for Kings Bromley being identified as a Level 4 settlement noted.
POPD1073	Define for Bloor Homes at Mile Oak	20	The proposed "protection" of the countryside is inconsistent with the NPPF that instead refers to "recognising". The Plan should not seek to impose a higher level of "blanket" protection that is inappropriate and unwarranted.	Noted
POPD1074	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	1	Supported	Noted
POPD1075	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	2	Remain broadly the same but notes the specific references to particular settlements. In terms of Objective 6 notes that this has been updated previously only made reference to need in Lichfield - reflects comments made in previous re- include housing market area. Note Objective 6 removes reference to just Lichfield residents this is welcomes but maintain that this should be strengthened to refer to GBHMA. Fundamental need fulfil duty to cooperate and this should be made explicit.	Comments noted .The need for wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate. Duty to cooperate is referenced in the Introduction & context section and is a legal requirement.
POPD1076	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	Chapter 10	Spatial Strategy. Supports Kings Bromley idnetified within the Settlement Sustainability Study 2018 and as a level 4 settlement.	Comments and support for Kings Bromley being identified as a Level 4 settlement noted.
POPD1077	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	3	Support the preferred policy direction for the Spatial Strategy. Level of growth to 2036 will require a number of Sustainable Extensions inc Kings Bromley. Consider there is justification for identifying land outside the current settlement boundary for development at Kings Bromley. That is, necessary growth to meet market and Affordable housing needs, promotes sustainable patterns of development, only realistic means of growth in Kings Bromley. Only means of proportionate growth is through release of land outside the existing constraining settlement boundary. Restricting growth compromises status as level 4 settlement. Proportionate growth would assist in supporting existing and proposed services and facilities. Consider there is no alterantive settlement hierarchy the Council could consider.	Comments and support for preferred spatial strategy noted.
POPD1078	Define for Bloor Homes at Mile Oak	Chapter 19	Table 19.1 is principally based on potential constraints, however the scope for mitigation should not be ignored, there is seemingly little regard for the consideration of transport and infrastructure matters that are critical to the deliverability of the broad options or the potential benefits that strategic growth can realise. Significant infrastructure constraints to the development of land north of Tamworth and deliverability is critical. The "Preferred Strategic Options for Growth: as set out in Figure 22.1 should exclude the land to the north of Tamworth because of its known deliverability issues and include strategic growth at Mile Oak that can realise significant benefits for the area. Further information provided.	Comments noted. Comments regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan and will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1079	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	9	Notes updated PPG is a baseline figure not accounting for economic growth and housing need from GBBCHMA. HEDNA supported. Reviews the options . Considered Options 1 to 3 not sufficient. Disputes the 3000 additional dwellings are a reasonably significant contribution towards the unmet need. Represents less than 5% of the unmet need from GB&BCHMA. Disputes 4,500 additional dwellings is mid point in the range for the two recommended areas of search for urban extensions and fails to take account of the recommended area of search for a new settlement within SGS. Option 6 does not represent a mid point in the scale range in line with option 5.. A mid point would be 12,500. GBBCHMA Strategic Growth study identified 3 areas of search. Not clear how figure of 4500 as option 5 derived. Assumes only one area of search tested. Inconsistent with approach of other LAs, eg South Staffs and Cannock Chase. Consitent approach would suggest option of Local Housing Need plus minimum requirement of recommended areas of search in the SGS = 13,000. Concern 3000 to 4500 in options 4 and 5 fail to take account of opportunities to boost supply given strong geographical reationship with the adjoining major urban area of Birmigham and the Black Country and as free of physical and environmental constraints. Need to commit to accomodate development not just commit to a test as the plan is formulated.	Comments and suggestions noted.Table 14.2 sets out the housing requirement options and explains each option in detail. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD1080	Define for Bloor Homes at Mile Oak	Whole Document	Promoting land atMile Oak, Fazeley for housing. Welcome plan period upto 2036 and proposal to address the needs arising in the plan area and the wider HMA. Mile Oak is a sustainable location for strategic scale growth as recognised in SGS. Presents an excellent opportunity for the delivery of a sustainable urban extension, realising significant socio-economic benefits for the local area and wider District. Various additional reports submitted. Site is available, suitable and deliverable. It would make a significant contribution to meeting the identified market and affordable housing and employment needs within the plan period in a sustainable location, where residents will have direct access to, and provide support for, a range of local facilities and services in Mile Oak and good access via public transport to higher level services and employment opportunities provided in Tamworth. The proposal, therefore, accords with the provisions of the NPPF and would constitute “sustainable development”. Bloor Homes, therefore, encourage the District Council to embrace this significant opportunity and remove the site from the Green Belt and allocate it for the development of a strategic urban extension as a fundamental element of the Local Plan Review’s spatial strategy to address the District’s long term housing needs and unmet needs arising elsewhere in the GBHMA and neighbouring authorities, including Tamworth.	Comments and preferences for growth noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of plan process. The District Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities as part of the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD1081	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	10	Housing mix should be guided by market signals in line with up to date SHMA. Shouldn't specify mix across the district, instead reflect mix across sub areas, changing need over time and site specifics. Should also meet needs arsing across boundaries	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD1082	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	Whole Document	Planning context Supports the continuing review of the Local Plan to 2036. provides an opportunity to review, in line from requirements of the NPPF. This consultant follows the previous scope issues and options. Current documents is high level assessment. Acres Architecture supports the Councils proactive approach in continuing with a review to ensure an up to date policy framework exists with the District to guide growth to 2036 and to ensure growth is plan lead.	Comments and support noted.
POPD1083	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	1	Notes the vision is broadly the same as that of the adopted Local Plan Strategy.	Noted
POPD1084	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	2	Recognised that Strategic Objectives and Prorities have been refined and that they remain relevant. Noted that in updating the prorities the Council has chosen to remove the specfic reference to particular settlements at this stage of the review process. Objective & prority 6 meeting Housing Need notes update broadended to inculde meeting the needs of existing and new residents and this is welcomed but maintain that this should be strengthened to refer to meeting the unmet housing needs of the GBHMA.	Comments noted. LDC's requirement to contribute towards meeting wider HMA unmet need is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1085	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	3	Consider the settlement hierarchy would result in in the delivery of sustainable development. Balanced growth in the most sustainble settlements with the District. Clear level of growth would require a number of sustainble extensions to existing settlements inculding Shenstone where oportuities for development within the existing settlement boundary are finite. Recongises that Shenstone steelment Boundary lies within Green Belt. Need to update Green Belt Evidance. Exceptional Circumstances at Shenstone to enable release of Green Belt. 1 allow for necessary growth in Shenstone in respect of market and affordable houses. 2 provide an opportunity to promote sustainble patterns of growth in line with the Settlement Hierarchy. 3 only realistic means of acheiving further proportionate growth is through Green Belt release. Restricting growth would effectively sterilise any further development at this settllement and prevent any further economic growth meansing shesntones status as Category 3 settlment would be significantly compromised. 4 growth would support exisitng services and facilities and delivery new and improved infastructure in line with community aspirations. Arces Architecture contends that there is no alternative settlement hierarchy that the Council could consider. It rightly reflects the sustainability of existing settlements within the District and forms an effective tool to determine the appropriate apportionment of growth across the District to 20236.	Comments and support for the settlement heirarchy noted. The Local Plan Review will be supprotted by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1086	Define for Bloor Homes at Shenstone	3	Promoting land at Shenstone. Settlement hierarchy at Table 10.1 provides a generally appropriate basis for delivery of sustainable development. GBHMA SGS recognises potential role of Shenstone as a location for strategic scale growth for a New Settlement or a strategic urban extension, the opportunity and socis-economic benefits that could be realised should be a key objective of the Plan.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1087	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	9	The baseline figure represents a minimum figure and does not account for housing demand related to economic growth, or meeting housing need arising from GBBCHMA authorities. Preferred Options standard methods - 333 dwellings but PPG 2a-003-20190220 identifies that a justified alternative can be used for plan making to be scrutinised at Local Plan examination. Para 14.11 support housing and Economic development needs assessment. could consider is there is a justified alternative to the standard method for calculating need at the local level. Option 1 Unsound and fails to recognise established and evidenced cross boundary needs. Option 2 does not represent an accurate or evidenced reflection of shortfalls to be experienced in these LPAs (Tamworth and Cannock)to 2036. Reflecting past rates of growth into the future is not a sound approach - compound existing issues of undersupply. Option 3 Does not reflect an appropriate shortfall GBBCHMA contained within the Strategic Growth Study. Option 4 3,000 figure disputed as represents less than 5% pf the unmet need arising from the GBBCHMA. Option 5 questions if this des represent a mid point for the two recommended areas of search for urban extensions. In addition it fails to take account of the recommended area of search for a new settlement identified within the Strategic Growth Study. Option 6 it doesn't represent a mid - point in the scale range in line with option 5 . A mid point in the range for a new settlement would equate to 12,500 additional dwellings plus service and employment. Option 7 equates to a mid point for the urban extensions and a minimum level of growth at a new settlement option as identified within the Strategic Growth Study, considered that an inconsistent approach to meeting the identified housing shortfall is being take across the GBBCHMA e.g. South Staffs 4,000 as a minimum contribution similar to Cannock Chase both recognise that this approach would only provide a comprehensive solution to meeting the identified housing shortfall if all other LSA within the HMA adopt a complementary approach. If a consistent approach was taken 10,000 new settlement and 3,000 two sustainable urban extensions. Concerned option Local Housing Need plus 13,000 consistent with other LPA has not been identified or considered. Concerned that 3,000 to 4,500 identified in options 4 & 5 fail to take account of the opportunities within Lichfield for boosting Housing supply. District large wraps around to major areas Birmingham and the Black County free from significant physical and environmental constraints. It is necessary that the Local Plan review includes a more definite commitment to accommodating development rather than simply commit to test contribution should not be aspirational but form an integral element of the overall housing requirement. LDC should test an option that would equate to meeting the Local needs plus the minimum requirements of the recommended areas of search within the SGS.	Comments and analysis of options noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process.
POPD1088	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	11	Support efficient use of land, however, a district wide minim density standard is not supported - it is necessary for site by site response. If density stds incorporated, they should be a minimum standard with reference to local character and context. May wish to consider a variety of density standards for different locations.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD1089	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	12	Identification of specific sites for self build and custom build is favoured. Should be specifically allocated.	Comments and preferred approach noted.
POPD1090	Define for Bloor Homes at Shenstone	9	Promoting land at Shenstone. It is essential that the market and affordable housing needs arising in the plan area over the period to 2036 are identified and fully provided for. The minimum number should be informed by a local housing needs assessment. It must also address unmet housing needs arising elsewhere in the HMA, especially from Birmingham and the Black Country. It is emphasised that a variety of development solutions will be required to address the housing need identified. Continued absence of an agreement as to the distribution of the shortfall is a real concern. Further unmet need arising from Tamworth is anticipated and Tamworth must be positively engaged with. Level of provision should be at least Option 5. A flexible contingency of 20% should be applied to the overall housing land supply so the Plan is sufficiently flexible to respond to rapid change and a continual supply of land. A review of the Green Belt will be required to release and allocate sites that are best placed to address needs and delivery can be assured and supported by new and enhanced infrastructure, notably highways, public transport and community. Close proximity to Birmingham and accessibility to public transport links to it is therefore a key considerton for locating strategic development within Lichfield District and in turn triggers the need for Green Belt release. No provision for prioritisation of previously developed land over greenfield sites in the NPPF that element of preferred policy direction is therefore entirely inappropriate.	Comments and support for the provision of a minimum of option 5 is noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing and employment growth scenarios. In addition further evidence base documents including a comprehensive Green Belt Assessment will be prepared to inform the next stages of the Local Plan Review. The Council will continue to engage with neighbouring authorities as part of the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD1091	Define for Bloor Homes at Shenstone	14	Support, notably the link to housing need and the partial strategy.	Duly Noted No Further Action Required
POPD1092	Define for Bloor Homes at Shenstone	20	The proposed “protection” of the countryside is inconsistent with the NPPF that instead refers to “recognising”. The Plan should not seek to impose a higher level of “blanket” protection that is inappropriate and unwarranted.	Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1093	Define for Bloor Homes at Shenstone	Chapter 19	Table 19.1 is principally based on potential constraints, however the scope for mitigation should not be ignored, there is seemingly little regard for the consideration of transport and infrastructure matters that are critical to the deliverability of the broad options or the potential benefits that strategic growth can realise. Significant infrastructure constraints to the development of land north of Tamworth and deliverability is critical. The “Preferred Strategic Options for Growth: as set out in Figure 22.1 should exclude the land to the north of Tamworth because of its known deliverability issues Strategic growth at shenstone can realise significant benefits for the area. The strategy should recognise scope for localised delivery at sustainable settlements to provide a broad portfolio of sites that will ensure the identified development needs are effectively addressed. Further information provided.	Comments noted. Comments regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan and will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy
POPD1094	Define for Bloor Homes at Shenstone	Whole Document	Promoting land at Shenstone for housing. Welcome plan period upto 2036 and proposal to address the needs arising in the plan area and the wider HMA. SGS highlighted potential for delivery of a new settlement around Shenstone because the area is relatively unconstrained and has good fast access and direct ervices to Birmingham and Lichfield, A5 and M6Toll. New settlements are complicated in terms of land assembly and infrastructure funding and provision. However that does not unedrmine the very clear credentials of Shenstone as a sustainable location for strategic scale growth as recognised in SGS. Presents an excellent opportunity for the delivery of a sustainable urban extension in terms of building on existing local transport and community infrastructure, providing opportunities for place-making investment. Various additional reports submitted. Site is available, suitable and deliverable. It would make a significant contribution to meeting the identified market and affordable housing and employment needs within the plan period in a sustainable location, where residents will have direct access to, and provide support for, a range of local facilities and services in Shenstone and good access via public transport to higher level services and employment opportunities provided in Lichfield and Birmingham. The proposal, therefore, accords with the provisions of the NPPF and would constitute “sustainable development”. Bloor Homes, therefore, encourage the District Council to embrace this significant opportunity and remove the site from the Green Belt and allocate it for the development of a strategic urban extension as a fundamental element of the Local Plan Review’s spatial strategy to address the District’s long term housing needs and unmet needs arising elsewhere in the GBHMA.	Comments and preferences for growth noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of plan process. The District Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities as part of the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD1095	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	Chapter 20	Should be made clear that the SA is different process to the assessment. Preferred Option (Option 2) is considered to be an appropriate option for delivering housing growth across District to 2036 allow for a range of sustainable sites to come forward. Will bring forward a number of benefits including consolidating the existing settlements achieving Objective 1. delivery a range of housing types Objective 6. Help to maintain services and facilities. Assist in delivering new houses Objective 2. Support rural communities Objective 2 and 3, 4 and 5, 12 and 14. Preferred Option offers a variety of significant benefits which will assist in achieving many of the Councils Objectives and achieve the requirements within the NPPF. With regard to alternative options it is considered a new settlement would have number of disbenefits. That is significant investment in infrastructure, long lead in times, market saturation - new settlement should not be considered as an isolated solution. It is however clear that there is scope for a wide range of sites spread across the District in accordance with the settlement hierarchy without the need to rely on the possible inclusion of a new settlement.	Comments and preferences noted. The SA processes is interactive with the Local Plan Review process.
POPD1096	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	4	Reflects national policy, supported	Comments noted.
POPD1097	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	5	No mandatory requirement for such assessments (BREAM). It is considered that this should be left to the discretion of the developer rather than in policy reflect of para 150 b NPPF. Identification of locations for renewable energy would be clearly in line with para 151b NPPF, and this would be supported. para 11.21 of the Preferred Options consultation document states council will commission a new study to update information relating to low carbon and renewable energy capacity to help identify areas sustainable for wind and solar energy development , and refers to Appendix A as including timescales for the collection of this evidence , it ia noted that reference to this updated study is omitted form Appendix A	Comments in relation to BREEAM and preferences towards the proposed approach noted.
POPD1098	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	6	Supported	Support noted
POPD1099	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	7	Supported	Support noted.
POPD1100	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	8	The preferred approach of updating the Sustainable Transport policy (CP5) of the adopted Local Plan to reflect the key transport schemes and priorities for the District, once the evidence base has been updated, is fully supported.	Duly Noted
POPD1101	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	17	It is considered that the creation of proportionate extensions to settlements within Lichfield District will assist in providing green infrastructure, opportunities for the provision of indoor and outdoor sports and recreation facilities, support sustainable transport measures and contribute towards health care facilities, which will encourage healthy lifestyles and thereby assist in tackling obesity	Noted
POPD1102	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	20	Green Belt is not a natural resource but an artificial constraint and therefore should not be included within a policy on natural resources. It is agreed countryside is a natural resource and an area irrespective of whether it lies in Green Belt, it is considered that a policy which seeks to impose a blanket protection for the countryside does not comply with national guidance, quotes Stroud DC vs SSCLG (2015) EWHC 488 (Admin) is clear that whilst valued landscapes do not need to have a formal designation 'valued' means something more than just 'popular' Landscape is only valued if it has physical attributes which take it out of the ordinary. Quotes Landscape Institutes Guidelines. Preferred Policy direction implies that all the landscape countryside of the District is valued. This is not justified or evidenced against Landscape Institutes Guidelines and secondly if all landscapes countryside demonstrated the same certain qualities it would not be valued as those qualities would instead to the inherent norm or baseline as such this policy direction as written requires amendment as it fails to have regard to national policy.	Noted
POPD1103	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	22	Considers that requiring a masterplan for all small and medium scale developments would be took onerous and may actually slow down the development process rather than assist in bringing sites forward. However to is the case that illustrative schemes are often produced to assist with pre-application discussion as well as local plan allocations. Considers illustrative masterplan shows proposed scheme at Lichfield Road, Kings Bromley is deliverable.	Noted.
POPD1104	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	23	With regard to the preferred policy direction on 'evidence supporting heritage proposals' it is considered that the requirement for a heritage statement should be included within validation guidance, rather than be enshrined in Local Plan Policy.	Noted. The requirement for a heritage statement is currently a requirement of the local validation process.
POPD1105	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	Whole Document	Promotes site at Huddlesford Lane, Whittington. Supports Local Plan Review.Supports preferred settlement hierarchy. Should review Green Belt boundary at Whittington to meet housing needs and shortfall from wider Birmingham and Black Country HMA. Considers development to be accommodated necessary to consolidate sustainability of the village and to meet local housing needs and meet infrastructure issues and aspirations.Considers LDC taking inconsistent approach compared to other LAs regarding meeting unmet need. Should test option to meet local need plus min requirement of recommendaed areas of search in SGS. Local Need + 13,000.	Comments and support for preferred settlement hierarchy noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evience base including a HEDNA which will test the preferred growth scenarios and a plan wide viability. The evidence base will inform the next stages of the local plan.
POPD1106	Birmingham City Council	Whole Document	Welcome content of plan and consideration of preferred strategic options. Welcome the opportunity for continued engagement and working with Lichfield through the duty to cooperate process.	Comments noted
POPD1107	Birmingham City Council	2	Key issue is the unmet housing need of the GBBCHMA. Support commitment to engaging with neighbours under the duty to cooperate to help meet the needs within the housing market area, but consider the strategic objectives should make specific reference to meeting housing need and the unmet housing need from the HMA.	Comments noted for review. The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated. Contributing towards meeting the wider HMA unmet need is referenced elsewhere in the POPD. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate process.
POPD1108	Birmingham City Council	3	Birmingham supports the preferred policy direction of the spatial strategy which will “determine and set out the level of housing growth to be accommodated within the district, including an appropriate level of provision to assist in delivering the unmet needs of our neighbours and the level of employment growth required to meet the housing growth requirements.”	Comments and support for the policy direction noted.
POPD1109	Birmingham City Council	9	Welcomed and supported. Appreciates work to test options in excess of local housing need and green belt assessment. Footnote xiii p 59 excludes ref to Birmingham CC. BCC supports commitment to test between 3,000-4,500 additional dwellings over and above local housing need and agree this represents a realistic and deliverable target to be fully tested whilst maintaining the preferred spatial strategy for the District.	Comments and support noted.
POPD1110	Birmingham City Council	11	Welcome policy on density which consider is appropriate.	Comments noted.
POPD1111	Birmingham City Council	Chapter 22	Welcomes options as they look positively to explore and test growth scenarios over and above local housing need. The Preferred Options focus on growth based on the existing settlement hierarchy with two specific areas identified for further exploration recommended through the Strategic Growth Study (north-east of Lichfield and north of Tamworth). The Preferred Strategic Options for Growth also include the exploration of other broad locations around smaller settlements including an area to north of Sutton Coldfield and Little Aston close to the boundary with Birmingham City Council. We would therefore welcome the opportunity to engage further with Lichfield Council in closer examination of this area through detailed green belt assessment in identifying any potential for development and its strategic implications in terms of sustainability, viability and infrastructure requirements.	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review.The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1112	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	1	Supported	Noted
POPD1113	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	2	Notes refined SOs & Ps and the specific references to particular settlements. In terms of Objective 6, notes that this has been updated as previously only made reference to need in Lichfield - reflects comments made in previous re- include housing market area. Note Objective 6 removes reference to just Lichfield residents. This is welcomes but maintain that this should be strengthened to refer to GBHMA. Fundamental need fulfil duty to cooperate and this should be made explicit.	Comments noted .The need for wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate. Duty to cooperate is referenced in the Introduction & context section and is a legal requirement.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1114	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	Chapter 10	Spatial Strategy. Notes and supports Settlement Sustainability Study 2018 findings and the reasons for it being identified a level 3 settlement. Notes the aspirations in the 'made Whittington and Fisherwick Neighbourhood Plan.	Comments and support for the findings of the Settlement Sustainability Study noted.
POPD1115	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	3	Support the preferred policy direction for the Spatial Strategy. Level of growth to 2036 will require a number of Sustainable Extensions inc Whittington. Need to update GB review. Consider there are exceptional circumstances for GB land release , ie necessary growth to meet market and affordable housing needs, promotes sustainable patterns of development, only realistic means of proportionate growth. Otherwise status as level 3 settlement compromised. Development would support existing and proposed services in line with community aspirations.Consider there is no alternative settlement hierarchy	Comments and support for preferred spatial strategy noted.
POPD1116	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	9	Notes updated PPG is a baseline figure not accounting for economic growth and housing need from GBBCHMA. HEDNA supported. Reviews the options . Considered Options 1 to 3 not sufficient. Disputes the 3000 additional dwellings are a reasonably significant contribution towards the unmet need. Represents less than 5% of the unmet need from GB&BCHMA. Disputes 4,500 additional dwellings is mid point in the range for the two recommended areas of search for urban extensions and fails to take account of the recommended area of search for a new settlement within SGS. Option 6 does not represent a mid point in the scale range in line with option 5.. A mid point would be 12,500. GBBCHMA Strategiic Growth study identified 3 areas of search. Not clear how figure of 4500 as option 5 derived. Assumes only one area of search tested. Inconsistent with approach of other LAs, eg South Staffs and Cannock Chase. Consitent approach would suggest option of Local Housing Need plus minimum requirement of recommended areas of search in the SGS = 13,000. Concern 3000 to 4500 in options 4 and 5 fail to take account of opportunities to boost supply given strong geographical realtionship with the adjoining major urban area of Birmingham and the Black Country and as free of physical and environmental constraints. Need to commit to accomodate development not just commit to a test as the plan is formulated.	Comments and suggestions noted.Table 14.2 sets out the housing requirement options and explains each option in detail. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD1117	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	10	Housing mix should be guided by market signals in line with up to date SHMA. Shouldn't specify mix across the district, instead reflect mix across sub areas, changing need over time and site specifics. Should also meet needs arsing across boundaries	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD1118	Turley for Taylor Wimpey at South of Rugeley Road, Armitage	1	Promoting land at Armitage. Support that it seeks to locate development in the most sustainable locations, but consider the vision could be more explicit in acknowledging LDC responsibility to accommodate proprtion of the GBHMA shortfall to 2036. It is inevitable that Green belt land will need to be released in the most sustainable locations such as Armitage with Handsacre and this should be recognised in the vision.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate regarding Green Belt review and meeting housing needs. Site specific suggestions will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review
POPD1119	Turley for Taylor Wimpey at South of Rugeley Road, Armitage	2	Promoting land at Armitage. Support, especially the identification within Objective 1 of the need to consolidate the sustainability of existing settlements such as Armitage with Handsacre through additional sustainable growth and 6 which seeks to provide a mix of market, specialist and affordable homes to meet the needs of existing and new residents. However objective 6 could be clearer in committing to contributing to the GBHMA's unmet needs, especially as paragraph 8.5 indicates it is the reason 'new residents' have been referenced.	Comments noted . Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. The need for wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate
POPD1120	Turley for Taylor Wimpey at South of Rugeley Road, Armitage	3	Promoting land at Armitage. Armitage with Handsacre is one of the most sustainable locations within the district. This represents the best opportunity to sustain existing settlements and deliver more comprehensive development including infrastructure improvements facilitated by new development. Growth at smaller and less sustainable 'smaller service villages' such as Stonnall, Hopwas and Kings Bromley must be carefully managed as this could result in unsustainable commuting patterns. Given the lack of available land within the District and Armitage with Handsacre, it will be necessary to release land from the Green Belt. LDC should take responsibility for assessing and identifying Green Belt releases with non-strategic plans simply defining more detailed boundary revisions. There are insufficient brownfield sites, there are therefore exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.	Comments noted. Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1121	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	11	Support efficient use of land, however, a district wide minim density standard is not supported - it is necessary for site by site response. If density stds incorporated, they should be a minimum standard with reference to local character and context. May wish to consider a variety of density standards for different locations	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD1122	Turley for Taylor Wimpey at South of Rugeley Road, Armitage	4	Promoting land at Armitage. Support, although contend that 17 key issues/principles is too long and some should be combined. Our proposed site will perform strongly.	Comments regarding policy length noted.
POPD1123	Turley for Taylor Wimpey at South of Rugeley Road, Armitage	9	Promoting land at Armitage. Strongly support recognition that LPR will be required to separately address both the District's local needs and a contribution to the unmet needs of the GBHMA. Taylor Wimpey and Turley support preparation of HEDNA and are keen to take an active role in contributing to this study. A separate technical review is submitted suggest explore requirement of at least 6,000 dpa at least 600 dpa.	Comments and support for the approach and preparation of a HEDNA noted.
POPD1124	Turley for Taylor Wimpey at South of Rugeley Road, Armitage	10	Promoting land at Armitage. Support commissioning of HEDNA but should not include prescriptive policy on housing mix as demography and market signals change over time and should reflect the needs of specific settlements and areas. Put in SPD.	Comments and preferences noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix.
POPD1125	Turley for Taylor Wimpey at South of Rugeley Road, Armitage	11	Promoting land at Armitage. Not necessary to apply a blanket policy. Should be determined through character and context and needs of the area whilst still delivering a high quality development. If policy included should provide flexibility.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD1126	Turley for Taylor Wimpey at South of Rugeley Road, Armitage	15	Promoting land at Armitage. Support approach to larger service villages, especially Armitage.	Duly Noted
POPD1127	Turley for Taylor Wimpey at South of Rugeley Road, Armitage	22	Promoting land at Armitage. Support inclusion of a policy which promotes high quality design, attached vision framework has informed a masterplan for site proposed in Armitage.	Noted.
POPD1128	Turley for Taylor Wimpey at South of Rugeley Road, Armitage	Whole Document	Promoting land at Armitage. Welcomes opportunity to engage with the LPR so it has an up todate Local Plan and mechanism for identifying appropriate contribution to GBHMA shortfall. Site at Armitage is well suited and can deliver significant benefits for existing and new residents and is deliverable. Further details submitted.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1129	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	12	Identification of specific sites for self build and custom build is favoured. Should be specifically allocated.	Comments and preferred approach noted.
POPD1130	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	Chapter 20	Broadly agree with factors informing spatial distribution of growth. Green Belt purposes should be assessed at site level not broad parcels due to site specific factors. Should make clear assessment separate from SA process. Supports preferred option in POPD for delivering housing growth.. Benefits noted. Considers proposal in line with SO6 and SO11, reuses BF land and in line with SO14 and achieving SO 12. Should release GB land to deliver preferred spatial distribution and to provide long term options for growth. Alternative options including new settlement has disbenefits including requing significant investment in infrastructure, long lead in times and uncertainty over delivery. However, clear there is need for wide range of sites across the district.	Comments and preferences noted.The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs. The evidence base being assembled will help to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1131	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	10	Housing mix should be guided by market signals via an upto date SHLAA. Should not seek a specified mix for all development across the District. Housing needs from neighbouring authorities should also be a key consideration to determining housing mix.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis.
POPD1132	Duplicate of POPD1133			
POPD1133	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	11	District wide minimum density is not supported. Should be a site by site approach. LDC is diverse if they are inculded they should be minimum standards determined by reference to character.	Comments noted.
POPD1134	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	12	Identification of specific site is favoured = greater chance of ensuring that the needs of local people wishing to build their own homes are met. These sites are specifically located as self build custom build housing sites with the Local Plan review .	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD1135	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	Whole Document	Broadly agree factors presented. In terms of Green Belt purpose should be assessed at the site level at earliest stage. Should be made clear that the assessment in the documents is different to the Suitability Appraisal SA process. Notes homes focused on sustainable settlements and that this accords with Option 2 Town and Key rural villages and this option is considered to be an appropriate option for delivering housing growth. Support Preferred Option. Key benefit is delivering housing were the need is located. Will help delivery Objectives 2,3,4, 5 and 12 and 14 and help reuse brownfield land. Note that the settlements identified are inset within the Green Belt therefore required release of Green Belt Landon the edge of settlements - Shenstone to provide long term housing and employment options. changes should be through a strategy policy. New Settlements number of dis benefits = significant investment in infrastructure long lead in times market saturation should not be considered as a appropriate solution in meeting housing need in isolation. It is clear there is scope for a wide range od sites spread across the district without the need to rely on a new settlement. .	Comments and preferred approach noted. The consultation document sets out the option assessment assumptions in Table 4.1 and specifies that this is a high level assessment considering other factors including the SA. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of plan process.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1136	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	4	Supported	Noted.
POPD1137	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	5	No mandatory requirement for such assessments (BREAM). It is considered that this should be left to the discretion of the developer rather than in policy reflect of para 150 b NPPF. Identification of locations for renewable energy would be clearly in line with para 151b NPPF, and this would be supported. para 11.21 of the Preferred Options consultation document states council will commission a new study to update information relating to low carbon and renewable energy capacity to help identify areas sustainable for wind and solar energy development , and refers to Appendix A as including timescales for the collection of this evidence , it ia noted that reference to this updated study is omitted form Appendix A	Comments in relation to BREEAM and preferences towards the proposed approach noted.
POPD1138	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	6	Supported	Support noted
POPD1139	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	7	Supported	Support noted.
POPD1140	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	8	The preferred approach of updating the Sustainable Transport policy (CP5) of the adopted Local Plan to reflect the key transport schemes and priorities for the District, once the evidence base has been updated, is fully supported.	Duly Noted
POPD1141	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	17	It is considered that the creation of proportionate extensions to settlements within Lichfield District will assist in providing green infrastructure, opportunities for the provision of indoor and outdoor sports and recreation facilities, support sustainable transport measures and contribute towards health care facilities, which will encourage healthy lifestyles and thereby assist in tackling obesity	Noted
POPD1142	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	20	Green Belt is not a natural resource but an artificial constraint and therefore should not be included within a policy on natural resources. It is agreed countryside is a natural resource and an area irrespective of whether it lies in Green Belt, it is considered that a policy which seeks to impose a blanket protection for the countryside does not comply with national guidance, quotes Stroud DC vs SSCLG (2015) EWHC 488 (Admin) is clear that whilst valued landscapes do not need to have a formal designation 'valued' means something more than just 'popular' Landscape is only valued if it has physical attributes which take it out of the ordinary. Quotes Landscape Institutes Guidelines. Preferred Policy direction implies that all the landscape countryside of the District is valued. This is not justified or evidenced against Landscape Institutes Guidelines and secondly if all landscapes countryside demonstrated the same certain qualities it would not be valued as those qualities would instead to the inherent norm or baseline as such this policy direction as written requires amendment as it fails to have regard to national policy.	Noted
POPD1143	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	21	Agrees that important views containing the spires should be protected. Views especially important when approaching Lichfield from the north and west. Policy should make reference accordingly.	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD1144	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	22	Considers that requiring a masterplan for all small and medium scale developments would be took onerous and may actually slow down the development process rather than assist in bringing sites forward. However to is the case that illustrative schemes are often produced to assist with pre-application discussion as well as local plan allocations. Considers illustrative masterplan shows proposed scheme at Whittington is deliverable. Notes infrastructure projects in made neighbourhood plan. Considers this development would assist in providing contribuitions for these priorities	Noted.
POPD1145	Richborough Estates (Pegasus)	23	Heritage statement requirement should be in validation policy not LP.	Noted
POPD1146	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	4	The preferred policy approach towards sustainble development is considered reflective of national planning policy and is supported.	Comments noted.
POPD1147	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	5	Acknowledged that the Code for Sustainable homes has been withdrawn whilst BREEAM can still be used for new residential buildings. No mandatory requirements it is considered this should be left to the discretion of the developer further NPPF para 150b the proposed approach to not replace this policy to set local standards is entirely appropriate. Renewable energy locations should be in line with NPPF para 151 b therefore support approach. However para 11.21 intention to commission a new study, - this study is not identified in Appendix A of the review.	Comments in relation to BREEAM and preferences towards the proposed approach noted.
POPD1148	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	6	The preferred policy approach towards flood risk is considered reflective of national planning policy and is supported.	Support noted.
POPD1149	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	7	The preferred policy approach towards air quality is considered reflective of national planning policy and is supported.	Support noted.
POPD1150	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	8	Fully supportive once evidence has been updated.	Duly Noted
POPD1151	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	17	Sustainable urban extension will provide infrastructure which will encourage healthy lifestyles and thereby assist in tackling obesity.	Noted
POPD1152	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	20	The Green belt is not a natural resource. A policy that seek to impose a blanket protection for the countryside does not comply with national guidance, Case law Stroud DC vs SSCLG (2015) EWHC 488 (ADMIN0 is clear that whilst valued landscapes so not need to have a formal designation value means something more than just popular. Landscape is only valued if it has physical attributes which take it out of the ordinary. Landscape Institutes Guidance's for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment identify various factors relevant to assessment (listed). The Preferred Policy implies the landscape countryside is valued. This is not justified or evidenced against the criteria. If landscape countryside landscape demonstrate the same certain qualities it would be seen as the norm and not be valued.	Noted
POPD1153	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	21	Agree that the view of the five spires is important and should be protected. Important when approaching Lichfield from the north and the west and it is considered that the policy should make reference to this .	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD1154	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	22	A Masterplan requirement for small to medium scale developments is too onerous and may actually slow down development. Acres Architecture have provided significant amounts of information thorough the plan process to demonstrate the proposed scheme is deliverable.	Noted.
POPD1155	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	23	Requirement for a heritage statement should be within the validation requirements rather than in the policy.	Noted. A heritage statement is currently a requirement of the local validation process.
POPD1156	Redrow Homes Ltd	Whole Document	Site promoted at Highfields Road, Burntwood. Supports review. Mechanism for meeting unmet need from Birmingham HMA. First City act for landowner and submitted separate reps. Removed from Focussed Changes Allocation DPD only because sufficient land identified to meet housingr equirement. Vision Framework attached. Site not subject to environmental and physical constraints. SHLAA July 2017 showed it was deliverable. SA 2015 said it was in a sustainable location. GB reviews 2013 and 2016 concluded site only played a moderate role in safeguarding countryside from encroachment and why it could be released.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1157	Georgina Doyle (Pegasus) Arces Architecture	Whole Document	Land off Court Drive Shenstone - Should be considered appropriate location for housing - Developable in line with NPPF para 73 on accordance with the Core Policies and demonstrated through SHLAA submission. 6.3 ha located to the South of Holy Hill Lane and south western fringe of Shenstone Village. Runs parallel to Court Drove. bound to the west by the Cross City line. Site consists of two residential properties one within Shenstone settlement boundary, agricultural land in the Green Belt. Not in conservation area. gently undulating topography. number of semi mature trees. 0.6km from Shenstone railway station 0.8km from bus stop local facilities within Shenstone. current two owners promoted by Acres Architecture available for development in 5 years no know constraints . Would support the delivery of Preferred Growth Options.	Comments and preferred approach noted.
POPD1158	Duplicate of POPD1159			
POPD1159	Redrow Homes Ltd	1	Consider vision could be clearer in meeting GBHMA shortfall. Should recognise GB release needed in the most sustainable locations to meet housing requirement 2020-2036	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1160	Redrow Homes Ltd	2	Support objective 1 and objective 6. But obj 6 could be clearer in contributing to HMA's unmet needs, especially as this is referred to in para 8.5 as the reason ' new residents' have been referenced.	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated. The need for wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document.The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities through the duty to cooperate

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1161	Redrow Homes Ltd	3	Supports the preferred spatial strategy. Consider residential growth at less sustainable smaller villages such as Stonnall. Hopwas and Kings Bromley could result in unsustainable commuting patterns. LPR evidence and GB review should consider various scales of proportional dispersal for sites up to 500 dwellings as per 8.122 of SGS on the complex urban edge of towns north of Walsall including Burntwood which would not significantly compromise the strategic function of the GB. LDC should assess and identify GB releases with non strategic plans simply defining more detailed boundary revisions. Support Burntwood as other main centre. Limited BF sites so will require GB review of Burntwood boundaries. LDC own evidence indicates Highfield Road site appropriate for release. Can be developed to provide defensible boundaries	Comments and support for preferred spatial strategy noted.
POPD1162	Lee Powell	Whole Document	Comments relate to SA. Does not include a comparative assessment for the four options for residential growth. Therefore considered the SA assessment attached to Scope Issues and Options. Question the choice of Option Two which would require green Belt release when a new settlement outside the green belt would not require this. Sa includes and admission that it is imprecise and relies on assumptions therefore cannot be relied upon to identify a best option with any degree of certainty. Section 4 (quotes paras 4.2.1, Scope Issues SA para 5.2 Policy directions SA) - the choice of spatial option 2 does not consider the effect on Green Belt and Landscape, Burntwood residents suggest that this will be detrimental to health. Quote para 5.10.2 from SIO SA, -historic such growth has never made a significant impact on community or transport infrastructure - have little faith it will happen. Quote Appendix A Key Sustainability Issues identified in the Scoping report Dec 2017 - suggest more people in Lichfield and Burntwood will only have more exacerbate crime figures. Out commuting - high levels of congestion at peak times on Burntwood roads increase in Burntwood population will make this worse. Rural village attractive rural areas - some aspects of Burntwood still rural development has already caused damage to the character of the area. Firmly believe it is time to stop any further damage to the rural aspects of the place where I live. Public transport is variable - Burntwood has no rail bus station taxi rank only tow main roads and no bus service after 9pm. Appendix B Assessment Matrix for Growth Options growth options 2 and 4 have only two Sustainability objectives which have different assessments - Against SO efficient use of land and use of previously different land quotes report outcomes. Suggests limited in previously developed land in Burntwood unless Mount Road is looked at after that inevitable if Option 2 is delivered that LDC will seek to undermine the value of Burntwood Green Belt and release for housing. All Call for Site sites in Burntwood are on the periphery of Burntwood conurbation and hosing on these sites would add to the burden on over stretched amenities and infrastructure increasing journeys by car. Option 4 self contained settlement with school shops and medical facilities. Long suffering Burntwood residents this option is far more logical and sustainable than sacrificing more of Burntwood Green surroundings. SO Increase opportunities for non- car travel and reduce the need to travel - Growth Options 1 and 2 quote SA there is not much difference in the sustainability of options 2 and 4 regarding non car travel and if enhanced public transport is provided for a new settlement option 4 could be equally if not more sustainable. Overall SA does not show that option 2 is much more sustainable than Option 4. Compared to development on Burntwood Green Belt believes that option 4 is more sustainable. SA 2019 para 4.1.7 , 4.1.8 Does not make sense The development of Rugeley Power station is till in the Plan so why has Rugeley been deleted. Brownhills Norton Canes & Penkridge should not feature not in LDC However part of Brownhills West is in LDC and perhaps that should appear in option 2. Paras 4.1.10 and 4.1.11 endorse the need to explore Growth option 4 and the sites identified through the Strategic Growth Study in more detail. Paras 5.3.3, 5.3.4 unsure what these para say. Suggests a summary as, Despite choosing option 2 more assessment is required regarding GBHMA homes regarding impact on amenities infrastructure and the Green Belt The final Spatial Strategy will only be determined after works and analysis of the results of this consultation has been compared. Suggests three reasonable scenarios for housing growth to be SAed, 1 balanced growth subject to constraints such as Green Belt 2 meeting neighbour local planning needs 3 provision above locally assessed need in order to follow market signals and boast economic growth. Paras 5.3.12 suggest that 2 4500 urban extensions to Lichfield and Burntwood is not sustainable. Additional 4500 at Burntwood would destroy almost all the surrounding Green Belt and place unacceptable pressure on services and infrastructure nonsense to consider. para 5.3.13 suggest contentious statements - presumably there will be more CIL money for 2-4 bedroom homes and therefore more money might be available to improve health facilities. This is nonsense the building of Church Farm Estate and Hunslet estate and St Matthews Estate generated no money for improving health care facilities in Burntwood. Also questions link between school provision and educational access. - does this mean families living in affordable homes are more likely to send their children to local schools than their wealthier neighbours - insult to those living in affordable homes. These two sentence add nothing to justify the need for affordable housing and should be delivered at the earliest opportunity. para 5.3.27 - Burntwood has been assessed. Also assessments are nonsense - "Lichfield City would have a significant positive effect on the educational attainment sue to the potential increase in access to its infrastructure also quote " fazeley and Streethay have accessibility to high levels of existing health facilities and so there	Comments related the Sustainability Appraisal noted. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan. The SA process is iterative with the local plan review and will be applied with a consistent methodology as the local plan evolves.
POPD1163	Redrow Homes Ltd	4	Support preferred policy approach and principles but too long. Consider their site accords with the principles.	Comments noted.
POPD1164	Redrow Homes Ltd	9	Supports recognition LPR should meet district need and Greater Birmingham HMA. Support commissioning of HEDNA alongised and relative to employment need. Have undertaken their own housing needs study. Indicates between 500 to 600 dwellings per annum may be required. Consider options 4 and 5 would fail to make an additional or proprtionate contribution towards unmet need. Concern at unwillingness to pursue an increase even if evidence for local need increases. Should not discount a requirement between option 5 and option 6. Option 6 is disproportionately wide. Previous Inspector's concerns around a requirement over 600 per annum made during downturn. Strong evidence now of market recovery. They consider their technical review strongly indicates min of 600 per annum required to meet local and unmet need. SHLAA will need to take account of the NPPF revised defintion of deliverability and achievability.	Comments noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis.
POPD1165	Redrow Homes Ltd	10	Should not include a blanket policy on mix as needs change over time and could undermine viability and delivery. Such a policy should be an SPD regularly updated.	Comments and preferences noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment.
POPD1166	Turley for Bovis at Gillway Lane, Tamworth	1	Promoting land at Gillway Lane, Tamworth. Support that it seeks to locate development in the most sustainable locations, but consider the vision could be more explicit in acknowledging LDC responsibility to accommodate proprtion of the GBHMA shortfall to 2036, particularly as some of the shortfall arises from neighbouring Tamworth.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1167	Redrow Homes Ltd	11	Shouldn't be a prescriptive blanket policy on density. If LPR to include a policy, should be specific to urban centres and public transport nodes and flexible to respond to its context, local character and remain viable. Does not support 35dph in preferred policy direction as lower densites may be more appropriate adjoining the countryside.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD1168	Turley for Bovis at Gillway Lane, Tamworth	2	Promoting land at Gillway Lane, Tamworth. SO 6 sshould refer to plan contributing to GBHMA's unmet needs, including that arising from neighbouring Tamworth.	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. The need for wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate
POPD1169	Turley for Bovis at Gillway Lane, Tamworth	3	Promoting land at Gillway Lane, Tamworth. Tamworth represents one of the most sustainable locations for growth with an exceptional range of facilites and train servces to Birmigham, London and Nottingham, is supported by SGS and should be taken forward for further detailed consideration. In ensuring the plan delivers growth in the most sustainable locations, residential growth at smaller less sustainabel smaller service villages such as Stonnall, Hopwas and Kings Bromley should be carefully managed as this could result in unsustainable commuting patterns.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1170	Turley for Bovis at Gillway Lane, Tamworth	4	Promoting land at Gillway Lane, Tamworth. Support, although contend that 17 key issues/principles is too long and some should be combined. Our proposed site will perform strongly.	Comments regarding policy length noted.
POPD1171	Turley for Bovis at Gillway Lane, Tamworth	8	Promoting land at Gillway Lane, Tamworth. The preferred policy approach towards sustainable transport needs to be underpinned by a suitable spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy which seek to direct development to the most sustainable locations, as supported by our transport evidence.	Duly Noted
POPD1172	Turley for Bovis at Gillway Lane, Tamworth	9	Promoting land at Gillway Lane, Tamworth. Strongly support recognition that LPR will be required to separately address both the District's local needs and a contribution to the unmet needs of the GBHMA. Taylor Wimpey and Turley support preparation of HEDNA and are keen to take an active role in contributing to this study. A separate technical review is submitted suggest explore requirement of at least 6,000 dpa at least 600 dpa.	Comments and support for the approach and preparation of a HEDNA noted.
POPD1173	Turley for Bovis at Gillway Lane, Tamworth	10	Promoting land at Gillway Lane, Tamworth. Support commissioning of HEDNA but should not include prescriptive policy on housing mix as demography and market signals change over time and should reflect the needs of specific settlements and areas. Put in SPD.	Comments and preferences noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix.
POPD1174	Turley for Bovis at Gillway Lane, Tamworth	11	Promoting land at Gillway Lane, Tamworth. Not necessary to apply a blanket policy. Should be determined through character and context and needs of the area whilst still delivering a high quality development. If policy included should provide flexibility.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD1175	Turley for Bovis at Gillway Lane, Tamworth	22	Promoting land at Gillway Lane, Tamworth. Support inclusion of a policy which promotes high quality design, attached vision framework has informed a masterplan for site proposed.	Noted.
POPD1176	Turley for Bovis at Gillway Lane, Tamworth	Whole Document	Promoting land at Gillway Lane, Tamworth. Welcomes opportunity to engage with the LPR so it has an up todate Local Plan and mechanism for identifying appropriate contribution to GBHMA shortfall. Site at north of Tamworth recognised by SGS as sustainanble locations for growth given its proximity to Tamworth town centre. Site is well suited and can deliver significant benefits for existing and new residents and is deliverable. Further details submitted.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1177	Redrow Homes Ltd	14	Support the focus at existing key employment areas and identification of Burntwood as a focus for employment growth.	Duly Noted No Further Action Required
POPD1178	Redrow Homes Ltd	15	Support the preferred policy approach for Burntwood TC and Chasetown. Support acknowledgement of private sector investment being essential to deliver improvements within Burntwood through resi development.	Duly Noted
POPD1179	Redrow Homes Ltd	22	The attached Vision framework shows work already undertaken re masterplan	Noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1180	Grasscroft Homes - Avison Young	Whole Document	Promotes land at Hay End Lane, Fradley.Summarises GBHMA study findings and September 18 position statement update. Identifies at least 10,696 shortfall to be met 2011 to 2031. Considers evidence base appropriate but Urban Capacity Assessment should be added. Update due by May 2019, should consider additional sites now. SHLAA 2017 evidence shows site is sustainable, suitable, deliverable. Rep sets out how these considerations are met in detail. Concludes by supporting LDC re intention to meet unmet need. Concludes that Lichfield has capability to deliver 550 + dwellings per annum. Supports option 5 in table 14.1 of POPD. Next iteration should specify annual delivery figure. Supports option 2 re residential growth options.	Comments and preferences noted. The district council will be preparing an Urban Capacity Assessment to inform the next stages of the Local Plan Review.
POPD1181	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	1	Promoting land at Curborough North. Agree. Feel NE Lichfield is well placed to cater to this vision and provide for sustainable development.	Comments noted. The vision is provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level. Site specific suggestions will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.
POPD1182	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	2	Promoting land at Curborough North. SO and priority 2 suggest insert suitable wording to ensure that this provision of employment and housing is sustainable in nature, and appropriate in amount, taking account of access to jobs, services and facilities. SCC has raised issues in relation to school transport. The ability of rural communities to absorb new housing without creating social cohesion issues should also be taken into account. Suggest SO and priority 6 is expanded to make specific reference to the requirement to contribute to the unmet need of the wider HMA.	Comments noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. Strategic Objective & Priority 2 indicates the objective is to develop and maintain more sustainable rural communities. Contributing towards meeting wider HMA unmet need is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1183	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	3	Promoting land at Curborough North. Broadly agree and note the strategy acknowledges Lichfield City is the most accessible settlement. Consider should be amended to ensure the bulk is located in the most sustainable locations. North East Lichfield would be considered a sustainable extension to Lichfield. Need to assess if building in urban areas and on brownfield sites do not harm the character of those areas, particularly with regards to the specific heritage constraints within Lichfield and their viability and deliverability.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1184	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	4	Promoting land at Curborough North. Agree.	Comments noted.
POPD1185	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	8	Promoting land at Curborough North. Agree, see supporting documents to see how sites fulfills this.	Duly Noted
POPD1186	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	9	Promoting land at Curborough North. Council should use standard methodology in the first instance and consider economic aspirations in deciding the number of dwellings to plan for and any housing need arising from wider HMA. Consider standard methodology would result in decline in working age population and lower baseline job growth. Consider need updated evidence base as our evidence suggests 500-800 dpa not taking into account wider unmet need and economic aspirations. Consider not sufficient evidence to show that testing 3,000-4,5000 additional dwellings is the correct amount to accommodate. Questioned how much delivery will be from brownfield sites and consideration of constraints of urban areas, particularly from a heritage point of view needed. Growth North of Lichfield scored more positively and support and welcome NE Lichfield as preferred growth option. Further technical reports submitted.	Comments and preferences for housing growth noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing and employment growth scenarios. In addition further evidence base documents including an Urban Capacity Assessment will be prepared to inform the next stages of the Local Plan Review.
POPD1187	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	10	Promoting land at Curborough North. Housing mix and affordable housing requirements should be fully justified and evidenced and subject to viability testing.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment.
POPD1188	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	11	Promoting land at Curborough North. Blanket density policy would not promote high-quality design that reflects the character of the area. Should be evidenced and should not impact upon deliverability.	Comments and preferences noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. This will be considered further as the Local Plan review progresses.
POPD1189	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	12	Promoting land at Curborough North. Focus on supporting specific custom and self-build developments is a more pragmatic approach than requiring provision within wider schemes. Should not inhibit delivery of other forms of housing and any allocation of this type is in addition to any housing sites allocated.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD1190	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	14	Promoting land at Curborough North. Welcome focus of increasing employment provision within Fradley and Lichfield City. NE Lichfield is well placed to interact with these employment sites and sustainable transport links.	Duly Noted
POPD1191	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	15	Promoting land at Curborough North. Suggest should include provision of services and facilities within allocated sites.	Duly Noted
POPD1192	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	17	Promoting land at Curborough North. Curborough ward requires particular focus to address unhealthy lifestyles, propose development can address these.	Noted
POPD1193	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	22	Promoting land at Curborough North. Concept masterplans have been produced for the site showing how scheme can deliver homes and facilities. See further details.	Noted.
POPD1194	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough North	Whole Document	Promoting land at Curborough North, and should be read in conjunction with rep relating to Curborough South. Master plan submitted along with supporting technical documents. Modification to LP allocations makes it clear that LPR shall include a review of housing requirement and potential for housing land supply to meet unmet need arising in GBHMA and employment needs. Feel best way to accommodate required growth is through growth north east of Lichfield. The decision to review the document is supported.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered by the Local Plan Review.LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in assembling evidence with regard to meeting housing and employment needs.
POPD1195	Nicola Wallwork - Powell	Whole Document	Comments relate to SA. Does not include a comparative assessment for the four options for residential growth. Therefore considered the SA assessment attached to Scope Issues and Options. Question the choice of Option Two which would require green Belt release when a new settlement outside the green belt would not require this. Sa includes and admission that it is imprecise and relies on assumptions therefore cannot be relied upon to identify a best option with any degree of certainty. Section 4 (quotes paras 4.2.1, Scope Issues SA para 5.2 Policy directions SA) - the choice of spatial option 2 does not consider the effect on Green Belt and Landscape, Burntwood residents suggest that this will be detrimental to health. Quote para 5.10.2 from SIO SA, -historic such growth has never made a significant impact on community or transport infrastructure - have little faith it will happen. Quote Appendix A Key Sustainability Issues identified in the Scoping report Dec 2017 - suggest more people in Lichfield and Burntwood will only have more exacerbate crime figures. Out commuting - high levels of congestion at peak times on Burntwood roads increase in Burntwood population will make this worse. Rural village attractive rural areas - some aspects of Burntwood still rural development has already caused damage to the character of the area. Firmly believe it is time to stop any further damage to the rural aspects of the place where I live. Public transport is variable - Burntwood has no rail bus station taxi rank only tow main roads and no bus service after 9pm. Appendix B Assessment Matrix for Growth Options growth options 2 and 4 have only two Sustainability objectives which have different assessments - Against SO efficient use of land and use of previously different land quotes report outcomes. Suggests limited in previously developed land in Burntwood unless Mount Road is looked at after that inevitable if Option 2 is delivered that LDC will seek to undermine the value of Burntwood Green Belt and release for housing. All Call for Site sites in Burntwood are on the periphery of Burntwood conurbation and housing on these sites would add to the burden on over stretched amenities and infrastructure increasing journeys by car. Option 4 self contained settlement with school shops and medical facilities. Long suffering Burntwood residents this option is far more logical and sustainable than sacrificing more of Burntwood Green surroundings. SO Increase opportunities for non- car travel and reduce the need to travel - Growth Options 1 and 2 quote SA there is not much difference in the sustainability of options 2 and 4 regarding non car travel and if enhanced public transport is provided for a new settlement option 4 could be equally if not more sustainable. Overall SA does not show that option 2 is much more sustainable than Option 4. Compared to development on Burntwood Green Belt believes that option 4 is more sustainable. SA 2019 para 4.1.7 , 4.1.8 Does not make sense The development of Rugeley Power station is till in the Plan so why has Rugeley been deleted. Brownhills Norton Canes & Penkridge should not feature not in LDC However part of Brownhills West is in LDC and perhaps that should appear in option 2. Paras 4.1.10 and 4.1.11 endorse the need to explore Growth option 4 and the sites identified through the Strategic Growth Study in more detail. Paras 5.3.3, 5.3.4 unsure what these para say. Suggests a summary as, Despite choosing option 2 more assessment is required regarding GBHMA homes regarding impact on amenities infrastructure and the Green Belt The final Spatial Strategy will only be determined after works and analysis of the results of this consultation has been compared. Suggests three reasonable scenarios for housing growth to be SAed, 1 balanced growth subject to constraints such as Green Belt 2 meeting neighbour local planning needs 3 provision above locally assessed need in order to follow market signals and boost economic growth. Paras 5.3.12 suggest that 2 4500 urban extensions to Lichfield and Burntwood is not sustainable. Additional 4500 at Burntwood would destroy almost all the surrounding Green Belt and place unacceptable pressure on services and infrastructure nonsense to consider. para 5.3.13 suggest contentious statements - presumably there will be more CIL money for 2-4 bedroom homes and therefore more money might be available to improve health facilities. This is nonsense the building of Church Farm Estate and Hunslet estate and St Matthews Estate generated no money for improving health care facilities in Burntwood. Also questions link between school provision and educational access. - does this mean families living in affordable homes are more likely to send their children to local schools than their wealthier neighbours - insult to those living in affordable homes. These two sentence add nothing to justify the need for affordable housing and should be delivered at the earliest opportunity. para 5.3.27 - Burntwood has been assessed. Also assessments are nonsense - "Lichfield City would have a significant positive effect on the educational attainment due to the potential increase in access to its infrastructure also quote " fazeley and Streethay have accessibility to high levels of existing health facilities and so there	Comments related the Sustainability Appraisal noted. These will be considered further as the Local Plan Review and supporting evidence base including the Sustainability Appraisal evolve.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1196	David Townsend	Whole Document	<p>Comments relate to SA. Does not include a comparative assessment for the four options for residential growth. Therefore considered the SA assessment attached to Scope Issues and Options.</p> <p>Question the choice of Option Two which would require Green Belt release when a new settlement outside the green belt would not require this. SA includes and admission that it is imprecise and relies on assumptions therefore cannot be relied upon to identify a best option with any degree of certainty. Section 4 (quotes paras 4.2.1, Scope Issues SA para 5.2 Policy directions SA) - the choice of spatial option 2 does not consider the effect on Green Belt and Landscape, Burntwood residents suggest that this will be detrimental to health. Quote para 5.10.2 from SIO SA, -historic such growth has never made a significant impact on community or transport infrastructure - have little faith it will happen. Quote Appendix A Key Sustainability Issues identified in the Scoping report Dec 2017 - suggest more people in Lichfield and Burntwood will only have more exacerbate crime figures. Out commuting - high levels of congestion at peak times on Burntwood roads increase in Burntwood population will make this worse. Rural village attractive rural areas - some aspects of Burntwood still rural development has already caused damage to the character of the area. Firmly believe it is time to stop any further damage to the rural aspects of the place where I live. Public transport is variable - Burntwood has no rail bus station taxi rank only two main roads and no bus service after 9pm. Appendix B Assessment Matrix for Growth Options growth options 2 and 4 have only two Sustainability objectives which have different assessments - Against SO efficient use of land and use of previously different land quotes report outcomes. Suggests limited in previously developed land in Burntwood unless Mount Road is looked at after that inevitable if Option 2 is delivered that LDC will seek to undermine the value of Burntwood Green Belt and release for housing. All Call for Site sites in Burntwood are on the periphery of Burntwood conurbation and housing on these sites would add to the burden on over stretched amenities and infrastructure increasing journeys by car. Option 4 self contained settlement with school shops and medical facilities. Long suffering Burntwood residents this option is far more logical and sustainable than sacrificing more of Burntwood Green surroundings. SO Increase opportunities for non- car travel and reduce the need to travel - Growth Options 1 and 2 quote SA there is not much difference in the sustainability of options 2 and 4 regarding non car travel and if enhanced public transport is provided for a new settlement option 4 could be equally if not more sustainable. Overall SA does not show that option 2 is much more sustainable than Option 4. Compared to development on Burntwood Green Belt believes that option 4 is more sustainable. SA 2019 para 4.1.7 , 4.1.8 Does not make sense The development of Rugeley Power station is still in the Plan so why has Rugeley been deleted. Brownhills Norton Canes & Penkridge should not feature not in LDC However part of Brownhills West is in LDC and perhaps that should appear in option 2. Paras 4.1.10 and 4.1.11 endorse the need to explore Growth option 4 and the sites identified through the Strategic Growth Study in more detail. Paras 5.3.3, 5.3.4 unsure what these para say. Suggests a summary as, despite choosing option 2 more assessment is required regarding GBHMA homes regarding impact on amenities infrastructure and the Green Belt The final Spatial Strategy will only be determined after works and analysis of the results of this consultation has been compared. Suggests three reasonable scenarios for housing growth to be SAed, 1 balanced growth subject to constraints such as Green Belt 2 meeting neighbour local planning needs 3 provision above locally assessed need in order to follow market signals and boost economic growth. Paras 5.3.12 suggest that 2 4500 urban extensions to Lichfield and Burntwood is not sustainable. Additional 4500 at Burntwood would destroy almost all the surrounding Green Belt and place unacceptable pressure on services and infrastructure nonsense to consider. para 5.3.13 suggest contentious statements - presumably there will be more CIL money for 2-4 bedroom homes and therefore more money might be available to improve health facilities. This is nonsense the building of Church Farm Estate and Hunslet estate and St Matthews Estate generated no money for improving health care facilities in Burntwood. Also questions link between school provision and educational access - does this mean families living in affordable homes are more likely to send their children to local schools than their wealthier neighbours - insult to those living in affordable homes. These two sentence add nothing to justify the need for affordable housing and should be delivered at the earliest opportunity. para 5.3.27 - Burntwood has been assessed. Also assessments are nonsense - "Lichfield City would have a significant positive effect on the educational attainment due to the potential increase in access to its infrastructure also quote " Fazeley and Streethay have accessibility to high levels of existing health facilities and so</p>	<p>Comments related the Sustainability Appraisal noted. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan. The SA process is iterative with the local plan review and will be applied with a consistent methodology as the local plan evolves</p>
POPD1197	Grasscroft Homes - Avison Young	Chapter 14	<p>Agree with evidence base to calculate the need and the acknowledgment to meet unmet need in the GBHMA. Reserve right to comment further when GB review and UCA completed. Review 7 housing requirement options. Draws attention to delivery rates up until 2008 regularly between 497 and 647, then recession casuses sharp drop. Recent delivery numbers demonstate 550 can be delivered. Reference that LDC cannot deliver 550 on a regular basis should be removed.</p>	<p>Commentes noted. Delivery rates and trends are set out within the Authority Monitoring Report.</p>
POPD1198	Grasscroft Homes - Avison Young	9	<p>Agrees with principle of having a strategic policy on housing provsion. Notes further work required to define and finalsie details.Supports commitment to help address unmet need in wider HMA. Now need to specify annual figure that reflects commitment to address shortfall.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
POPD1199	Helen Townsend	Whole Document	<p>Comments relate to SA. Does not include a comparative assessment for the four options for residential growth. Therefore considered the SA assessment attached to Scope Issues and Options.</p> <p>Question the choice of Option Two which would require green Belt release when a new settlement outside the green belt would not require this. Sa includes and admission that it is imprecise and relies on assumptions therefore cannot be relied upon to identify a best option with any degree of certainty. Section 4 (quotes paras 4.2.1, Scope Issues SA para 5.2 Policy directions SA) - the choice of spatial option 2 does not consider the effect on Green Belt and Landscape, Burntwood residents suggest that this will be detrimental to health. Quote para 5.10.2 from SIO SA, -historic such growth has never made a significant impact on community or transport infrastructure - have little faith it will happen. Quote Appendix A Key Sustainability Issues identified in the Scoping report Dec 2017 - suggest more people in Lichfield and Burntwood will only have more exacerbate crime figures. Out commuting - high levels of congestion at peak times on Burntwood roads increase in Burntwood population will make this worse. Rural village attractive rural areas - some aspects of Burntwood still rural development has already caused damage to the character of the area. Firmly believe it is time to stop any further damage to the rural aspects of the place where I live. Public transport is variable - Burntwood has no rail bus station taxi rank only tow main roads and no bus service after 9pm. Appendix B Assessment Matrix for Growth Options growth options 2 and 4 have only two Sustainability objectives which have different assessments - Against SO efficient use of land and use of previously different land quotes report outcomes. Suggests limited in previously developed land in Burntwood unless Mount Road is looked at after that inevitable if Option 2 is delivered that LDC will seek to undermine the value of Burntwood Green Belt and release for housing. All Call for Site sites in Burntwood are on the periphery of Burntwood conurbation and hosing on these sites would add to the burden on over stretched amenities and infrastructure increasing journeys by car. Option 4 self contained settlement with school shops and medical facilities. Long suffering Burntwood residents this option is far more logical and sustainable than sacrificing more of Burntwood Green surroundings. SO Increase opportunities for non- car travel and reduce the need to travel - Growth Options 1 and 2 quote SA there is not much difference in the sustainability of options 2 and 4 regarding non car travel and if enhanced public transport is provided for a new settlement option 4 could be equally if not more sustainable. Overall SA does not show that option 2 is much more sustainable than Option 4. Compared to development on Burntwood Green Belt believes that option 4 is more sustainable. SA 2019 para 4.1.7 , 4.1.8 Does not make sense The development of Rugeley Power station is till in the Plan so why has Rugeley been deleted. Brownhills Norton Canes & Penkridge should not feature not in LDC However part of Brownhills West is in LDC and perhaps that should appear in option 2. Paras 4.1.10 and 4.1.11 endorse the need to explore Growth option 4 and the sites identified through the Strategic Growth Study in more detail. Paras 5.3.3, 5.3.4 unsure what these para say. Suggests a summary as, Despite choosing option 2 more assessment is required regarding GBHMA homes regarding impact on amenities infrastructure and the Green Belt The final Spatial Strategy will only be determined after works and analysis of the results of this consultation has been compared. Suggests three reasonable scenarios for housing growth to be SAed, 1 balanced growth subject to constraints such as Green Belt 2 meeting neighbour local planning needs 3 provision above locally assessed need in order to follow market signals and boast economic growth. Paras 5.3.12 suggest that 2 4500 urban extensions to Lichfield and Burntwood is not sustainable. Additional 4500 at Burntwood would destroy almost all the surrounding Green Belt and place unacceptable pressure on services and infrastructure nonsense to consider. para 5.3.13 suggest contentious statements - presumably there will be more CIL money for 2-4 bedroom homes and therefore more money might be available to improve health facilities. This is nonsense the building of Church Farm Estate and Hunslet estate and St Matthews Estate generated no money for improving health care facilities in Burntwood. Also questions link between school provision and educational access. - does this mean families living in affordable homes are more likely to send their children to local schools than their wealthier neighbours - insult to those living in affordable homes. These two sentence add nothing to justify the need for affordable housing and should be delivered at the earliest opportunity. para 5.3.27 - Burntwood has been assessed. Also assessments are nonsense - "Lichfield City would have a significant positive effect on the educational attainment sue to the potential increase in access to its infrastructure also quote " fazeley and Streethay have accessibility to high levels of existing health facilities and so there</p>	<p>Comments related the Sustainability Appraisal noted. A wide range of evidence is being assembled to support the review of the local plan. The SA process is iterative with the local plan review and will be applied with a consistent methodology as the local plan evolves.</p>

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1200	Nicola Townsend	Whole Document	Comments relate to SA. Does not include a comparative assessment for the four options for residential growth. Therefore considered the SA assessment attached to Scope Issues and Options. Question the choice of Option Two which would require green Belt release when a new settlement outside the green belt would not require this. Sa includes and admission that it is imprecise and relies on assumptions therefore cannot be relied upon to identify a best option with any degree of certainty. Section 4 (quotes paras 4.2.1, Scope Issues SA para 5.2 Policy directions SA) - the choice of spatial option 2 does not consider the effect on Green Belt and Landscape, Burntwood residents suggest that this will be detrimental to health. Quote para 5.10.2 from SIO SA, -historic such growth has never made a significant impact on community or transport infrastructure - have little faith it will happen. Quote Appendix A Key Sustainability Issues identified in the Scoping report Dec 2017 - suggest more people in Lichfield and Burntwood will only have more exacerbate crime figures. Out commuting - high levels of congestion at peak times on Burntwood roads increase in Burntwood population will make this worse. Rural village attractive rural areas - some aspects of Burntwood still rural development has already caused damage to the character of the area. Firmly believe it is time to stop any further damage to the rural aspects of the place where I live. Public transport is variable - Burntwood has no rail bus station taxi rank only tow main roads and no bus service after 9pm. Appendix B Assessment Matrix for Growth Options growth options 2 and 4 have only two Sustainability objectives which have different assessments - Against SO efficient use of land and use of previously different land quotes report outcomes. Suggests limited in previously developed land in Burntwood unless Mount Road is looked at after that inevitable if Option 2 is delivered that LDC will seek to undermine the value of Burntwood Green Belt and release for housing. All Call for Site sites in Burntwood are on the periphery of Burntwood conurbation and hosing on these sites would add to the burden on over stretched amenities and infrastructure increasing journeys by car. Option 4 self contained settlement with school shops and medical facilities. Long suffering Burntwood residents this option is far more logical and sustainable than sacrificing more of Burntwood Green surroundings. SO Increase opportunities for non- car travel and reduce the need to travel - Growth Options 1 and 2 quote SA there is not much difference in the sustainability of options 2 and 4 regarding non car travel and if enhanced public transport is provided for a new settlement option 4 could be equally if not more sustainable. Overall SA does not show that option 2 is much more sustainable than Option 4. Compared to development on Burntwood Green Belt believes that option 4 is more sustainable. SA 2019 para 4.1.7 , 4.1.8 Does not make sense The development of Rugeley Power station is till in the Plan so why has Rugeley been deleted. Brownhills Norton Canes & Penkridge should not feature not in LDC However part of Brownhills West is in LDC and perhaps that should appear in option 2. Paras 4.1.10 and 4.1.11 endorse the need to explore Growth option 4 and the sites identified through the Strategic Growth Study in more detail. Paras 5.3.3, 5.3.4 unsure what these para say. Suggests a summary as, Despite choosing option 2 more assessment is required regarding GBHMA homes regarding impact on amenities infrastructure and the Green Belt The final Spatial Strategy will only be determined after works and analysis of the results of this consultation has been compared. Suggests three reasonable scenarios for housing growth to be SAed, 1 balanced growth subject to constraints such as Green Belt 2 meeting neighbour local planning needs 3 provision above locally assessed need in order to follow market signals and boast economic growth. Paras 5.3.12 suggest that 2 4500 urban extensions to Lichfield and Burntwood is not sustainable. Additional 4500 at Burntwood would destroy almost all the surrounding Green Belt and place unacceptable pressure on services and infrastructure nonsense to consider. para 5.3.13 suggest contentious statements - presumably there will be more CL money for 2-4 bedroom homes and therefore more money might be available to improve health facilities. This is nonsense the building of Church Farm Estate and Hunslet estate and St Matthews Estate generated no money for improving health care facilities in Burntwood. Also questions link between school provision and educational access. - does this mean families living in affordable homes are more likely to send their children to local schools than their wealthier neighbours - insult to those living in affordable homes. These two sentence add nothing to justify the need for affordable housing and should be delivered at the earliest opportunity. para 5.3.27 - Burntwood has been assessed. Also assessments are nonsense - "Lichfield City would have a significant positive effect on the educational attainment sue to the potential increase in access to its infrastructure also quote " fazeley and Streethay have accessibility to high levels of existing health facilities and so there	Comments related the Sustainability Appraisal noted. These will be considered further as the Local Plan Review and supporting evidence base including the Sustainability Appraisal evolve.
POPD1201	Grasscroft Homes - Avison Young	Chapter 20	Considers the four residential growth options. Strongly object to option 1. Reasons include GB constraint, insufficient land in urban areas, long lead in times, smaller sites needed to meet higher levels of need. Supports option 2. Most sustainable option, support from Parish Council, housing requirement more likley to be met. Option 3 not preferred as development should be focussed at the districts most sustainable locations therefore agree with LDC. Option 4 objected to as contrary to preferred settlement hierarchy and agree with LDC option is not deliverable.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1202	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	1	Promoting land at Curborough South. Agree. Feel NE Lichfield is well placed to cater to this vision and provide for sustainable development.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level. Site specific suggestions will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.
POPD1203	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	2	Promoting land at Curborough south. SO and priority 2 suggest insert suitable wording to ensure that this provision of employment and housing is sustainable in nature, and appropriate in amount, taking account of access to jobs, services and facilities. SCC has raised issues in relation to school transport. The ability of rural communities to absorb new housing without creating social cohesion issues should also be taken into account. Suggest SO and priority 6 is expanded to make specific reference to the requirement to contribute to the unmet need of the wider HMA.	Comments noted . Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. Strategic Objective & Priority 2 indicates the objective is to develop and maintain more sustainable rural communities. The need for wider HMA unmet need to be met is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1204	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	3	Promoting land at Curborough south. Broadly agree and note the strategy acknowledges Lichfield City is the most accessible settlement. Consider should be amended to ensure the bulk is located in the most sustainable locations. North East Lichfield would be considered a sustainable extension to Lichfield. Need to assess if building in urban areas and on brownfield sites do not harm the character of those areas, particularly with regards to the specific heritage constraints within Lichfield and their viability and deliverability.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1205	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	4	Promoting land at Curborough South. Agree.	Comments noted.
POPD1206	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	8	Promoting land at Curborough south. Agree, see supporting documents to see how sites fulfills this.	Duly Noted
POPD1207	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	9	Promoting land at Curborough south. Council should use standard methodology in the first instance and consider economic aspirations in deciding the number of dwellings to plan for and any housing need arising from wider HMA. Consider standard methodology would result in decline in working age population and lower baseline job growth. Consider need updated evidence base as our evidence suggests 500-800 dpa not taking into account wider unmet need and economic aspirations. Consider not sufficient evidence to show that testing 3,000-4,5000 additional dwellings is the correct amount to accommodate. Questioned how much delivery will be from brownfield sites and consideration of constraints of urban areas, particularly from a heritage point of view needed. Growth North of Lichfield scored more positively and support and welcome NE Lichfield as preferred growth option. Further technical reports submitted.	Comments and preferences for housing growth noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing and employment growth scenarios. In addition further evidence base documents including an Urban Capacity Assessment will be prepared to inform the next stages of the Local Plan Review.
POPD1208	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	10	Promoting land at Curborough south. Housing mix and affordable housing requirements should be fully justified and evidenced and subject to viability testing.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment.
POPD1209	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	11	Promoting land at Curborough south. Blanket density policy would not promote high-quality design that reflects the character of the area. Should be evidenced and should not impact upon deliverability.	Comments and preferences noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. This will be considered further as the Local Plan review progresses.
POPD1210	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	12	Promoting land at Curborough south. Focus on supporting specific custom and self-build developments is a more pragmatic approach than requiring provision within wider schemes. Should not inhibit delivery of other forms of housing and any allocation of this type is in addition to any housing sites allocated.	Comments and preferred approach noted. This will be considered further as the Local Plan Review progresses.
POPD1211	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	14	Promoting land at Curborough south. Welcome focus of increasing employment provision within Fradley and Lichfield City. NE Lichfield is well placed to interact with these employment sites and sustainable transport links.	Duly Noted
POPD1212	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	15	Promoting land at Curborough south. Suggest should include provision of services and facilites within allocated sites.	Duly Noted
POPD1213	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	17	Promoting land at Curborough south. Curborough ward requires particular focus to address unhealthy lifestyles, propose development can address these.	Noted
POPD1214	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	22	Promoting land at Curborough south. Concept masterplans have been produced for thesite showing how scheme can deliver homes and facilities. See further details.	Noted.
POPD1215	Barton Willmore for IM Land at Curborough South	Whole Document	Promoting land at Curborough south, and should be read in conjunction with rep relating to Curborough North. Master plan submitted along with supporting technical documents. Modification to LPAllocations makes it clear that LPR shall include a review of housing requirement and potential for housing land supply to meet unmet need arising in GBBCHMA and employment needs. Feel best way to accommodate required growth is through growth north east of Lichfield. The decision to review the document is supported.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered by the Local Plan Review.LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in assembling evidence with regard to meeting housing and employment needs.
POPD1216	Liz Bodden (Pegasus) for Drayton Mannor	Whole Document	Rep made on behalf of Drayton Manor Park in relation the existing theme park and its future development proposals. Support Preferred Policy that promotes tourist attractions including DMP. Rep explore how this policy can be developed. Rep supported by Appendix 1 Economic Benefits report Appendix 2 Vison Document Appendix 3 landscape and Visual Statement. DMP Site Context Site Location Plan Appendix 4. Site is approx. 116 h, 40h main park. Locations 0.5 south of Fazeley accessed off A4091 connects to A5 and Junction 9 pf the M42. Site surrounded by agr land golf course and woodland area. Economy Benefits - 1.2 million visitors £140 visitor spend £35m economic output. Employing 700 400 full time. £30m invested in the last 10years including hotel. Future Proposals Important to invest in the park new rides and attractions. Next 15 years plan to invest in upgrading facilities delivery new facilities and attritions increase capacity expand accommodation offer. Includes new road junction with traffic lights access of A4091 app being submitted April 2019 completion over the next two years. Barriers system installed currently. Appendix 2 includes a timeline for the proposals. Next 10 years expansion of Theme Park, refit of zoo, indoor water play, woodland activity centre, offices, hotel and conference facilities, lodge park, caravan and camping. beyond 10 expansion of developable are of DMP. Could increase visitors to 1.5 million generating £180 million per annum visitor spend £44.6m economic output, employment to 850-900 up to 500 full time - see Appendix 1.	Comments noted. Specific sites and their associated elements will be considered as the local plan review progresses.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1217	Liz Bodden (Pegasus) for Drayton Mannor	2	Note that they remain broadly the same. SOP 7 = Strongly support. DMP is a major employer reference their Appendix 2 essential expansion plans are able to be implemented assist in maintaining a thriving economy. SOP 8 support particularly as the desire to diversify the leisure offer of the park would assist in meeting this objective. SOP10 fully support aspiration to expand and add to visitor accommodation. SOP 11 supports future development plans included a indoor water play and woodland activity centre.	Comments noted
POPD1218	Liz Bodden (Pegasus) for Drayton Mannor	14	Direction strongly supported consider jobs in tourism and leisure sectors should also fall within the remit of this policy and not just traditional employment land classes B1 B2 B8 as previously. DMP should be identified as a existing employment site. para 15.22 clear tourism is integral part of district economy - failure to do so could impact on effectiveness of the Plan. Policy requires greater detail regarding the support element (DMP 400 full time employees). reference Appendix 2 of rep DMP current turnover £140 in visitor spend £35m in economic output. The barrier to investment and growth at the Park caused by the proposed change in planning policy would therefore affect future sustainable economic growth of the District and Tamworth. Justification for DMP to be treated as a traditional employment site to support economic growth. Pertinent given the site is currently within Green Belt Policy EMP5 of the 1998 Plan which is saved cease to exist once the LPR is adopted . Absence of a policy allocation for Drayton Manor Park will cause a lack of Clarity could that stifle investment within the site. In additional there is also a risk that the lack of policy allocation for DMP could impact the effectiveness of the overall Local Plan in delivering the SOP over the Plan period and as such could impact the soundness of the LPR. Employment evidence base - DMP maintained a full replacement of the ELR is required rather than just an update. New ELR will need to look a completely new data sets. if only an update risk that under estimating employment change and subsequent land requirements, also require research into major employer future growth plans Reference Appendix 2. Green belt - employment growth may require release of green belt informed by a comprehensive review of the Green Belt. This is welcomed essential that it is a comprehensive review including consideration of the DMP. Remiss that the DPR has not been included in previous assessments. Reference Appendix 3 which concludes the DMP is located in a reas that provides limited contribution to the purpose of the Green Belt and concludes no overriding landscape and visual reasons why new development could not assimilated into the landscape. New development would result in new built areas located directly adjacent to land which already consists of several different urban fringe land use. Clear justification for DMP to clearly identified allocated as an existing employment sites as well as a key tourist attraction. request policy and allocation within the plan.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs.
POPD1219	Liz Boden (Pegasus) for Drayton Mannor	16	Supports Policy. Encourages inclusion of reference to support and promote of DMP specifically. Note over night accommodation reference. DMP is entirely suitable as a location to be determined for tourism initiatives and for further hotel overnight accommodation. Ideally with new policy relating to specifically to DMP. DPM significant contribution to major employer and key tourist attraction specific support should be given for the sites future development, gives flexibility to the policy restraint of Green Belt. Identifying allocating land at DMP provides opportunity for a Supplementary Planning Document. Without suffice planning policy protection potential impact on economy and soundness of the LPR. Examples fo planning policy approaches to major tourist attractions - reference Alton Towers resort Staffordshire Moorlands. Wyre Forest District Council West Midlands Safari & Leisure Park. reference Appendix 6 of rep. Reference Central Bedfordshire - Appendix 7. DMP seeks similar planning policy as implemented in examples . Provides an example policy wording. Prudent that such a policy is inserted in the Local Plan review document reference appendix 3. minimise the risk associated with bringing forward development at the site.	Duly Noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review. A comprehensive Green Belt review is proposed as the evidence base is assembled.
POPD1220	Mr Gray	Whole Document	Promoting land at Whittington known as Sheepwash Farm, Fisherwick Road, Whittington. Boradly support POPD but concerns that a higher amount of housing growth should be planned and there is a mix of sites without over reliance on strategic urban extensions. Interest being pursued and therefore site is deliverable	Comments noted.
POPD1221	Liz Bodden (Pegasus) for Drayton Mannor	17	As a provider seeking to expand and diversify DMP is fully supportive. Plan indoor water play splash zone - Expansion and enhancement of facilities at DPM should be facilitated by the inclusion of a policy and allocation within the LPR.	Noted. The inclusion of a Drayton Manor Park specific policy has been considered elsewhere.
POPD1222	Liz Boden (Pegasus) for Drayton Mannor	20	Green Belt is not a natural recourse but an artificial policy constraint and should not be included within a policy on natural resources.	Noted
POPD1223	Liz Boden (Pegasus) for Drayton Mannor	22	Progressing masterplans would be the most suitable approach to assist in the bringing forward development in certain instances. DMP significant benefits in developing a masterplan endorsed by the Council to assist in development and expansion. Other examples in LA to assist the development of significant tourist facilities. This approach is consider to be most appropriate in ensuring DMP to function and grow as major contributor to LDC economy. Masterplan alongside a specific policy allocation with the LPR ensuring the parks continued protection from the full effect of national Development plan Green Belt policy currently afforded in policy EMP5. EMP5 out of step but still a need to provide a secure policy. Clear economic benefits from identifying allocation DPM through the LPR. reference appendix 2 of submission. Clear opportunity for a joint masterplan between LDC and DMP from DMP area which would refer back to a policy specifically relating to DMP within the LPD. Masterplan and development strategy which provides guidance on development management decisions relating to the park. Help promote sustainable future development in the park. Provide certainty for the Park and not unduly restrict the parks growth also provide certainty for LDC. Strategic Objective 7 and 8 it is imperative that the economic contribution of DMP is not unduly restricted and it continues to contribute significantly to the district local economy.	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations.
POPD1224	Liz Boden (Pegasus) for Drayton Mannor	Whole Document	References Appendix 1 and 2 DPM is a key contributor within the Local economy and plan a significant role in the sustainable growth of the District. Clear justified need to allocate DMP with the LOR with a policy that protects the long term development of the sites from the potential barriers to investment caused by full Green Belt policy. Green Belt designation if the site will hinder the ability of DMP to deliver planned improvements stay competitive in the leisure industry and may even threaten viability oft continue as a key tourist destination. Reference Wyre Forest District Council, Staffordshire Moorlands District Central Bedfordshire Council - seeks a policy provision within the Local plan which would then provide an opportunity to provide a masterplan for the parks long term growth. Critically that the £50m growth plan is able to operate in a positive environment - failed to do so would be a retrograde step leading to stagnation and possible contraction of the business. Genuine risk that the local specific policy support for DMP would severely impact any potential investment in the Parks future development plans and may jeopardise the long terms sustainable growth consequential impact on the growth of the district economy tourism recreation and leisure offer.	Comments and preferred approach towards Drayton Manor Park noted. DUPLICATE od POPD 1224
POPD1225	Savills for Barratt West Midlands for Rugely Road, Burntwood	3	Promoting land at Rugeley Road, Burntwood. Support approach to secure balanced growth across the district whereby growth will be focused in the most sustainable locations as shown in settlement hierarchy. Agree Burntwood level 2 strategic centre, future residential growth should be directed to this settlement instead of level 3-4 villages such as Whittington, Shenstone, Alrewas which do not have the range of services and facilities that Burntwood does. Not enough brownfield land in Burntwood to support level of growth that LDC is projecting in addition to GBHMA shortfall to be met as part of Duty to cooperate therefore consider sustainable extensions adjacent to Burntwood required. Support further work on phasing and how will meet development needs and delivery test done as soon as possible. Distribution of shortfall across HMA should be agreed in statement of Common Ground. Urban capacity study 2019 should inform housing provision. Consider that in order to rejuvenate Burntwood town centre and to ensure new commercial developments are successful they need to be supported by the expansion of the local community. Consider Green Belt should be reviewed around the most sustainable settlements eg Burntwood. Birmingham shortfall justifies the special circumstances to justify the release of Green Belt.	Comments and support to focusing growth in most sustainable locations noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1226	Savills for Barratt West Midlands for Rugely Road, Burntwood	8	Promoting land at Rugeley Road, Burntwood. Consider transport modelling evidence should be available as soon as possible so can inform LPR and IDP. IDP should include HMA shortfall. Support development to be focussed on the most accessible and sustainable location to reduce the need to travel, consider future residential growth should primarily be directed to Burntwood as second most sustainable settlement.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities.
POPD1227	Savills for Barratt West Midlands for Rugely Road, Burntwood	9	Promoting land at Rugeley Road, Burntwood. Need SHMA and HEDNA. Standard methodology only accounts for local needs not GBBCHMA shortfall. 333 dpa too low. Options between 5 and 6 (558-833dpa) is realistic target. Distribution of HMA shortfall must be agreed in Statement of Common Ground.	Comments and support for option 5 noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process.
POPD1228	Savills for Barratt West Midlands for Rugely Road, Burntwood	10	Promoting land at Rugeley Road, Burntwood. Suggest SHMA published updated as soon as possible. Consider proposed housing mix for Rugeley Road should be detached family housing and different to citycentre location therefore blanket policy prescribing a specific housing mix may have implications for housing delivery. Housing mix should be set out in evidence base rather than policy and each development should be considered independently based on geographical location and local site characteristics.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD1229	Savills for Barratt West Midlands for Rugely Road, Burntwood	11	Promoting land at Rugeley Road, Burntwood. Supports a policy which avoids inclusion of a blanket density requirement and suggest sites should be assessed on a site by site basis on the sites characteristics.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD1230	Savills for Barratt West Midlands for Rugely Road, Burntwood	Chapter 19	Promoting land at Rugeley Road, Burntwood. Sites within and adjacent to Burntwood should be prioritised over less sustainable settlements. 2 most sustainable settlements in the district have limited brownfield opportunity and are constrained by Green Belt as such there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release from the Green Belt. Our site is the lowest performing Green Belt parcel around the settlement and should be considered for release and allocated for residential development. Additional reports submitted on flooding, ecology and heritage.	Comments noted. Comments regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review.
POPD1231	Savills for Barratt West Midlands for Rugely Road, Burntwood	Whole Document	Promoting land at Rugeley Road, Burntwood. Site is only moderately performing Green Belt parcel in Burntwood, Burntwood is second most sustainable settlement site and should be considered for release from Green Belt and allocated for residential development. Appendix A: Evidence Base SHMA required. New approach to National Forest taking into account the increases in housing requirement.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1232	Mr Gray	2	Agree with proposed objectives and priorities. However SO&P6 should be amended to include ref to meeting needs of existing and new residents and incorporates as much growth as possible from the district and the neighbouring authorities such as Tamworth and Birmingham.	Comments noted.The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated. LDC's requirement to contribute towards meeting wider HMA unmet need is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1233	Mr Gray	3	Agree with balanced growth across the district but mix of sites needed to ensure sufficient supply. Several SUEs allocated yet to come forward therefore mix of sites should be considered for each settlement. GB review needed to deliver growth anticipated. Consider their site performs less important role than other sites around Whittington and is enclosed.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1234	Mr Gray	4	Broadly agree, especially by ensuring new development can support local communities such as Whittington.	Comments noted.
POPD1235	Mr Gray	9	Broadly agree with the preferred policy direction , would welcome further emphasis on growth accomodating unmet need from Black Country and Birmingham HMA. Note BF land often have issues, therefore need for balance to bring forward deliverable and viable GF as well. Consider Option 6 required to meet need. Note increase in requirement higher than previous completions but mix of sites inc SUEs and potential new settlement will allow more deliverable strategy.	Comments and preference for Option 6 noted. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall under the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD1236	Mr Gray	12	Should only be provided in places where there is defined need and requirement. Should not prejudice tradional route of delivery.	Comments noted. The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD1237	Mr Gray	22	Further clarity of the area wide assessments, and definitions of small and medium. Support high quaility design but should not be overly prescriptive to allow for the change in the housing market over time.	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations.
POPD1238	L +J Froggatt	Whole Document	Please don't take any more greenfield sites. Wildlife depends on them. Humans depend on them for wellbeing. Please consider brownfield sites and vacancies above shops.	A Green Belt Review will be completed and Urban Capacity Assessment will be completed as part of the Local Plan review process
POPD1239	Brereton and Ravenhill PC	Whole Document	Concern that Brereton and Ravenhill are treated as part of Rugeley when it is a community with its own identity. Should restore bus routes using S016 and CIL. Level of commuting by car are unsustainable. More would use stations in Lichfield if more parking and lower parking charges. Reopening train services between Lichfield and Burton with stations in Fradley/ Alrewas would provide an alternative. Towpath made suitable for cycling along the Trent and Mersely canal would provide alternative route to Rugeley TC. The Power Station site should include employment for new business and those wishing to expand. Concern live/work employment will tutn out to not be employment. Supports SO &P 12. With large amount of development north of A513, there is no need to alter the GB boundary and the gap between Brereton and Ravenhill and the villages of Armitage, Longdon and Upper Longdon. Supports para 20.9 but Rugeley should read Rugeley and Brereton and Ravenhill.	Comments and preferences noted. Specific sites will be considered by the Local Plan Review.LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing and employment needs. Some of the projects suggested will require funding in order to be deliverable which is beyond the scope of the local plan review process.
POPD1240	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	3	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Support approach to secure balanced growth across the district whereby growth will be focused in the most sustainable locations as shown in settlement hierarchy. Consider there is not enough land within settlements to support the level of growth that Lichfield is projecting and as such, sustainable extensions will be required. The wording of the policy should be amended to reflect this.	Comments and support to focusing growth in most sustainable locations noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assesment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1241	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	4	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Support, redevelopment the Rugeley Power Station encourages the re-use of previously developed land which makes a positive contribution to LDC's sustainability objectives and seeks to improve Rugeley's economic vitality.	Comments noted
POPD1242	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	5	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Consider that LDC should continue to seek to achieve the national minimum and not go above it as this could prohibit development. Supports LDC's commitment to identify areas of opportunity for renewable energy. Factors that will be considered, should be listed in the corresponding policy relating to sustainability standards. Welcome new study to update information relating to low carbon and renewable energy capacity in order to help identify areas suitable for wind and solar energy development.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1243	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	6	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Agree new development should be directed away from those areas at highest flood risk. However, should consider potential future innovative development which may come forward that could be built within Flood Zones 2 and 3 to ensure that innovative designs will not be prevented or discouraged in policy and should encourage innovative design that addresses specific risks and issues associated with the flood zone and does not adversely affect the flood plain.	Comments noted.
POPD1244	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	7	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Should prepare Air Quality Action Plan with neighbouring authorities. Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts should be identified, such as through traffic and travel management and green infrastructure provision and enhancement at the plan-making stage.	Comments and suggestions noted.
POPD1245	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	8	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Support retention of policy, requires evidence to comment further.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1246	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	10	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Support, however should not discourage innovative housing mix and design solutions.	Comments noted.
POPD1247	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	11	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Support a density policy which avoids the inclusion of a blanket density requirement and suggests that sites should be assessed on a site by site basis based on the sites locally distinctive characteristics. Large strategic sites, such as Rugeley Power Station, should be expected to provide a range of densities across the site which make the most efficient use of land.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD1248	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	14	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Supports focus on the delivery of brownfield sites and the re-use and redevelopment of older employment sites.	Duly Noted
POPD1249	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	15	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Consider Rugeley Power Station is not included in hierarchy of centres. Table 15.1 should be amended to include Rugeley or East of Rugeley allocation. Existing Policy E1 should be amended so new neighbourhood centres as part of strategic allocations should not be required to submit a retail impact assessment on retail proposals of 100sqm or more.	Table 15.1 sets out the hierarchy of centres Rugeley does not lie within LDC boundary and therefore does not form part of this table. Neighbourhood Centres related to existing centres and proposed neighbourhood centres will be defined once the level of housing and growth locations have been defined.
POPD1250	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	17	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Supports LDC's commitment to tackle obesity and health challenges through the provision of infrastructure and support initiatives. Redevelopment proposals at Rugeley Power Station will include the provision of sports and leisure facilities, public footpaths and cycle paths and a Country Park which should assist LDC's in tackling obesity and health challenges.	Noted
POPD1251	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	20	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Consider that LDC should consider adopting a 10% percentage which aligns with Natural England's most recent published evidence on biodiversity net gain or LDC should provide justification on why their requirement will remain higher than the national average, and potentially lead to more onerous requirements.	Comments are noted and will be considered as all policies will be with regards viability. The percentage biodiversity net gain is currently set within an adopted SPD.
POPD1252	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	22	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. Support the criteria for high quality sustainable developments that are listed in the preferred policy for high quality design. Policy should not discourage or prevent innovative design solutions. In some instances innovative design is required to support viability of masterplans for challenging development projects.Sustainable Design SPD could hamper innovative design and delivery of new housing products particularly in relation to its required private amenity / garden space and could have negative consequences to the overall housing delivery. Policy should encourage the use of innovative design solutions.	Noted. Policy wording will be reviewed in light of all the representations.
POPD1253	Savills for Rugeley Power Station	Whole Document	Promoting development of Rugeley Power Station. The Rugeley Power Station site extends to 139 hectares (343 acres) between the A51 and the River Trent (within Cannock Chase District and Lichfield District). The part of the site which lies within Lichfield District is allocated for a minimum of 800 dwellings in their emerging Local Plan Allocations document. A site specific supplementary planning document has been adopted by both LDC & CCDC. Wish to encourage more comprehensive thinking in relation to issues concerning the delivery of the power station which has unique connections and scale of critical mass in terms of the potential to a new sustainable residential development. Proposing redevelopment of the power station for up to 2,300 dwellings etc. Reserved Matters applications will be submitted across the circa 20 year construction period of the power station.	Comments noted. Rugeley Power Station is allocated for a minimum of 800 dwellings within the Local Plan Allocations.
POPD1254	B Eisner	Whole Document	Transport: Concern over poor bus services high car usage and quantity of car parks. Tourism: concern that unmet need for hotels in Lichfield should be treated with caution. Warning from Friarsgate project. Hotel sector, like retail is vulnerable to change, whereas people always need a home. In times of recession, people may sttle for day trips. Have one large hotel, another would detract from historic flavour of the city centre which is our unique selling point. Additional hotels should be smaller, well designed and varied. Should be design to allow conversion to flats if hotel market shrinks. Residential Development: Concern that with retail not viable at Friarsgate / Birmingham Road site, housing may be proposed, but the public want leisure and recreation. seems inevitable that there will be some residnetial units, but to have a great many would detract from the historic character of Lichfield.	Comments noted
POPD1255	Avison Young for Metacre at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood	1	Promoting land at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood. Vision should place a greater emphasis on delivering the housing required within Lichfield District and the unmet needs of other authorities through the Duty to Cooperate.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1256	Avison Young for Metacre at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood	2	Promoting land at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood. Agree and consider appropriate. In SO and P6 should include the need to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities as part of duty to cooperate. Agree with SO & P1 should clarify that the key settlements are Lichfield and Burntwood.	Noted. Site specific proposals will be considered as part of the local plan review. Duty to cooperate is referenced in the Introduction & context section and is a legal requirement. The settlement hierrchy is identified in Chapter 10. The Strategic Objectives & Priorities are intended to be broad in nature, but the POPD acknowledges that they are likley to develop further and become more locally distinctive as the review is formulated. Contributing towards meeting wider HMA unmet need is recognised elsewhere in the document.
POPD1257	Avison Young for Metacre at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood	3	Promoting land at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood. Agree that a spatial strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy is appropriate and will deliver the most sustainable outcomes. Agree that the settlement hierarchy is the most appropriate, having regard to the sustainability credentials of the settlements in the District and their respective needs for growth. Will be important to strike the right balance between levels of growth directed to the main urban areas and levels of growth accommodated elsewhere in the District. Plan needs to be more heavily weighted towards Burntwood to help deliver the infrastructure that the settlement requires, need to take care to avoid placing unrealistic reliance on urban capacity and upping densities on sites. In reality Lichfield and Burntwood need to expand outwards and require alterations to the Green Belt boundary. It is necessary to look beyond the plan period so alterations endure. Not appropriate for Green Belt release to be addresses through Neighbourhood Plans.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a wide range of evidence including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be consistent with national policy and local policy.
POPD1258	Avison Young for Metacre at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood	4	Promoting land at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood. Is appropriate	Comments noted.
POPD1259	Avison Young for Metacre at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood	9	Promoting land at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood. Plan period - to 2036 appropriate as long as no slippage in adoption. Local Housing Need - Agree 333dpa is correct. Needs from HMA - Birmingham and Black Country needs assessments are out of date, satisfying need from HMA will require a step change in level and rate of delivery. No evidence to support 3,000-4,500 option as an appropriate option. Lichfield Should be testing maximum levels of delivery.	Comments noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenrios.
POPD1260	Avison Young for Metacre at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood	10	Promoting land at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood. Is appropriate	Noted
POPD1261	Avison Young for Metacre at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood	11	Promoting land at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood. Agree but should be linked to housing mix, as larger houses and bungalows have a lower density than smaller properties. Also supportive of different areas within the district having different housing densities to reflect the sustainability of each location. However, the policy should avoid being too prescriptive to recognise that even within settlements different densities may be appropriate dependent on the characteristics of the locality and on site constraints.	Comments noted.The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD1262	Avison Young for Metacre at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood	Whole Document	Promoting land at Bleak House Farm, Burntwood.The site is suitable for development, is available now and is achievable. Have prepared various technical assessments. Consider SGS has made overly optimistic assumptions and figure for unmet need is higher than 60,855 homes. In addition LDC will need to be satisfied that any baseline unmet need has been calculated using the standard method.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing needs.
POPD1263	Mr A D Owen	Whole Document	Lichfield needs assessed in detail but not from outside Lichfield. Needs to be quantified and any need to be met to be identified and justified. Apart from unsustainability reasons, GB boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. LDC can't demonstrate exceptional circumstances when there are large sustainable areas north of Lichfield and Tamworth which are not in the GB but can meet the Council's mid range option without GB release. Little Aston to Shenstone gap is one of the most important in Greater Birmingham. When considering hierarchy for small scale development, those villages outside the GB - Fradley and Alrewas must be considered first. Any GB review must then consider other settlements but Shenstone and Little Aston within critically important and snsitive corridor must be protected.LDC must ensure it is not neeting needs the responsibility of others and in meeting its own needs, the areas north of Lichfield and Tamworth would enable large scale development without impacting on GB. Concern at how the Council and independent body reviewed importance of wildlife in GB and the loss if development takes place.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1264	Mr P Mawer	Whole Document	Endorse Shenstone PC comments and adds: concern development will merge Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall losing much of their character and sense of community, no BF sites identified or No of houses that could be built on them limiting need for additional housing, GB assumed sacrosanct. loss causes negative effect on Environment. Should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and authority has examined all other reasonable options. Railway car parking already difficult in Blake Street. Increased need for public transport could cause significant problems in locality. More lenient infill could reduce need.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supproted by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1265	Mrs A Mawer	Whole Document	Endorse Shenstone PC comments and adds: concern development will merge Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall losing much of their character and sense of community, no BF sites identified or No of houses that could be built on them limiting need for additional housing, GB assumed sacrosanct. loss causes negative effect on Environment. Should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and authority has examined all other reasonable options. Railway car parking already difficult in Blake Street. Increased need for public transport could cause significant problems in locality. More lenient infill could reduce need.	Comments and preferences noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1266	S Whale	1	The Local Plan housing growth proposals for Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston contradict the proposed Local Plan vision. The vision states that Lichfield District Council wants to see residents "proud of their communities" with a "strong sense of local community... and belonging". Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have these strong characteristics. However later in the consultation document, the proposals for housing growth, dependant on the scale of the growth, location and type of growth could put the vision completely at risk. The consultation document review of housing needs is not comprehensively assessed. Lichfield needs are assessed in detail but no needs from outside Lichfield are assessed. The external needs need to be quantified. Any housing need to be met by Lichfield District Council arising from the wider West Midlands Housing Market Area needs to be fully justified. Currently those needs are not identified in any detail or justified in the consultation document. The growth proposals may therefore be subject to near future housing pressures to accommodate - that impact is not identified in the consultation document.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1267	S Whale	2	The justification for Strategic Priority 1. "Communities capable of growth" which includes Little Aston and Shenstone is flawed. This is because Little Aston and Shenstone have very high scores for housing growth potential because of their access to a bus service or railway station "serving 5 main centres". Three of the five centres identified as benefitting Little Aston and Shenstone are Bromsgrove, Longbridge and Redditch. These are simply railway connections along the length of a cross city line only and no actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Little Aston and Shenstone are identified.	Comments noted. The wording "capable of growth" is not referenced in the strategic priorties and policies chapter but is referenced in chapter 20 in relation to the settlement sustainability study. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1268	S Whale	5	The identification of sustainability standards is important. The Local Plan preferred options should identify where the best potential housing growth exists using this criterion. Electrification of the underused railway line running north east of Lichfield Trent Valley station would further strengthen the case for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option which is outside of the Green Belt. This proposal would reduce the volumes of car movements from the proposed new A38 corridor settlement and should be complemented with a new park and ride rail station south of Lichfield north of Wall. This would reduce the car movements through south Staffordshire villages as they enter north Birmingham.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out the preferred settlement hierarchy and growth options. Locations for growth will be considered as the local plan progresses.
POPD1269	S Whale	6	Flood risk assessment data was obtained for Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall during their Neighbourhood Plan preparation periods. The data places limits on what can be housing development built without risk. This needs to be continued to be acknowledged in any future housing development proposals.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD1270	S Whale	7	Any housing growth proposals should not increase pollution. To date Shenstone and Little Aston await any meaningful enhancement to rail travel times or quality from the new train franchise. As identified above a new rail station would be required for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option north east of Lichfield to reduce the impact of increased vehicle movements coming from that strategic housing proposal.	Comments noted.
POPD1271	S Whale	8	As identified in previous responses to the growth preferred options. The sustainable transport with the greatest potential that provides the greatest opportunity is to electrify the railway line to the north east of Lichfield.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1272	B Morris	1	The Local Plan housing growth proposals for Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston contradict the proposed Local Plan vision.The vision states that Lichfield District Council wants to see residents "proud of their communities" with a "strong sense of local community... and belonging". Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have these strong characteristics. However later in the consultation document, the proposals for housing growth, dependant on the scale of the growth, location and type of growth could put the vision completely at risk.The consultation document review of housing needs is not comprehensively assessed. Lichfield needs are assessed in detail but no needs from outside Lichfield are assessed. The external needs need to be quantified. Any housing need to be met by Lichfield District Council arising from the wider West Midlands Housing Market Area needs to be fully justified. Currently those needs are not identified in any detail or justified in the consultation document. The growth proposals may therefore be subject to near future housing pressures to accommodate - that impact is not identified in the consultation document.	Comments noted. The vision is provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1273	B Morris	2	The justification for Strategic Priority 1. “Communities capable of growth” which includes Little Aston and Shenstone is flawed. This is because Little Aston and Shenstone have very high scores for housing growth potential because of their access to a bus service or railway station “serving 5 main centres”. Three of the five centres identified as benefitting Little Aston and Shenstone are Bromsgrove, Longbridge and Redditch. These are simply railway connections along the length of a cross city line only and no actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Little Aston and Shenstone are identified. Also, Shenstone station only has two trains per hour compared with 4 per hour for Lichfield Stations, and these trains are susceptible to cancellation when there are operating difficulties on the Cross-City line. Also, the bus services are of no use to people getting to and from work as they arrive too late in the morning and leave too early in the evening. In January 2019 we were asked by Staffs CC to comment on their proposed parking restrictions to mitigate the station parking problems. This will clearly be exacerbated by large scale additional housing	Comments noted. The wording “capable of growth” is not referenced in the strategic priorities and policies chapter but is referenced in chapter 20 in relation to the settlement sustainability study. The settlement hierarchy in chapter 10 identifies Shenstone and Little Aston as level 3 centres and Stonnall as a level 4 settlement recognising their attributes (services +facilities) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1274	B Morris	3	The evidence for Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone having capacity for growth is considered on pages 101 and 102 of the Lichfield District Council preferred options report including Table 20.2. This section, introduced as “what the evidence tells us” shows that Shenstone has more growth potential negatives than positives in that it has many more red and amber judgements on Table 20.2 than green judgements. Stonnall is shown as having a balance of negative and positive and Little Aston more positive than negative however in the case of Little Aston and Stonnall the SHLAA interest in land designations are significantly shown as “non developable”. This is strong evidence of the inappropriateness of selecting Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone for growth. The Lichfield District Council strategy for housing based on a settlement hierarchy of communities such as Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone which are primarily in the Green Belt should be revised. The priorities below should be based on unused existing industrial land, existing urban areas and the two new growth settlements. Therefore, Lichfield District Council housing growth should be focussed on the alternative areas that are identified in the proposed spatial strategy (i) Brownfield sites that are no longer viable (ii) Existing urban areas with a good range of established services (ii) The two potential strategic growth communities north east of Lichfield and north of Tamworth. The preferred options for housing growth have been published without a Brownfield Site assessment having been completed or a Green Belt Review having been completed or the other West Midland Housing Market Area authorities indicating they will accommodate additional growth, so the data platform for the preferred options spatial strategy assumptions is also incomplete.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including an updated SHLAA, Urban Capacity Assessment and Green Belt Review.
POPD1275	B Morris	4	The Lichfield District Council preferred policy towards sustainable development is acceptable in that it seeks to protect our natural environment. However, the District Council already have a published Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment known as the SHLAA which for Little Aston and Stonnall shows very significant numbers of land owner enquiries adjacent to Stonnall and Little Aston as “not developable”. This SHLAA designation of “not developable” is considered positive classification by Little Aston and Stonnall residents. The considerations included in any existing “not developable” judgement should also be made clear in any future decision making particularly if they are based on sustainable development criteria. The role of the Neighbourhood Plan in the identification and upholding of sustainable development should be made clear as is not identified. The Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone Neighbourhood Plans have all been used effectively to date in challenging non sustainable development in recent years.	
POPD1276	B Morris	5	The identification of sustainability standards is important. The Local Plan preferred options should identify where the best potential housing growth exists using this criterion. Electrification of the underused railway line running north east of Lichfield Trent Valley station would further strengthen the case for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option which is outside of the Green Belt. This proposal would reduce the volumes of car movements from the proposed new A38 corridor settlement and should be complemented with a new park and ride rail station south of Lichfield north of Wall. This would reduce the car movements through south Staffordshire villages as they enter north Birmingham.	Comments noted. The preferred approach towards sustainable transport is addressed in chapter 13.
POPD1277	B Morris	6	Flood risk assessment data was obtained for Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall during their Neighbourhood Plan preparation periods. The data places limits on what can be housing development built without risk. This needs to be continued to be acknowledged in any future housing development proposals.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be informed by a SFRA
POPD1278	B Morris	7	Any housing growth proposals should not increase pollution. To date Shenstone and Little Aston await any meaningful enhancement to rail travel times or quality from the new train franchise. As identified above a new rail station would be required for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option north east of Lichfield to reduce the impact of increased vehicle movements coming from that strategic housing proposal.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1279	B Morris	8	As identified in previous responses to the growth preferred options. The sustainable transport with the greatest potential that provides the greatest opportunity is to electrify the railway line to the north east of Lichfield. The reliability of the Cross-City line is a key to its use by commuters. After 2010, when the service was unreliable for use by commuters, the sale of season tickets at Shenstone Station declined by over 25% and has not yet got back to the level in 2010. Parking at Shenstone station is inadequate with rail users parking in adjacent streets. This may be alleviated if the potential development of Shenstone Business Park takes place, but housing development in the Court Drive area of Shenstone is likely to make the position worse. The Wall Island and the A5127 cannot currently cope with rush hour and there is inadequate parking in Shenstone for the current numbers of commuters.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1280	B Morris	9	The preferred policy direction as set out is not comprehensive, in that it proposes a way forward for housing provision in Lichfield District without: (i) identifying the Lichfield requirements to grow or not to grow from the West Midlands Housing Market Renewal Area and (ii) any Green Belt Review (iii) only commits to understanding traveller requirements, not to responding as with other categories of need (Stonnall has had direct experience of the current vacuum in this third area) (iv) any Brownfield analysis having been completed.	Comments noted. Chapter 14 sets out the methodology for the proposed housing scenarios. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1281	B Morris	10	This policy direction seeks to meet all the housing needs of the District through all levels of affordable and market housing options. All neighbourhood Plans have considered these issues. The recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying affordable and market needs at the neighbourhood level with agreed housing sizes and bedroom mix ratios should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of any new preferred policy direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1282	B Morris	11	Again, recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying the appropriate density at the neighbourhood plan level should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of the policy direction. This has been an area of particular importance to Shenstone, where before the Neighbourhood Plan the area was subject to planning application exhibiting new build over intensification	Noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1283	B Morris	12	A register of sites suitable for self-builders in the whole of Lichfield District would assist those who wish to build their own home.	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD1284	B Morris	13	Lichfield District Council has not met current targets for pitch provision and has not for many years refreshed its needs assessment in this area. This gap in planning and provision has had direct implications for the Stonnall area. It is important that the new criteria identified in the consultation document in respect of the A5 and A38 corridors for travellers, do actually enable a more proactive approach to provision. The consultation document does not actually identify how the new criteria will do this. Given the history in this area this needs to be significantly clarified.	Noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1285	B Morris	14	The employment and economic development focus on Lichfield City, Burntwood and Frole Park is welcome. The Lichfield District Council employment policy should be further strengthened by identifying what the council will do to support the older employment areas which have larger industrial uses with location and site viability features that challenge their long-term future. The Shenstone industrial estate has examples of this. The industrial estate user vacancy rate, short term user churn and traffic impact on the Shenstone village centre require the development of incentives for those users who wish to relocate to the economic development areas above. This may be as straightforward as Lichfield Council identifying the changes of use from industrial to residential development that will be considered.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs. Our Spatial Strategy identifies the preferred location for housing growth.
POPD1286	B Morris	15	Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone are classified in the preferred options report as “Rural Centres” catering for the day to day needs of the village and the wider rural area around. While this may be currently true this does not automatically justify any future growth capacity. Parking in the centre of Shenstone is inadequate and any housing developments not within easy walking distance of the village centre will only make the problem worse.	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD1287	B Morris	17	This policy talks of the importance of protecting open space for recreation and overall well-being. Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have several protected green spaces which are actively used within their Neighbourhood Plans. Shenstone has recently had one of these areas of land come under consideration for housing in the recent District Council review of the Land Allocation Plan. This proposal was withdrawn. Green field amenity land adding to overall well-being should not be considered for housing.	Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1288	B Morris	20	Any area of special environmental merit has been identified in the Neighbourhood Plans of Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone. The strategy should recognise the contribution of Neighbourhood Plans.	Not all areas have Neighbourhood Plans. Neighbourhood Plans have limited scope and provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment /contribute.
POPD1289	B Morris	21	The provision of high-quality housing development is being reduced by the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in that (i) the consultation on what the Lichfield CIL strategy is to invest in is not open to broad, regular consultation about quality priorities, and (ii) the CIL introduction has limited the developers' resources left for Section 106 contributions to add quality improvements when a specific housing development is approved.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process. Consultation on the CIL process will be in accordance with the Adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
POPD1290	B Morris	22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan. This should be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1291	B Morris	23	This question is about how Lichfield protects local heritage and the answer is in using the Neighbourhood Plans which should have a stronger role	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1292	MC Garratt	1	Proposed vision contradicts local area plans. The vision wishes to see residents proud of their communities but needs outside of the city are not assessed or quantified.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1293	MC Garratt	2	Shenstone appears to be 'capable of growth' because of transport services. Identifies three of the five main centres as Bromsgrove, Longbridge and Redditch, questions what social and economic benefits this gives to Shenstone as none are identified.	Comments noted. The wording "capable of growth" is not referenced in the strategic priorities and policies chapter but is referenced in chapter 20 in relation to the settlement sustainability study. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1294	MC Garratt	3	LDC Strategy should be revised having completed a Brownfield Site Assessment and/ or a Green Belt Review	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1295	MC Garratt	4	The preferred spatial strategy towards sustainable development is acceptable. The role of the Neighbourhood Plan should be made clear in the upholding of sustainable development	Comments noted.
POPD1296	MC Garratt	5	Local Plan preferred options should identify where the best potential housing growth exists	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out the preferred settlement hierarchy and growth option. Locations for growth will be considered as the local plan progresses.
POPD1297	MC Garratt	6	Flood risk assessment data was obtained for the neighbourhood plan. This needs to be continued in any future housing development proposals.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD1298	MC Garratt	7	Any housing growth proposals should not increase pollution.	Comments noted.
POPD1299	MC Garratt	8	The sustainable transport with the most potential that provides the best opportunity is the electrification of the railway line to the NE of Lichfield thus easing car movements on the A38 'racetrack'.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1300	MC Garratt	9	The preferred policy direction is incomplete. LDC Strategy should be revised having completed a Brownfield Site Assessment and/ or a Green Belt Review	Comments noted. The Council will prepare a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1301	MC Garratt	10	The Neighbourhood Plan considered these issues. The Neighbourhood Plan should be acknowledged as part of any new preferred policy direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1302	MC Garratt	11	The Neighbourhood Plan considered these issues. The Neighbourhood Plan should be acknowledged as part of any new preferred policy direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD1303	MC Garratt	12	Yes	Noted
POPD1304	MC Garratt	13	LDC has not met current targets for provision. Given the history, the consultation document needs to state how the identified criteria will lead to provision being met.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1305	MC Garratt	14	Shenstone Industrial Estate has a dramatic effect on traffic in the village centre. Could incentives be offered to move to the economic development areas identified?	Duly Noted
POPD1306	MC Garratt	15	Shenstone should remain classified as a 'rural centre'.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1307	MC Garratt	16	Yes	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1308	MC Garratt	17	Existing protected green spaces should remain as such. We have recently has one of these areas come under consideration for housing and whilst the proposal was withdrawn it should never have been included in the Land Allocation Plan.	Noted.
POPD1309	MC Garratt	18	No	Noted
POPD1310	MC Garratt	19	Definitely not!	Noted
POPD1311	MC Garratt	20	The strategy should recognise the neighbourhood plans	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD1312	MC Garratt	21	The provision of high quality housing is being reduced by the introduction of CIL. CIL has limited developers resources left for Section 106 contributions.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process.
POPD1313	V Chamberlain - BAG	1	Support ideas and sentiment but too wordy	Noted but no justification for the comment is provided.
POPD1314	MC Garratt	22	A lot of time and effort went into the Neighbourhood Plan which was altered within weeks of being adopted. They should have far more recognition in any future option plan and this such be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1315	MC Garratt	23	A lot of time and effort went into the Neighbourhood Plan which was altered within weeks of being adopted. They should have far more recognition in any future option plan and this such be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1316	Steve Keyte	1	The scale of the proposed growth in Shenstone contradicts the vision of local community which will be lost.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate. The evidence assembled will further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1317	Steve Keyte	2	The high scores for Shenstone as a main centre is flawed, the railway link is simply a connection point with no quantifiable benefits! The car parking at Shenstone is very problematic.	Comments noted. Shenstone is identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1318	V Chamberlain - BAG	2	Commendable ideas but without serious policies, some will remain wishes	Comments noted. But no justification or suggstions to addres concerns provided.
POPD1319	Steve Keyte	3	The growth potential for Shenstone is flawed as there are more negatives than positives in the judgement table.	Comments noted.
POPD1320	Steve Keyte	4	Believes in sustainable development.Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan should be respected as to where development should occur.	Noted. Neighbourhood will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1321	Steve Keyte	5	Electrification of the A38 corridor would suggest focus on the A38 corridor development to reduce impact on volumes of cars in Staffordshire villages.	Comments and preferences noted
POPD1322	V Chamberlain - BAG	3	Burntwood Action Group does not consider the Spatial Strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development. Burntwood's infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable. Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated. Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey's corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires. Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes For too long, Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents. BAG has no faith in any new Green Belt review as the 2013 Supplement used definitions of terms, choice of questions, prejudiced answers and incorrect/misleading statements to classify pre-chosen (in BAG'S opinion) parcels of land as not providing an important contribution to the Green Belt. Alternative strategy- New Settlements BAG can visualise no 'exceptional circumstances' in which Burntwood's Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward. Therefore, BAG believes that, at this stage, LDC should be planning for new settlements. Then perhaps, Lichfield District would be in a position to house a significant number from the neighbouring conurbation.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1323	Steve Keyte	6	Flood risks for Shenstone should continue to be considered avoiding development by the brook in Shenstone.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD1324	Steve Keyte	7	No increase in air pollution levels should occur in Shenstone.	Comments noted.
POPD1325	Steve Keyte	8	Electrification of the railway to the North of Lichfield should continue.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1326	Steve Keyte	9	The policy is not comprehensive it should remove any development in Green Belt areas.	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1327	Steve Keyte	10	The housing needs for Shenstone should be restricted to the neighbourhood plan. Housing should fit the character of the village.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1328	Steve Keyte	11	The housing needs for Shenstone should be restricted to the neighbourhood plan. Housing should fit the character of the village.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD1329	Steve Keyte	12	Providing quality of built is maintained.	Comments noted.
POPD1330	Steve Keyte	14	The Shenstone Industrial Estate can be sustained with sustainable activity but should not impact on the residents. HGV movements remain a serious risk to residents of Shenstone.	Duly Noted
POPD1331	V Chamberlain - BAG	4	Agree with preferred policy approach towards sustainable development. Building on Green Belt around Burntwood against the principles. Allowing windfall without CIL and not counting towards Burntwoods housing allocation is not sustainable. All should be subject to CIL and contribute towards Burntwoods Housing Allocation.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a wide range of evidence which will inform the next stages of the plan making process including a Green Belt Review. Lichfield District Council commenced charging CIL in 2016 and any CIL liable development within the District is required to pay CIL.
POPD1332	Steve Keyte	4	Shenstone should remain a rural centre.	Noted.
POPD1333	Steve Keyte	17	The green spaces in Shenstone should remain protected. Use of these should be enhanced to reduce obesity.	Noted
POPD1334	Steve Keyte	20	Confine and protect any SSSI	Agree, SSSI receive statutory protection further detail will be incorporated in subesquent iterations of the preferred policy options.
POPD1335	Steve Keyte	21	Shenstone should continue to have high quality provision to retain the character of the village.	Noted. Policies seek to maintain local distinctiveness without stifling innovation.
POPD1336	Steve Keyte	22	Then recommendation for Shenstone should be adopted as stated in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Not all areas have Neighbourhood Plans. Neighbourhood Plans have limited scope and provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment contribute.
POPD1337	Steve Keyte	23	Adopt the Neighbourhood Plan which is supported by Shenstone residents.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1338	V Chamberlain - BAG	5	General agreement but would welcome LDC loking for a viable standard above national minimum. Identifying locations for renewable energy development appears sensible.	Comments and preferences towards the proposed approach noted.
POPD1339	JM Parry	1	Vision of Shenstone is shattered by HGVs entering Pinfold Hill on its way to the Industrial Estate	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level. The concern raised cannot be addressed by the Local Plan review.
POPD1340	JM Parry	2	Any further increase in growth would push existing services to point of imploding. Train station is already over exposed.	Comments noted. But no justification / suggestions provided. Evidence is being assembled which will help further refine the sttlement hierarchy and the spatial strategy.
POPD1341	V Chamberlain - BAG	6	Pragmatic and sensible approach	Comments noted
POPD1342	JM Parry	3	Available brownfield sites should be used first and Green Belt should left as it is.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supproted by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1343	V Chamberlain - BAG	7	Agrees policy needed. LDC not taking issue seriously. Action plan produced to satisfy national requirements without actions to monitor air quality across district and action to be taken taken when pollutants above acceptable level. Should install many more air quality monitoring stations.	Comments and suggestions noted. In accordance with national policy local planning authorities are required to monitor the outputs from policies.
POPD1344	JM Parry	4	Agree with existing policy	Comments noted.
POPD1345	JM Parry	5	Local Plan should identify the best areas for housing growth. The rail-line north-east of Lichfield Trent Valley should be electrified.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out the preferred settlement hierarchy and growth option. Locations for growth will be considered as the local plan progresses.
POPD1346	JM Parry	6	The flood risk assessment must be adhered to, under no circumstances should the areas be breached.	Comments noted.
POPD1347	JM Parry	7	Agree with the current air quality policy. Any method to minimize any bad effect on air quality must be adopted.	Comments noted.
POPD1348	V Chamberlain - BAG	Chapter 12	Need for improvements to Burntwood TC identified many years ago. However only recently development at Sankey's corner started . Concerned permissions granted without overall plan. Urge LDC to commission overall plan.	Comments noted
POPD1349	JM Parry	8	Agree	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1350	JM Parry	9	Very confusing outlook within the preferred policy. Green Belt must be protected.	Comments noted. The Council will prepare a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1351	JM Parry	10	Agree	Support noted.
POPD1352	JM Parry	11	Agree	Support noted.
POPD1353	JM Parry	12	Agree, will be a better build quality than bigger companies.	Comments noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1354	V Chamberlain - BAG	8	To the preferred policy direction add: Produce a plan for the re-location of Industrial premise from within residential areas to outlying industrial sites which have better road links for heavy vehicles. Quote from the Lichfield District integrated transport strategy 2011- 2029: "The economic regeneration and town centre growth at Burntwood, as encouraged by the District Council, will be supported by enhanced transport infrastructure funded by developers and, if necessary, public funds, as resources permit. The priority will be environmental enhancements and an improved bus interchange." For this to happen it must be incorporated into the overall plan of the area, as mentioned above	The location of employment land and future employment land is condiered within Section 15 economic growth enterprise and tourism of the Local Plan review : Preferred options and Policy Directions. The adopted Regulation 123 list enables the delivery of the identified transport elements reference within the representation.
POPD1355	JM Parry	14	Agree	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1356	JM Parry	15	Agree	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1357	V Chamberlain - BAG	9	Agrees further work to be done. Cannot agree with bullet point 2. Could only support focus majority of new housing on new settlements. Support bullet point 4 delivery of BF before GF.	Comments noted.
POPD1358	JM Parry	16	Agree	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1359	JM Parry	17	Existing open recreation areas must be protected. Could LDC finance/ support new facilities for better well being?	Noted. No evidence provided on what sort of facilities are suggested for better well being.
POPD1360	JM Parry	20	Agree	Noted
POPD1361	JM Parry	21	Areas must be aside for high quality development as not everyone wants to live in a community.	Noted. Policies seek to maintain local distinctiveness without stifling innovation.
POPD1362	V Chamberlain - BAG	10	Supports	Support noted
POPD1363	JM Parry	22	Would agree that a masterplan is a good idea and workable.	Noted.
POPD1364	JM Parry	23	All currently looks fine	Noted
POPD1365	V Chamberlain - BAG	11	Supports	Support noted.
POPD1366	V Chamberlain - BAG	12	Supports	Support noted.
POPD1367	PW Griffiths	Whole Document	Does not support any building work taking place on the Green Belt land in Stonnall or provision of services or land for gypsies and travellers in Stonnall.	Noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evience base including a comprehensive green belt review and gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment. The evidence base will inform the next stages of the local plan.
POPD1368	V Chamberlain - BAG	13	Supports	Noted
POPD1369	V Chamberlain - BAG	14	Agree with policy direction but could deal with the future of old industrial sites in residential areas by saying - Where an old outdated industrial site involves heavy traffic having to negotiate narrow roads in residential areas the council will make every effort to re-locate businesses to more suitable premises in sustainable locations on the periphery of settlements	Duly Noted The Employment Land availability assessment (ELAA) will direct policy direction in additional the Our Spatial strategy will consider future housing locations. The Preferred policy direction; Our employment and ecominc development "seeks to maintain and enhance a diverse local econmoy and ensiurage opportunities for inward investment."
POPD1370	V Chamberlain - BAG	15	General agreement but would like an action plan. In "Preferred policy: Burntwood economy" the reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) does not help. There is insufficient information in the IDP to facilitate the progress towards a coherent, attractive, and vibrant town centre. BAG believes that, until a detailed action plan is drawn up, such a town centre will never materialise. It urges LDC to commission such a plan urgently using CIL money.	Duly Noted the Infrastructre Delivery Plan will be amended to reflect updated evidance base and Our Spatial Policy
POPD1371	S Pritchard	1	Agree but need to be aware of other ideas which could take away our green belt.	Noted
POPD1372	V Chamberlain - BAG	16	Preferred policy acceptable but could be more ambitious such as Plans to open the disused railway line between Lichfield and Brownhills as a cycleway and footpath and link it to the canal and onwards to Chasewater will be supported. The various voluntary groups involved in that project will receive every encouragement from the council	Duly Noted Preferred Policy direction; sustainble transport offers support for this.
POPD1373	S Pritchard	2	Agree	Noted
POPD1374	S Pritchard	3	Agree - proud of the village atmosphere in Stonnall.	Noted.
POPD1375	S Pritchard	4	Stonnall has always been a farming village - do not take away our fields and footpaths.	Comments noted.
POPD1376	S Pritchard	5	Agree	Noted
POPD1377	S Pritchard	6	There are many roads around Stonnall that flood.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD1378	S Pritchard	7	Stonnall has become a rat run - more traffic would increase air quality	Noted.
POPD1379	V Chamberlain - BAG	Chapter 16	To the preferred policy direction add: The green surroundings of built up areas will be valued and access routes into the countryside will be secured to allow residents to walk into the countryside without having to use any other form of transport. Allotments will be provided, wherever possible, within or on the edges of built up areas. Page 81 - Para. 16.17 Lines 5-7 "There were limited comments relating to open space provision. More general comments were received from residents regarding the need to protect green belt and greenfield land and preserve existing open space for future generations to enjoy." LDC has misunderstood comments of residents regarding the recreational value of the green spaces surrounding built up areas. People of all ages, particularly those of advancing years get a great deal of exercise and enjoyment from walking in and around those areas. They are probably more valuable to the health and fitness of the community than all the sports grounds. Page 83 - Line one of the preferred policy should read: The protection of open space (including the green surroundings of built up areas), sports and recreational....	Comments and suggested noted. Aspirations will also be considered by chapter 13 and chapter 18.
POPD1380	S Pritchard	8	Keep the buses - some villagers use them on a daily basis	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1381	S Pritchard	9	Agree	Noted
POPD1382	S Pritchard	13	Stonnall should not make any more sites availabe for gypsy and traveller sites	Noted
POPD1383	S Pritchard	15	Agree	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1384	S Pritchard	17	Keep our open spaces and maintain the current walking routes	Noted. Further consideration required with regard to which policy will include the provision/protection of long distance cycle routes/footpaths.
POPD1385	V Chamberlain - BAG	17	Other opportunities that can be supported by policy that will address the issue of obesity directly in our district? "The inter-connection of places by cycleways and footpaths is mentioned in paragraph 5 of the "preferred policy: Open space and recreation" but the policy needs more definition and teeth to make it meaningful. IBAG suggests adding an additional paragraph along the following lines: LDC, developers and those involved in producing Neighbourhood plans will be required to prioritise the planning and commissioning of viable cycleways and footpaths which link all residential areas to amenities and the countryside.	Noted. Matter will also be addressed in sustainable transport policy.
POPD1386	S Pritchard	20	Agree	Noted
POPD1387	S Pritchard	22	Agree	Noted.
POPD1388	S Pritchard	23	Agree	Noted
POPD1389	V Chamberlain - BAG	18	Not aware of evidence supporting arts and culture and little provision. Would like something incorprated into Burntwood TC.	Noted
POPD1390	V Chamberlain - BAG	19	Consider arts and culture is valued. LDC should produce a seprate policy statement how it will be catered for and supported.	Noted
POPD1391	V Chamberlain - BAG	20	Supported if evidence provided by local residents is fed into analysis of the importance of particular green spaces	Consultation such as this exercise provides the opportunity to be involved in the planning for your area.
POPD1392	V Chamberlain - BAG	21	lists views which help identify you are in or near Burntwood	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD1393	V Chamberlain - BAG	22	Residents would benefit from improvements to built environment eg Sankeys Corner	Noted.
POPD1394	V Chamberlain - BAG	23	Supports	Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1395	S Fletcher	3	Burntwood cannot take anymore development. Burntwood has grown from villages to sprawl with no extra infrastructure or amenities. Concern at lack of facilities, need for updating of oepn spaces and need for extra schools and nurseries if further development going ahead. Concen at lack of parking in Burntwood, poor signage on bypass and increase of traffic on roads meant for villages. No CIL has gone to Burntwood and 347 windfalls have not contributed CIL. The Council needs to do more about Sankeys Corner. Should ask developers to regenerate Sankeys Corner for shops and housing. Should put housing at Mount Road industrial zone which is an industrial zone in a residential area and move the industry to Sankeys Corner. Should also build housing at Queen St, Chasetown. Green Belt important to health and welbeing and should be preserved. Should then look at new settlements outside the Green Belt at West of A38, Brookhay. Alrewas Quarry, East of A38, Packington Hall Farm, Tamworth Rd.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process. Lichfield District Council commenced charging CIL in 2016 all CIL liable developments throughout the district are required to pay CIL.
POPD1396	P & L Gostling	3	Do not consider the Spatial Strategy based on the identified Settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development for the following reasons: Burntwood's existing infrastructure is failing to cater for the existing urban sprawl which continues to grow and will increase significantly with the proposals.The By-Pass is only partial to the built-up area and the remaining road network is poor with parking partially blocking many major routes on roads that were not designed for the quantity of traffic using it. Traffic flow is appalling and alternative public transport arrangements are expensive, slow and deteriorating. The narrow roads make cycling or walking a very dangerous alternative as well. The Town Centre has few shops or amenities considering the size of the existing and planned housing area. Medical and Educational services are stretched within the Burntwood area. Any increases in population would be disastrous. Burntwood was surrounded by Green Belt land. This has been eroded over the years and the plans will almost decimate what little remains. If Burntwood is to become a housing area to support Lichfield and its surrounding villages, the well-being of the population who live there will be dramatically reduced by a reduction in green areas around the area. Can visualise no 'exceptional circumstances' in which Burntwood's Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward. Therefore, LDC should be planning for new settlements: West of the A38, Brookhay, Alrewas Quarry, East of the A38, Packington Hall Farm, Tamworth Road, any other suitable and sustainable locations outside the Green Belt	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1397	C J Burns	3	Do not consider the Spatial Strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development. Burntwood's infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable. Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated. Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey's corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires. Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes. For too long, Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents. Have no faith in any new Green Belt review as the 2013 Supplement used definitions of terms, choice of questions, prejudiced answers and incorrect/misleading statements to classify pre-chosen (in my opinion) parcels of land as not providing an important contribution to the Green Belt. Can visualise no 'exceptional circumstances' in which Burntwood's Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward. Therefore, believe that, at this stage, LDC should be planning for new settlements. Then perhaps, Lichfield District would be in a position to house a significant number from the neighbouring conurbation. No amenites and public transport especially for older people. Sankeys corner too small to be developed.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1398	Mr + Mrs P Mckeown	3	Do not consider the Spatial Strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development. Burntwood's infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable. Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated. Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey's corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires. Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes. For too long, Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents. Have no faith in any new Green Belt review as the 2013 Supplement used definitions of terms, choice of questions, prejudiced answers and incorrect/misleading statements to classify pre-chosen (in my opinion) parcels of land as not providing an important contribution to the Green Belt. Can visualise no 'exceptional circumstances' in which Burntwood's Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward. Therefore, believe that, at this stage, LDC should be planning for new settlements. Then perhaps, Lichfield District would be in a position to house a significant number from the neighbouring conurbation. Medical centre not extended, delays in doctor and hospital appointments.	The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1399	S +A Harrison	3	Consider the Spatial Strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development. Burntwood's infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable. Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated. Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey's corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires. Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes. For too long, Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents. I have no faith in any new Green Belt review as the 2013 Supplement used definitions of terms, choice of questions, prejudiced answers and incorrect/misleading statements to classify pre-chosen (in my opinion) parcels of land as not providing an important contribution to the Green Belt. Can visualise no 'exceptional circumstances' in which Burntwood's Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward. Therefore, I believe that, at this stage, LDC should be planning for new settlements. Then perhaps, Lichfield District would be in a position to house a significant number from the neighbouring conurbation. Norton Lane, Hammerwich Rd, and Hospital Rd are at present very narrow and busy roads. Any further development would result in increased traffic flows and increased safety concerns.The Swan Island centre suffers from lack of parking and facilities which would become even more overlooked. Will destroy Green belt for future generations.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1400	A+D Hughes	3	<p>Consider the Spatial Strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development.</p> <p>Burntwood’s infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable.</p> <p>Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated.</p> <p>Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey’s corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires.</p> <p>Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes.</p> <p>For too long, Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents.</p> <p>No faith in any new Green Belt review as the 2013 Supplement used definitions of terms, choice of questions, prejudiced answers and incorrect/misleading statements to classify pre-chosen (in my opinion) parcels of land as not providing an important contribution to the Green Belt.</p> <p>Can visualise no ‘exceptional circumstances’ in which Burntwood’s Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward.</p> <p>Therefore, I believe that, at this stage, LDC should be planning for new settlements. Then perhaps, Lichfield District would be in a position to house a significant number from the neighbouring conurbation. Lack of services. Should build on brown field. Build affordable renting.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base which including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.</p>
POPD1401	Mrs A Rhodes	3	<p>Consider the Spatial Strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development.</p> <p>Burntwood’s infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable.</p> <p>Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated.</p> <p>Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey’s corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires.</p> <p>Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes.</p> <p>For too long, Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents.</p> <p>I have no faith in any new Green Belt review as the 2013 Supplement used definitions of terms, choice of questions, prejudiced answers and incorrect/misleading statements to classify pre-chosen (in my opinion) parcels of land as not providing an important contribution to the Green Belt.</p> <p>Can visualise no ‘exceptional circumstances’ in which Burntwood’s Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward.</p> <p>Therefore, I believe that, at this stage, LDC should be planning for new settlements. Then perhaps, Lichfield District would be in a position to house a significant number from the neighbouring conurbation.Considers more thought should be given to wilidlife, not destroying habitat. Building brings more traffic.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.</p>
POPD1402	Mr T Mason	3	<p>Can visualise no ‘exceptional circumstances’ in which Burntwood’s Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward.</p> <p>Therefore, I believe that, at this stage, LDC should be planning for new settlements. Then perhaps, Lichfield District would be in a position to house a significant number from the neighbouring conurbation.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.</p>
POPD1403	P Stretton	3	<p>Consider the Spatial Strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development.</p> <p>Burntwood’s infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable.</p> <p>Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated.</p> <p>Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey’s corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires.</p> <p>Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes.</p> <p>For too long, Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents.</p> <p>I have no faith in any new Green Belt review as the 2013 Supplement used definitions of terms, choice of questions, prejudiced answers and incorrect/misleading statements to classify pre-chosen (in my opinion) parcels of land as not providing an important contribution to the Green Belt.</p> <p>Can visualise no ‘exceptional circumstances’ in which Burntwood’s Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward.</p> <p>Therefore, I believe that, at this stage, LDC should be planning for new settlements. Then perhaps, Lichfield District would be in a position to house a significant number from the neighbouring conurbation. Expresses additional concerns regarding increased traffic, loss of green space, impact on air quality. Should use Borwnfield sites in West Midlands before green belt. Increased danger from road traffic with lorries on Hospital Rd, loss of identities for Burntwood and Hammerwich. Impact if Chasewater dam failed.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.</p>
POPD1404	M Standish	3	<p>When suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have put forward. therefore, I believe that at this stage, LDC should be planning for new settlements</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
POPD1405	B Woolridge	3	<p>No, I do not consider the Spatial Strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development.</p> <p>Burntwood’s infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable.</p> <p>Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated.</p> <p>Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey’s corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires.</p> <p>Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes.</p> <p>For too long, Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents</p>	<p>Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.</p>
POPD1406	Mrs KM Mace	3	<p>Chose to live in Burntwood due to access to Green Belt and for children to be raised. They now want it for their children too. Can give us freedom and lesiure, live healthy lifestyle so value green areas.</p> <p>Therefore strongly object to any way GB is lost to housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green belt have been put forward. Should plan for these new settlements in other suitable and sustinable locations outside GB. Should consider wildlife returning after Bleak House Open cast. Apprecait new housing needed but balance required so no building on Green Belt.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.</p>
POPD1407	A Revitt	Chapter 10	<p>Do not believe the spatial strategy will deliver sustainable within Burntwood locality. Table 10.1 - doesn't meet needs of the community. Not addressed but development permitted without infrastructure or services. Apart from bypass, no investment. PT cut. Sankeys Corner continues to shrink. Can't support community or new development. Evidence so far indicates resi would not fund investment. Development if permitted should be conditional on improvement to community infrastructure funded by the developer. Borwnfield sites should be used. Relocate fragmented Mount Road and develop residential as alternative to Green belt. Concerns GB review used to reduce amount of GB as exceptional circumstnaces. Scope for extensive development along A38 in Brookhay area with advantage of rail access. Development of sustainable communities in such locations would seem to be a far more practical way forward than any attempt to undertake expanded development in the Green Belt within the environs of an already overloaded community infrastructure such as Burntwood</p>	<p>Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.</p>
POPD1408	N Marshall	1	<p>Proposals for housing growth in Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall could put the vision at risk.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.</p>
POPD1409	J Dunne	3	<p>Infrastructure and services in Burntwood not big enough to cope with extra demand. Services already unable to cope. Love walking in the countryside, once built on, never get back.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including an Infrastructure Capacity Study which will inform the next stages of the plan.</p>

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1410	N Marshall	2	Claims Shenstone and Little Aston are capable of growth because of access to a station are flaws. The rail stations are used for commuting. They are of no social and economic benefit to Shenstone and Little Aston.	Comments noted.Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as a level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements.A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy to seek to deliver sustainable development in accordance with the Nationa Planning Policy Framework.
POPD1411	N Marshall	3	The growth option has been published without a brownfield site assessment or green belt review completed therefore the assumptions is incompleted.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1412	N Marshall	4	Policy towards sustainable development is positive but more attention should be paid to the role of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1413	N Marshall	5	Council should consider a sustainability standard above the minimum if possible.A new Park and Ride rail station could reduce car movements through south staffordshire going to and form Birmingham and help reduce pollution.	Comments and preferences noted
POPD1414	A Harper	Whole Document	Under attack from 18 planning applications. Hope LDC uses diligence and considers long term future. Current poor amenities. How will extra housing be dealt with.	Comments noted. Specific sites will be considered as part of the local plan review.The evidence base is being updated to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1415	Mr & Mrs Hilton	3	Do not consider preferred strategy appropriate. Consider Burntwoods infrastructure and amenites do not adequately cater for the current population so any significant increase in its population is not sustainable. Examples given.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities.
POPD1416	Ms J Taylor	3	Do not consider the Spatial Strategy based upon the identified settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate strategy for delivering sustainable development. Burntwood's infrastructure and amenities do not adequately cater for the huge urban sprawl which has been allowed to develop and any significant increase in its population is not sustainable. Other than the by-pass the immediate road network is poor, resulting in poor traffic flows at peak times and over the past few years public transport has deteriorated. Any re-development of the Town Centre at Sankey's corner is unlikely to provide the amenities which a settlement of this size requires. Unless the whole of the Mount Road site is re-designated for housing, there is insufficient previously used land to provide a significant number of new homes. For too long, Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl into surrounding countryside and now, all of its surrounding Green Belt is needed to maintain the health and well-being of its residents. I have no faith in any new Green Belt review as the 2013 Supplement used definitions of terms, choice of questions, prejudiced answers and incorrect/misleading statements to classify pre-chosen (in my opinion) parcels of land as not providing an important contribution to the Green Belt. There are no 'exceptional circumstances' in which Burntwood's Green Belt could be justified for housing when suitable sites for new settlements outside the Green Belt have been put forward. Therefore, I believe that, at this stage, LDC should be planning for new settlements: West of the A38, Brookhay, Alrewas Quarry, East of A38, Packington Hall Farm, Tamworth Road, Any other suitable and sustainable locations outside the Green Belt.	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District including Burntwood. Burntwood is identified as a Level 2 - Other Main Centre given it is the second largest urban areas within the district with good access to a range of services and facilities. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1417	Mrs J Taylor	Whole Document	Infrastructure neglected, and volume of traffic increased dangerously. Tired of housing been built in greenery. Building on Green Belt destroys our woodland. Services are full, Town Centre a Ghost town. Burntwood cannot sustain any more development. Need to build on brownfield sites not the Green belt. Should build on Mount Road site. If homes needed, need a new strategy of building a new settlement. Burntwood is along way from Birmingham to be overspill. Burntwood could have been a tourist attraction with cycle paths and train links to Chasewater. Burntwood has not kept its identity. Sankeys corner an eyesore. Parks need regenerating . Need something for the younger generations to have something to do.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and infrastructure capacity study which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1418	Mrs M Harrison	Whole Document	Should be no more houses in the Green Belt. Roads can't take more traffic. Use empty houses, Concerned wildlife has been pushed out.	A Green Belt Review will be completed and Urban Capacity Assessment will be completed as part of the Local Plan review process. The Local Plan review will be accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will identify infrastructure requirements and how they will be delivered.
POPD1419	D R Coleman	Whole Document	Over the years Burntwood has become over-whelmed with population and attendant infrastructure problems. Eg Traffic problems need to be attended to before any more development.More developemnt will only detract from health and welbeing of residents.Only 3 natural open spaces in Burntwood. Too far away for many residents to access. Imact on wildlife. Smaller population needed not endless estates. Developing further will blight the area.	Duly Noted
POPD1420	K Powell	Whole Document	Do not believe it is the best plan for Burntwood. Infrastructure inadequate, Concerned car journeys will increase, road links poor, signage at Milestone Road points Lichfield bound traffic away from by-pass. Burntwood not able to offer the jobs for the new homes, Mount Road dated and needs improvement.Few shops at Swan Island, but parking difficult. Green Belt around Burntwood has heritage value which would be lost to development. Green belt a refuge for wildlife and residents for walking. Burntwood has been filled in leaving very few open spaces. More thought and creative thinking therefore required.	Duly Noted. A Green Belt Review will be completed and Urban Capacity Assessment will be completed as part of the Local Plan review process
POPD1421	N Marshall	6	FRA data was obtained during neighbourhood plan process. The data places limits on what level of housing can be built without increasing the flooding risk	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD1422	C Beesley	Whole Document	Exceptional circumstances do not exist for LDC to do a call for sites. Do not agree with LDC that Mount Road Industrial Estate should be rejected for development proposals. Concern LDC is one of the landlords at Mount rd. Do not accept that other proposals are too difficult to acheive. BF available in Burntwood, therefore call for sites in Burntwood redundant and contray to government policy. Proposals to redesignate Green belt for housing are contrary to government legislation.	Comments noted. LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate in preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and in meeting housing and employment needs. The work will be done in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework
POPD1423	N Marshall	7	Proposals should look to reduce air pollution	Comments noted.
POPD1424	T & R Cox	Whole Document	After decades of allowing Burntwood to sprawl, time to halt and protect the definition of the GB. Current infrastructure in Burntwood inadequate for more building.Roads inadequate . Pressure from building will result in delays, road deterioration and potentially accidents. No capacity for more people. Car parks full and there is a lack of places for schools and doctors. Queries whether gas, electricity or water supplies can cope. One builder given authority to buildi in GB will mean more plans passed and sprawl. Targets must be met within existing town boundaries or land west of Brookhay, Packington Hall farm, Alrewas Quarry, and possibly around the M6 toll. GB must be used for agriculture and for future generations to enjoy.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review and urban capacity assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan. The Local Plan review will be accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will identify infrastructure requirements and how they will be delivered.
POPD1425	N Marshall	8	The sustainable transport with the most potential that provides the best opportunity is the electrification of the railway line to the NE of Lichfield	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1426	N Marshall	9	Brownfield analysis needs to be completed and incorproated in order for the preferred approach to housing to be comprehensive.	Comments noted. The Council will be carrying an Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stages of the Local Plan Review.
POPD1427	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	Whole Document	promoting land off London Road on behalf of Cooper Developments for 155 dwelling site. No technical constraints size of site would not require significant update in exsiting infastructre. Reference information submitted in appendix 1.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1428	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	Whole Document	Planning Context ; Supports the Review, this is in line with the NPPF five year review requirement. The current consultation follows previous Scope Issues and Options. Cooper Development supports the Council proactive approach in continuing with a review of the Local Plan to ensure that an up to date policy framework exits within the District to guide growth to 2036 and to ensure that development is genuinely plan led.	Duly Noted No Further Actions Required
POPD1429	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	1	Noted Vision remains broadly the same which is relevant and supported.	Noted
POPD1430	J Wilson	1	The Local Plan housing growth proposals for Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall contradict the Local Plan Vision	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level. Site specific suggestions and concerns received will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review
POPD1431	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	2	Considered they remain broadly relevant However chosen to remove specific references to particular settlements at this stage of the process. SOP 6 note update Broadened to include "existing and new residents. Welcomed but maintain that this should be strengthened to refer to meeting the unmet housing needs of the wider Birmingham and the black Country Market Area.	Comments noted .LDC's requirement to contribute towards meeting wider HMA unmet need is recognised elsewhere in the document. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1432	N Marshall	10	Neighbourhood Plans have been useful in identifying affordable housing and the sixe and bedroom mix rations at neighbourhood level and should be referenced in any planning.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1433	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	3	Supports the continuation of the Spatial strategy within the Local Plan Strategy rightly identifies Lichfield as a Strategic Centre in recognition of the services and facilities available and importantly its public transport links to Birmingham. Important considering links to GBHMA. The Settlement hierarchy should represent the primary driver for influencing the spatial strategy. Not that this has been updated but evidence is still needs to consider means of meeting cross boundary growth. Vitally important to update Green Belt evidence in light of the proposed changes to the Settlement Hierarchy and development strategy and in recognition of the development that has come forward since the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy. para 136 NPPF exceptional circumstanced view the alternation to Green Belt boundaries are fully justified. Established that meeting the necessary growth needs in respect of market and affordable housing is an exceptional circumstance. 60% of District in the green Belt including the most sustainable settlement of Lichfield is in the Green Belt. The Local Plan Strategy land t the southern edge of the Lichfield was found the most sustainable location to meet housing needs and amendments to the Green Belt Boundary were made to allocate three SDA's. Cooper Development contend that this general location remains the most sustainable location for growth and that land off London Road would represent a logical and deliverable extension to complementing the allocation that are now coming forward.	Comments and support for the settlement hierarchy noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1434	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	9	Notes updated PPG is a baseline figure not accounting for economic growth and housing need from GBBCHMA. HEDNA supported. Reviews the options. Considered Options 1 to 3 not sufficient. Disputes the 3000 additional dwellings are a reasonably significant contribution towards the unmet need. Represents less than 5% of the unmet need from GB&BCHMA. Disputes 4,500 additional dwellings is mid point in the range for the two recommended areas of search for urban extensions and fails to take account of the recommended area of search for a new settlement within SGS. Option 6 does not represent a mid point in the scale range in line with option 5.. A mid point would be 12,500. GBBCHMA Strategic Growth study identified 3 areas of search. Not clear how figure of 4500 as option 5 derived. Assumes only one area of search tested. Inconsistent with approach of other LAs, eg South Staffs and Cannock Chase. Consistent approach would suggest option of Local Housing Need plus minimum requirement of recommended areas of search in the SGS = 13,000. Concern 3000 to 4500 in options 4 and 5 fail to take account of opportunities to boost supply given strong geographical relationship with the adjoining major urban area of Birmingham and the Black Country and as free of physical and environmental constraints. Need to commit to accommodate development not just commit to a test as the plan is formulated.	Comments and analysis of options noted. The Council have commissioned a HEDNA which will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy and practice guidance and test housing growth scenarios. This will inform the next stage of the local plan process.
POPD1435	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	10	Believe housing mix should be guided by market signals and an up to date SHMA. The Local Plan should not seek to establish a specified mix for all developments. Para 61 2019 is clear that size type and tenure needs are different sections of communities. Housing needs arising from neighbouring authorities should consider most appropriate mix to be achieved.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a HEDNA and plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define policies relating to housing mix.
POPD1436	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	11	We broadly agree with the factors presented. Green Belt purposes should be assessed at a site level. GBHMA Strategic Growth Study para 10.45 assumes the majority of unmet need will be met by a range of small scale developments. This will require LAs to consider proportionate dispersal of smaller scale development opportunities - outside of the larger strategic growth options both within and outside the Green Belt. The Study underlines the importance of identifying a range of sites and not just large -scale strategic developments. Cooper Developments consider that it should be made clear within the Preferred Options that this assessment is a separate process from the Sustainability appraisals. Notes that the Preferred option will focus new homes on the suitable settlements this seem logical and broadly accords with Option 2. However stress NPPF para 78 clearly underlines the importance of promoting suitable development in real areas and meeting rural housing needs. It is considered that the delivery of a new settlement would have significant disbenefits, long lead in times uncertain delivery market saturation. further to response in questions 9 firmly believe that there is the potential for the District to accommodate increased housing numbers to 2036 without the need for a new settlement.	Comments noted. The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study recommends authorities across the HMA increase housing density. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence base studies including a plan wide viability assessment. This will inform the next stage of the review and help define the policy approach relating to housing mix and housing density.
POPD1437	J Wilson	3	The Lichfield District Council Strategy for housing based on settlement hierarchy and communities such as Little Aston, Shenstone which are priority in the Green belt should be revised. It should be based on unused existing industrial land, existing urban areas and two new growth settlements	Comments noted. The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1438	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	4	Noted Core Policy 3 has been updated considered reflective of national policy and supported.	Comments noted.
POPD1439	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	20	The Green belt is not a natural resource. A policy that seek to impose a blanket protection for the countryside does not comply with national guidance, Case law Stroud DC vs SSCLG (2015) EWHC 488 (ADMIN) is clear that whilst valued landscapes so not need to have a formal designation value means something more than just popular. Landscape is only valued if it has physical attributes which take it out of the ordinary. Landscape Institutes Guidance's for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment identify various factors relevant to assessment (listed). The Preferred Policy implies the landscape countryside is valued. This is not justified or evidenced against the criteria. If landscape countryside landscape demonstrate the same certain qualities it would be seen as the norm and not be valued.	Noted.
POPD1440	N Marshall	12	A registration of sites suitable for self builders in the Lichfield District would be useful	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD1441	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	21	Considered appropriate to include reference to three Spires. Policy should include reference to their significance when approaching the City from the north and west.	Noted, comments will help inform consideration of a local policy
POPD1442	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	22	Do not consider there there is justification for a policy to require a masterplan for all small and medium scale developments. To onerous slow down development. However in practice schemes often produce information at pre-app stage to assist - this should be done on a site by site basis. Cooper developed have provided significant amounts of information through the Development Plan process including a masterplan.	Noted.
POPD1443	M Dauncey Cooper Developments	Whole Document	Supports the decision to review, Visions and Strategic Priorities remain broadly the same there has been number of factors that have changes including meeting cross boundary need. Proposed development strategy broadly supported especially Lichfield City as a focus for growth. Concerns the preferred options does not commit to meeting the needs GBBCHMA. Review must review Green Belt boundaries including around Lichfield City this should include land off London Road to ensure housing need to 2036 is met. Note Green Belt evidence attached the Local Plan Strategy did not consider land off London Road. Cooper Development would welcome the opportunity to maintain a dialogue with the LDC.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive green belt review which will inform the next stages of the plan. The District Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities to address the HMA shortfall as part of the Duty to Cooperate.
POPD1444	N Marshall	14	The employment and economic development focus on Lichfield City, Burntwood and Fradley Park is welcome. It should be easier for larger industries wishing to move to areas which are accessible and more viable in the long term.	Duly Noted
POPD1445	J Wilson	4	The SHLAA designation of land developable of Little Aston & Stonnall should be made clear in any future decision making	Comments noted. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated on an annual basis and will inform the local plan review process.
POPD1446	J Wilson	5	The A38 corridor strategic housing growth option coupled with the electrification of the unused railway line running north east of Lichfield Trent Valley Station would protect the Green Belt	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1447	N Marshall	17	Greenfield land which adds to fitness and well-being should not be considered for housing	Noted
POPD1448	J Wilson	6	Flood data assessed needs to be centralised - to be of use in any further housing development proposals	The Local Plan Review will be informed by a SFRA.
POPD1449	N Marshall	22	Neighbourhood Plans are a strong method for bringing forward small sites and retaining the quality of housing.	Noted.
POPD1450	J Wilson	7	Any housing growth proposals should not increase pollution	Comments noted.
POPD1451	J Wilson	8	The sustainable transport with the greatest potential that provides the greatest opportunity is to electrify the railway line to the north of Lichfield	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1452	J Wilson	9	The preferred policy direction is not complete. For example no Green belt review or brownfield analysis has been completed.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan process.
POPD1453	J Wilson	10	Neighbourhood plan recognition as they have considered the issues	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1454	J Wilson	11	Neighbourhood plan recognition in identifying the appropriate density should be acknowledged	Noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1455	J Wilson	12	There should be a register of self build sites	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD1456	J Wilson	13	The consultation document does not actually identify how the new criteria will do this. This needs to be clarified.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1457	J Wilson	15	The clarification of rural centres does not automatically justify any future growth capacity.	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD1458	J Wilson	17	Green Belt / field amenity adding to overall well being and recreation should not be considered for housing	Noted
POPD1459	J Wilson	20	Any areas of special environmental merit has been identified in the neighbourhood plans of Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone. the strategy should recognise the neighbourhood plans	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD1460	J Wilson	22	Neighbourhood plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any further options plan.	Noted.
POPD1461	Mrs D Cotterill	1	The Local Plan housing proposals for Shenstone have ignored the plan accepted by the village	Comments noted. The vision is provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. Specific proposals and concerns for particular areas will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. A neighbourhood plan is required to support the delivery of strategic policies set out in a Local Plan.
POPD1462	Mrs D Cotterill	2	Shenstone has already expanded by a huge amount. It is and should stay a village. We have mediocre bus service, and half of all trains do not stop at Shenstone	Noted. Shenstone is identified as a level 3 settlement in the settlement hierarchy having regard to its attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy having regard to addressing any growth needs
POPD1463	Mrs D Cotterill	3	Any further building, other than previously agreed, will seriously damage the green belt, agricultural land	Comments noted.
POPD1464	Mrs D Cotterill	4	Sustainable development should mean using the available underused industrial land	Comments noted. The preferred policy seeks to encourage the re-use of previously developed land.
POPD1465	Mrs D Cotterill	5	Further building should be to the north of Lichfield with more trains to take commuters	Comments noted
POPD1466	Mrs D Cotterill	6	This has already been assessed and the land already agreed on	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD1467	Mrs D Cotterill	7	Regular trains and buses (including Sundays for buses) would benefit all	Noted.
POPD1468	Mrs D Cotterill	8	Most residents use cars as the bus and train system fails, trains services should be improved north of Lichfield	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1469	Mrs D Cotterill	9	People living in the outlying villages have not been considered or consulted properly	This stage of the Local Plan Review has been consulted on in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement.
POPD1470	J Hubbard	1	Needs for housing to be assessed, especially for first time buyers, the elderly.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated including in resepect of housing needs.
POPD1471	Mrs D Cotterill	10	The original neighbourhood plans covered this	Comments noted. Neighoburhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1472	J Hubbard	2	Capability for growth' needs supportive services eg Post Offices, not just train and bus services which are unable to be used by persons with disabilities.	Comments noted. The wording "capable of growth" is not referenced in the strategic priorties and policies but is referenced in chapter 20 in relation to the settlement sustainability study. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements.
POPD1473	Mrs D Cotterill	11	The original neighbourhood plans covered this	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD1474	Mrs D Cotterill	14	Shenstone has a small underused industrial site better suited to a housing development	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidance that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for empoyment development needs. Our Spatial Strateg identifies the preferred location for housing growth.
POPD1475	Mrs D Cotterill	17	Shenstone villagers are using all of the amenity land and surrounding green belt for exercise and relaxation	Noted
POPD1476	Mrs D Cotterill	20	Involve and inform the people living in the areas before any action is taken	Opportunities for local residents to contribute to identifying the importance of particular green spaces are through consultations such as this and through Neighbourhood Plans.
POPD1477	Mrs D Cotterill	22	Most villages can absorb small scale building plots but not huge developments. It destroys the whole infrastructure of the area	Noted.
POPD1478	K R Hayes	1	The Local Plan housing growth proposals for Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston contradict the proposed Local Plan vision. The vision states that Lichfield District Council wants to see residents "proud of their communities" with a "strong sense of local community... and belonging". Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have these strong characteristics. However later in the consultation document, the proposals for housing growth, dependant on the scale of the growth, location and type of growth could put the vision completely at risk. The consultation document review of housing needs is not comprehensively assessed. Lichfield needs are assessed in detail but no needs from outside Lichfield are assessed. The external needs need to be quantified. Any housing need to be met by Lichfield District Council arising from the wider West Midlands Housing Market Area needs to be fully justified. Currently those needs are not identified in any detail or justified in the consultation document. The growth proposals may therefore be subject to near future housing pressures to accommodate - that impact is not identified in the consultation document.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1479	KR Hayes	2	The justification for Strategic Priority1. "Communities capable of growth" which includes Little Aston and Shenstone is flawed. This is because Little Aston and Shenstone have very high scores for housing growth potential because of their access to a bus service or railway station "serving 5 main centres". Three of the five centres identified as benefitting Little Aston and Shenstone are Bromsgrove, Longbridge and Redditch. These are simply railway connections along the length of a cross city line only and no actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Little Aston and Shenstone are identified.	Comments noted. The wording "capable of growth" is not referenced in the strategic priorties and policies but is referenced in chapter 20 in relation to the settlement sustainability study. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1480	KR Hayes	3	<p>The evidence for Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone having capacity for growth is considered on pages 101and 102 of the Lichfield District Council preferred options report including Table 20.2. This section shows that Shenstone has more growth potential negatives than positives in that it has many more red and amber judgements on Table 20.2 than green judgements. Stonnall is shown as having a balance of negative and positive and Little Aston more positive than negative however in the case of Little Aston and Stonnall the SHLAA interest in land designations are significantly shown as "non developable". This is strong evidence of the inappropriateness of selecting Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone for growth. The Lichfield District Council strategy for housing based on a settlement hierarchy of communities such as Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone which are primarily in the Green Belt should be revised. The priorities below should be based on unused existing industrial land, existing urban areas and the two new growth settlements.</p> <p>Lichfield District Council housing growth should be focussed on (i) Brownfield sites that are no longer viable (ii) Existing urban areas with a good range of established services (ii) The two potential strategic growth communities north east of Lichfield and north of Tamworth.</p> <p>The preferred options for housing growth have been published without a Brownfield Site assessment having been completed or a Green Belt Review having been completed or the other West Midland Housing Market Area authorities indicating they will accommodate additional growth, so the data platform for the preferred options spatial strategy assumptions is also incomplete</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review, Urban Capacity Assessment and Infrastructure Capacity Study which will inform the next stages of the plan. The SHLAA is a living document and reviewed and updated on an annual basis.
POPD1481	KR Hayes	4	<p>The Lichfield District Council preferred policy towards sustainable development is acceptable in that it seeks to protect our natural environment.</p> <p>However, the District Council already have a published Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment known as the SHLAA which for Little Aston and Stonnall shows very significant numbers of land owner enquiries adjacent to Stonnall and Little Aston as "not developable".</p> <p>This SHLAA designation of "not developable" is considered positive classification by Little Aston and Stonnall residents. The considerations included in any existing "not developable" judgement should also be made clear in any future decision making particularly if they are based on sustainable development criteria.</p> <p>The role of the Neighbourhood Plan in the identification and upholding of sustainable development should be made clear as is not identified. The Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone Neighbourhood Plans have all been used effectively to date in challenging non sustainable development in recent years</p>	Comments noted. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis and will inform the local plan review process.
POPD1482	A&F Bowdler	1	Agree with the views stated	Noted
POPD1483	KR Hayes	5	<p>The identification of sustainability standards is important.</p> <p>The Local Plan preferred options should identify where the best potential housing growth exists using this criteria.</p> <p>Electrification of the underused railway line running north east of Lichfield Trent Valley station would further strengthen the case for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option which is outside of the Green Belt. This proposal would reduce the volumes of car movements from the proposed new A38 corridor settlement and should be complemented with a new park and ride rail station south of Lichfield north of Wall. This would reduce the car movements through south Staffordshire villages as they enter north Birmingham</p>	Comments noted.
POPD1484	A&F Bowdler	2	Cross City line doesn't benefit Shenstone	Noted but no justification / suggestions provided.
POPD1485	A&F Bowdler	3	Brownfield land should always be utilised first before building on any greenfield sites	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including an Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1486	Andrew Partington	1	Any large scale development within Shenstone Stonall or Little Aston is completely at odds within the local Plans focus your attention on option 1.	Comments and preference noted.
POPD1487	Andrew Partington	2	Partially but some of the logic is baffling - 99% of rail commuters alright at New Street not Bromsgrive Longbridge and Redditch there is no ecomic correlation.	Noted
POPD1488	KR Hayes	6	<p>Flood risk assessment data was obtained for Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall during their Neighbourhood Plan preparation periods. The data places limits on what can be housing development built without risk. This needs to be continued to be acknowledged in any future housing development proposals</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD1489	KR Hayes	7	<p>Any housing growth proposals should not increase pollution.</p> <p>To date Shenstone and Little Aston await any meaningful enhancement to rail travel times or quality from the new train franchise.</p> <p>As identified above a new rail station would be required for the A38 corridor strategic housing growth option north east of Lichfield to reduce the impact of increased vehicle movements coming from that strategic housing proposal</p>	Comments noted.
POPD1490	KR Hayes	8	As identified in previous responses to the growth preferred options. The sustainable transport with the greatest 1 potential that provides the greatest opportunity is to electrify the railway line to the north east of Lichfield.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1491	KR Hayes	9	<p>The preferred policy direction as set out is not comprehensive, in that it proposes a way forward for housing : provision in Lichfield District without: (i) identifying the Lichfield requirements to grow or not to grow from the West Midlands Housing Market Renewal Area and (ii) any Green Belt Review (iii) only commits to understanding traveller requirements, not to responding as with other categories of need (Stonnall has had direct experience of the current vacuum in this third area) (iv) any Brownfield analysis having been completed.</p>	Comments noted. Chapter 14 of the consultation documents sets out the methodology for the proposed housing scenarios. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1492	KR Hayes	10	<p>This policy direction seeks to meet all the housing needs of the District through all levels of affordable and market housing options. All neighbourhood Plans have considered these issues. The recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying affordable and market needs at the neighbourhood level with agreed housing sizes and bedroom mix ratios should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of any new preferred policy direction</p>	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1493	KR Hayes	11	<p>Again, recognition of Neighbourhood Plans in identifying the appropriate density at the neighbourhood plan level should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of the policy direction. This has been an area of particular importance to Shenstone, where before the Neighbourhood Plan the area was subject to planning application exhibiting new build over intensification</p>	Noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1494	KR Hayes	12	<p>The use of the Neighbourhood Plan to identify and sustain suitable housing development in / around the Lichfield area is shown to be very necessary in challenging non sustainable housing in Little Aston, Shenstone & Stonnall.</p>	Comments noted.
POPD1495	Duplicate of POPD1496			
POPD1496	A&F Bowdler	4	<p>Lichfield District Council has not met current targets for pitch provision and has not for many years refreshed its needs assessment in this area. This gap in planning and provision has had direct implications for the Stonnall area.</p> <p>It is important that the new criteria identified in the consultation document in respect of the A5 and A38 corridors for travellers, do actually enable a more proactive approach to provision. The consultation document does not actually identify how the new criteria will do this. Given the history in this area this needs to be significantly clarified</p>	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessments which will inform the next stages of the plan making process.
POPD1497	Andrew Partington	3	Focus on a housing strategy aligned to key arterial roads like A38 and A5 - Don't disrupt green belt residential areas.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1498	A&F Bowdler	5	Further development will only make traffic volumes worse along the A38 corridor. Parking at Trent Bridge inadequate with knock on effect.	Comments noted.
POPD1499	Andrew Partington	4	Largely	Noted.
POPD1500	Andrew Partington	5	Largley better use of rail links would faciliate the objectives within option 1.	Noted.
POPD1501	Andrew Partington	7	yes	Noted.
POPD1502	Andrew Partington	8	Yes	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1503	Andrew Partington	9	largely but need to fully outline green belt and traveller community implications	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1504	KR Hayes	14	The employment and economic development focus on Lichfield City, Burntwood and Fraley Park is welcome. The Lichfield District Council employment policy should be further strengthened by identifying what the council will do to support the older employment areas which have larger industrial uses with location and site viability features that challenge their long-term future. The Shenstone industrial estate has examples of this. The industrial estate user vacancy rate, short term user churn and traffic impact on the Shenstone village centre require the development of incentives for those users who wish to relocate to the economic development areas above. This may be as straightforward as Lichfield Council identifying the changes of use from industrial to residential development that will be considered	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs. Our Spatial Strateg identifies the preferred location for housing growth.
POPD1505	Andrew Partington	10	Yes	Support noted
POPD1506	Andrew Partington	11	largely	Noted
POPD1507	KR Hayes	15	Stonnall, Little Aston and Shenstone are classified in the preferred options report as "Rural Centres" catering for the day to day needs of the village and the wider rural area around. While this may be currently true this does not automatically justify any future growth capacity	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD1508	KR Hayes	17	This policy talks of the importance of protecting open space for recreation and overall well-being. Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have several protected green spaces which are actively used within their Neighbourhood Plans. Shenstone has recently had one of these areas of land come under consideration for housing in the recent District Council review of the Land Allocation Plan. This proposal was withdrawn. Green field amenity land adding to overall well-being should not be considered for housing	Noted
POPD1509	KR Hayes	20	Any area of special environmental merit has been identified in the Neighbourhood Plans of Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone. The strategy should recognise the contribution of Neighbourhood Plans	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD1510	KR Hayes	21	The provision of high-quality housing development is being reduced by the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in that (i) the consultation on what the Lichfield CIL strategy is to invest in is not open to broad, regular consultation about quality priorities, and (ii) the CIL introduction has limited the developers resources left for Section 106 contributions to add quality improvements when a specific housing development is approved.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process. Consultation on the CIL process will be in accordance with the Adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
POPD1511	KR Hayes	22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan. This should be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1512	KR Hayes	23	This question is about how Lichfield protects local heritage and the answer is the same as for Q 22 above.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1513	A&F Bowdler	6	Agree with the policy stated	Comments noted.
POPD1514	A&F Bowdler	7	Agree with the policy stated	Support noted.
POPD1515	A&F Bowdler	8	Agree with the plan to improve the rail link	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1516	Andrew Partington	13	Needs to be better scurity on this entire subject the decision to uphold the Stonnall Appeal case should not be repeated in Green Belt rural Locations the answer is obvious A5/A38 etc	Noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1517	Andrew Partington	14	Largely	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1518	Andrew Partington	15	it is entirely inappropriate to majority develop these 3 locations the traffic in Stonnall at rsh hour school times is already at dangerous levels serviced by narrow B and C roads. Further self inflicted traffic would be abhorrent and very dangerous.	Duly Noted This response will be addressed through Preferred policy : Sustainable Transport.
POPD1519	J Hubbard	3	Not happy with proposals but unable to offer alternatives.	Comments noted.
POPD1520	Andrew Partington	17	Playing field and walking routes should be preserved and never come under consideration for housing development.	Noted
POPD1521	Andrew Partington	18	Think of the Bigger Picture	Noted
POPD1522	Andrew Partington	21	Please do not overload Lichfield with a Milton Keynes Type Strategy	Noted. Policies seek to maintain local distinctiveness without stifling innovation.
POPD1523	Andrew Partington	22	Listen to local communities not greedy developers.	Noted.
POPD1524	Andrew Partington	23	Focus your energies on an outcome which gives you the biggest bang for your buck and minimal disruption, it can only be A38 /A5.	Noted. Policies and strategies established through the Local Plan will guide the future growth of the District the decisions will be informed by evidence.
POPD1525	J Hubbard	4	Future sustainability is essential - Neighbourhood Plan should be included in proposals.	Comments noted.
POPD1526	J Hubbard	5	Any developments should positively reduce traffic volumes through Shenstone and Stonnall.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1527	A&F Bowdler	10	Agree	Support noted
POPD1528	A&F Bowdler	11	Agree	Support noted
POPD1529	A&F Bowdler	12	Agree	Support noted.
POPD1530	J Hubbard	6	As someone who has experienced 3.5ft of sewage infected house flooding in another area of the country, comprehensive flood risk assessment for any future development is essential.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD1531	Alan & Pauline Taylor	1	An alternative which could remedy many green belt problems the horrendous traffic problem through Shenstone would be to move the industrial estate to present Wyvale site and land behind, together with piece of the land between toll road and A5. Has this been considered by planning?	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level. Site specific suggestions will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.
POPD1532	J Hubbard	7	Agree	Noted
POPD1533	J Hubbard	8	Agree	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1534	Alan & Pauline Taylor	7	'Capability for growth' needs supportive services eg Post Offices, not just train and bus services which are unable to be used by persons with disabilities.	Comments noted.
POPD1535	J Hubbard	9	Needs to include maintenance of Green Belt as far as possible.	Noted
POPD1536	A&F Bowdler	13	Agree	Noted
POPD1537	A&F Bowdler	16	More town twinning to be encouraged.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1538	J Hubbard	10	'Capability for growth' needs supportive services eg Post Offices, not just train and bus services which are unable to be used by persons with disabilities.	Comments noted.
POPD1539	A&F Bowdler	17	Little Aston's recreational ground is well run by LACA and LARGA	Noted.
POPD1540	Alan & Pauline Taylor	3	We concur with statement made by Shenstone Parish Council together with Save Shenstone Group.	Comments noted.
POPD1541	Alan & Pauline Taylor	4	Development of Millbrook adjacent to Lammas Land should not take place. 1) Flood plain 2)Lammas Land increasingly used by villagers for walking, picnics recreation etc. Wild life needs protection particularly bat life very evident on summer evenings at dusk.	Comments noted.
POPD1542	Alan & Pauline Taylor	5	Agree with comments in Consultation question and responses	Comments noted.
POPD1543	Alan & Pauline Taylor	6	Flood risks should be taken seriously - overspill from Fotherley Brook along the Lamas land path has become increasingly evident in last 3/4 years.	Comments noted.
POPD1544	Alan & Pauline Taylor	7	Agree with statement from Shenstone on consultation document.	Comments noted.
POPD1545	Alan & Pauline Taylor	8	Agree with statement from Shenstone on consultation document.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1546	Alan & Pauline Taylor	9	Agree with statement from Shenstone on consultation document.	Comments noted.
POPD1547	Alan & Pauline Taylor	10	Agree	Support noted
POPD1548	Alan & Pauline Taylor	11	Agree	Support noted
POPD1549	Alan & Pauline Taylor	12	Agree	Support noted.
POPD1550	Alan & Pauline Taylor	13	Agree	Noted
POPD1551	Alan & Pauline Taylor	14	Movement of industrial site as suggested should invite sustained and improved usage and increased local employment	Misinterpretation of Policy direction Duly Noted
POPD1552	Alan & Pauline Taylor	15	Agree	Duly Noted No Further Action

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1553	Alan & Pauline Taylor	16	Is there any tourism in our 3 villages?	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1554	Alan & Pauline Taylor	17	The Lamas Land is a constant source of exercise for all age groups in Shenstone - the proposed Millbrook site land would be a very beneficial addition to this!	Noted
POPD1555	Alan & Pauline Taylor	18	Shenstone is fast increasing in social and cultural activities mainly through community with library. It is a tight community with initiatives from all age groups	Noted
POPD1556	Alan & Pauline Taylor	20	Neighbourhood plan is positive	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan.
POPD1557	Alan & Pauline Taylor	21	It should be remembered that Shenstone is essentially a village in its own right. Village identity should be respected and maintained with close attention to community life.	Noted.
POPD1558	Alan & Pauline Taylor	22	Neighbourhood plans of vital importance - treated seriously by the community in Shenstone and hopefully be seriously considered in future decision making	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1559	Alan & Pauline Taylor	23	Neighbourhood plans of vital importance - treated seriously by the community in Shenstone and hopefully be seriously considered in future decision making	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1560	A&F Bowdler	18	Perhaps a festival to celebrate different cultures / religions ie Lichfield Mystery Play plus others	Noted.
POPD1561	A&F Bowdler	20	Agree	Noted
POPD1562	A&F Bowdler	21	Agree	Noted.
POPD1563	A&F Bowdler	22	Agree. Hope to retain green field with developments and trees	Noted.
POPD1564	A&F Bowdler	23	Agree	Noted
POPD1565	John Hayhoe	1	Just another way to waste tax payers money. Leave it as it is.	Noted
POPD1566	J Hubbard	12	Register of sites available for self builders sounds a good idea.	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD1567	John Hayhoe	2	Just another way to waste tax payers money. Leave it as it is.	Comments noted. The Council is required in national legislation to regularly review its local plan.
POPD1568	J Hubbard	13	Clarification of criteria for determining future need/ planning/ provision is essential.	Comments noted.
POPD1569	John Hayhoe	3	Am I dealing with moral people here? I know nobody who would use these phrases.	Noted.
POPD1570	Sheila Beilby	1	No fully support the suggested response	Noted
POPD1571	Sheila Beilby	2	We agree with the suggested response	Comments noted
POPD1572	Sheila Beilby	3	We agree with the suggested response	Noted
POPD1573	J Hubbard	14	Yes	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1574	Sheila Beilby	4	We agree with the suggested response	Noted
POPD1575	J Hubbard	17	Public open space and amenity land is precious for now and future generations.	Noted
POPD1576	Sheila Beilby	5	Good idea . We support this option	Noted
POPD1577	Sheila Beilby	6	We agree	Noted
POPD1578	John Hayhoe	4	No	Noted
POPD1579	Sheila Beilby	7	Anything that minimises car fumes must be benefical	Comments noted.
POPD1580	John Hayhoe	5	Not interested in national minimums, all questions are hypothetical.	Comments noted.
POPD1581	Sheila Beilby	8	We agree with the suggested response	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1582	J Hubbard	18	No, but with all local authority budgets, this area should not be overlooked.	Noted
POPD1583	Sheila Beilby	9	The few points must be considered in any future policy.	Noted
POPD1584	Sheila Beilby	10	We support the suggested response	Support noted.
POPD1585	John Hayhoe	11	No	Comments noted.
POPD1586	J Hubbard	19	Other areas of UK seem to draw together various services in 1 building, so maximum use of eg. library, village hall and larger room would be useful	Noted
POPD1587	John Hayhoe	6	300 feet above sea level and have no major rivers in the area	Noted.
POPD1588	Sheila Beilby	11	The neighbourhood Plans must be adherd to and infrastructure considred.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD1589	J Hubbard	20	Repeat - include Neighbourhood Plan comments	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan.
POPD1590	Sheila Beilby	12	Good idea we were self builders	Noted
POPD1591	Sheila Beilby	13	We fully support the suggested response	Noted
POPD1592	Sheila Beilby	14	We support response - a great idea.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1593	John Hayhoe	7	What on earth can Lichfield or Stafford Council do about air quality. Speak to China or India	Noted. The consultation document sets out a preferred policy direction in relation to air quality.
POPD1594	Sheila Beilby	15	The suggested response needs further cclarification Stonnall has neither a chemist or post office so very limited day to day needs.	Noted. The preferred settlement hierarchy is based on the outcomes of the Sustainable Settlement Study
POPD1595	J Hubbard	21	Section 106 provision as part of planning approval can deliver many benefits.	Noted. Policies seek to maintain local distinctiveness without stifling innovation.
POPD1596	Sheila Beilby	16	Not applicable to Stonnall.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1597	J Hubbard	22	Repeat - Neighbourhood Plan important	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1598	J Hubbard	23	Repeat - Neighbourhood Plan important	Noted.
POPD1599	Sheila Beilby	17	Reducing the volume and speed of traffic along our lanes would enable villages to feel safer walking the lanes for pleasure and exercise.	Noted. Add pedestrain safety to Sustainable transport policy.
POPD1600	Shirley O'Mara	1	The Local Plan and these proposals do not match. I also feel there is not enough detail regarding needs outside Lichfield - especially from Birmingham.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1601	John Hayhoe	8	Build more roads	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1602	Sheila Beilby	18	Not really applicable to Stonnall	Noted
POPD1603	John Hayhoe	9	Stop building houses	Noted
POPD1604	Shirley O'Mara	2	I do not. Shenstone does not have the infrastructure to cope with much more housing development.	Comments noted .Shenstone is identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1605	Sheila Beilby	20	We support the suggested response the neighbourhood plans were complied by the local people who know the area and this should be acknowledged.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan.
POPD1606	Shirley O'Mara	3	Brownfield sites make much more sense	Noted
POPD1607	John Hayhoe	10	Speak	Noted
POPD1608	Shirley O'Mara	4	The neighbourhood plan needs to be followed.	Noted. Neighbourhood will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1609	Shirley O'Mara	5	Again, refer to Local Plan	Comments noted
POPD1610	Shirley O'Mara	7	Any developments should not increase pollution	Comments noted
POPD1611	Shirley O'Mara	8	Transport is already under pressure in Shenstone with reduced bus services and major parking problems	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1612	Shirley O'Mara	9	Need more affordable housing but with it better infrastructure	Noted
POPD1613	EM Owen	1	Any housing need to be met by Lichfield District Council arising from the wider West Midlands Housing Market Area needs to be fully justified. Currently those needs are not identified or justified in the consultation document.	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate.
POPD1614	Shirley O'Mara	10	Need more affordable housing but with it better infrastructure	Comments noted.
POPD1615	Shirley O'Mara	11	Existing neighbourhood plan covers this	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1616	Shirley O'Mara	13	The criteria needs to be clearer	Noted
POPD1617	Shirley O'Mara	14	Difficult to understand where employment could develop apart from the industrial estate - then more traffic implications	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1618	John Hayhoe	12	Yes	Noted
POPD1619	EM Owen	2	Little Aston and Shenstone are identified for growth because of their access to bus services or railway stations. This is a cross cityline but no actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Little Aston or Shenstone are identified.	Comments noted. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. The evidence base is being assembled and will further help refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1620	Shirley O'Mara	15	Tourism is not an issue	Duly Noted Response should fall under Question 16
POPD1621	Duplicate of POPD1622			
POPD1622	John Hayhoe	13	Travellers must be moved on after one night only	Noted
POPD1623	Shirley O'Mara	17	Green spaces for recreation should be protected	Noted
POPD1624	Shirley O'Mara	20	Yes	Noted
POPD1625	EM Owen	3	Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston are primarily in Green Belt and the strategy should be revised. Growth should focus on brownfield sites, existing urban areas with established services. No brownfield site assessment or Green Belt review has been completed and no indication from other West Midland Housing Authorities that they will accommodate additional growth.	Comments noted. The The proposed settlement hierarchy is informed by the Settlement Sustainability Study which assessed all settlements within the District. The Local Plan Review will be informed by a suite of evidence base documents including an Urban Capacity Assessment and Green Belt Review. These documents will inform the next stage of the process.
POPD1626	John Hayhoe	14	Ensure industrial estates have access roads to stop HGVs travelling through small villages	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1627	Shirley O'Mara	22	Existing neighbourhood plan and future plans	Not all areas have Neighbourhood Plans. Neighbourhood Plans have limited scope and provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment contribute.
POPD1628	John Hayhoe	15	I don't know what it means	Duly Noted
POPD1629	EM Owen	9	LDCs proposals for housing provision have not identified what other West Midlands Areas are prepared to do - has not done a comprehensive Green Belt Review, completed a comprehensive brownfield analysis.	Comments noted. The Council will prepare a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stage of the Local Plan Review.
POPD1630	John Hayhoe	16	Let tourists have free parking	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1631	EM Owen	17	Shenstone, Little Aston and Stonnall have several protected green spaces which are actively used within their Neighbourhood Plan. Greenfield amenity land adding to overall well being should not be considered for housing.	Noted
POPD1632	John Hayhoe	17	Introduce food rationing	Unable to be considered through a Local Plan.
POPD1633	EM Owen	20	Neighbourhood Plans of Little Aston, Stonnall and Shenstone have identified areas of special environmental merit and the strategy should recognize the contribution of these Plans.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD1634	EM Owen	22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanisms for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan.	Noted. Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment contribute. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the local plan.
POPD1635	John Hayhoe	18	No to have artistic or theatrical experiences the individual must pay	Noted
POPD1636	John Hayhoe	19	Waste of tax payers money	Noted
POPD1637	John Hayhoe	20	I have no idea and neither does the council	Subsequent policies will be informed following the receipt of further evidence and the representations received.
POPD1638	John Hayhoe	21	Stop building	The Local Plan will help guide new development to deliver sustainable development.
POPD1639	John Hayhoe	22	Why bother? Residents suggestions are rejected by government	Disagree, the Local Plan provides an opportunity to engage in the shaping of the future growth of the District.
POPD1640	John Hayhoe	23	Revolution	No comment.
POPD1641	Stuart & Hannah Smith	1	Housing Growth proposals for Shenstone Stonnall and Little Aston contradict the proposed local vision. "proud of their communities" "strong sense of local community ... and belonging" Shenstone Little Tonal have these strong characteristics. However the housing growth location and type could put this vision completely at risk. Housing needs are not comprehensively assessed. Lichfield needs are assessed in detail but needs from outside are not assessed. Housing needs from West Midlands housing area taken by Lichfield need to be justified. Currently not justified.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate. The evidence assembled will further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1642	Stuart & Hannah Smith	2	Strategic Priority 1 is flawed because Little Aston and Shenstone have very high scores for housing growth potential due to rail and bus access "serving 5 main centres". Three of the five are Bromsgrove, Longbridge and Redditch. These connections along the length of a cross city line only and no actual verifiable social or economic benefits to Little Aston and Shenstone are identified.	Comments noted. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1643	Stuart & Hannah Smith	3	Pages 101 and 102 table 20.2. Section What the evidence tells us - shows Shenstone has more growth potential negatives than positives. Tonal is shown as having a balance of negative and positive. Little Aston more positive than negative. Land interests in Little Aston and Tonal SHLAA interest shown as non developable. Strong evidence of the inappropriateness of selecting Little Aston Tonal and Shenstone. LDC strategy for housing based on a settlement hierarchy for Tonal Little Aston and Shenstone located in the Green Belt should be revised. priorities should be based on unused existing industrial land, existing urban areas and the two growth settlements. Housing growth should be focused on Brownfield sites that are no longer viable, Existing urban areas with a good range of established services, Two potential strategic growth communities north east of Lichfield and north of Tamworth. The preferred options for housing growth have been published without Brownfield Site assessment or a Green belt review or West Midlands Market Areas authorities not confirming level of housings they will accommodate. These data platform supporting preferred options incomplete.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Green Belt Review which will inform the next stage of the plan process. The SHLAA is a living document and reviewed and updated on an annual basis.
POPD1644	Stuart & Hannah Smith	4	Support that it seeks to protect our natural environment. However the SHLAA for Little Aston and Tonal shows very significant numbers of land owner enquiries adjacent to Stonnall and Little Aston as not developable. This is considered positive for Little Aston and Stonnall residents. Judgements relating to not developable classification should be made clear in any future decisions included if based on sustainable development criteria. The role of the Neighbourhood Plan in identification and upholding sustainable development should be made clear as is not identified. The Little Aston Stonnall and Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan have all been used effectively to date in challenging non sustainable development in recent years.	Comments noted. The SHLAA is a living document which is updated and published on an annual basis and will inform the local plan review process. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1645	Stuart & Hannah Smith	5	Identification of sustainable standards is important. The Local Plan preferred options should identify best potential housing growth option using exiting criteria. Electrification of underused railway line from north east Lichfield Trent Valley station would strengthen the case of strategic housing along A38 corridor which would reduce car movements should be complemented with new park and ride rail station south of Lichfield north of Wall. this would reduce the car movements through south Staffordshire villages as they enter north Birmingham.	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out the preferred settlement hierarchy and growth options. Locations for growth will be considered as the local plan progresses.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1646	Stuart & Hannah Smith	6	Flood risk assessment data was obtained for Shenstone Little Aston and Tonal during their Neighbourhood Plan data placed limits on what can be housing development built without risk. This needs to be contained to be acknowledged in any future housing developments.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a district wide up to date SFRA. The outcomes of the SFRA will inform the next stage of the local plan review process.
POPD1647	Stuart & Hannah Smith	7	Any housing growth will increase pollution. Shenstone and Little Aston await enhancement to rail travel times or quality form new train franchise. New rail station would required for A38 corridor strategic housing growth option north east of Lichfield to reduce the impact of increased vehicle movements coming from that strategic housing proposal.	Comments noted.
POPD1648	Stuart & Hannah Smith	8	The sustainable transport with the greatest potential that provides the greatest opportunity is to electrify the railway line to the north of Lichfield	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1649	Stuart & Hannah Smith	9	Direction is not comprehensive. Proposes a way forward without, identify Lichfield's requirements to grow or not to grow from the West Midlands Housing Market renewal Area, Green Belt review, commits to understanding traveller requirements without understand need (Stonnall has experience of the current vacuum in this area) and any Brownfield analysis being completed.	Comments noted. Chapter 14 of the consultation documents sets out the methodology for the proposed housing scenarios which includes a contribution towards meeting GBHMA shortfall. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review, Urban Capacity Assessment and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1650	Stuart & Hannah Smith	10	All Neighbourhood Plans have considered these issues, The recognition of Neighbourhood Plan in identifying affordable and market needs at the neighbourhood level with agreed housing sizes and bedroom mix ratios housing be acknowledge and referenced as part of the formal assembly of any new preferred policy direction.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1651	Stuart & Hannah Smith	11	neighbourhood Plans in identifying the appropriate density at the neighbourhood plan level should be acknowledged and referenced as part of the formal assembly of the policy direction. Important to Shenstone before the Neighbourhood Plan was made there where planning applications exhibiting new build over intensification.	Comments noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national and local planning policy.
POPD1652	Stuart & Hannah Smith	12	A register would assist those wishing to become self builders.	The Council maintains a self build register in accordance with legislative requirements.
POPD1653	Stuart & Hannah Smith	13	LDC has not met current targets for pitch provision and has not for many years refreshed its needs assessment in this areas. This gap in planning and provision has had direct implications for the Tonal Areas. It is important that the new criteria identified fin the consultation document in respect to of the A5 and A38 corridors for travellers do actually enable a more proactive approach to provisions. The consultation document does not actually identity how the new criteria will do this. Given the history in this area this needs to be significant clarity.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including a Gypsy and traveller needs accommodation assessment which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1654	Stuart & Hannah Smith	14	Welcome economic growth at Lichfield City Burntwood Fradley Park. Policy should be further strengthened by identifying what the council will so to support the older employment areas which have larger industrial uses with location and site viability features that challenge their line term future. Shenstone industrial estate has examples of this. Industrial estate vacancy rate, short term user churn, traffic impact - incentives for those users who wish to relocate to the economic development areas above. LDC could identify the changes of use from industrial to residential development that will be considered.	Duly Noted the Housing and emplyment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidance that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for empoyment development needs. Our Spatial Strateg identifies the preferred location for housing growth.
POPD1655	Stuart & Hannah Smith	15	Tonal, Little Aston and Shenstone are classified in the preferred options report as "Rural Centres" catering for the day to day needs of the village and the wider rural area around. While this may be currently true this does not automatically justify a	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD1656	Georgia Whorton	1	The industrial estate should be relocated releasing future housing land. Wyevale or David Lloyd sites could be used.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level. Site specific suggestions will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review
POPD1657	Brian Hawthorn	1	Primarily this proposal seems to ignore the Local Plan presented some time ago. It will, effectively alter the communities of Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston to the point of destroying them in their present form. Neither the needs of these communities or current housing needs have been properly evaluated.	Comments noted. The comments do not appear to relate to the vision. Site specific proposals affecting Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. The evidence base is being updated / assembled to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1658	Stuart & Hannah Smith	17	This policy talks about the importance of protecting open space for recreation and overall well - being. Shenstone Little Aston and Tonal have several protected green spaces which are actively used . Shenstone has recently had one of theses areas of land come under consideration for housing in the Local Allocations Plan. The proposal was withdrawn . Green field amenity land adding to overall well-being should not be considered for housing.	Noted
POPD1659	Stuart & Hannah Smith	20	Any area of special environmental merit has been identified in the Neighbourhood Plan of Little Aston Stonnal and Shenstone. The strategy should recognised the contribution of Neighbourhood Plans.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD1660	Stuart & Hannah Smith	21	The provision of high quality housing development is being reduced by the introduction of the CIL, in that I the consultation on what the Lichfield CIL strategy is to invest is not open to broad regular consultation about quality priorities. li the CIL introduction has limited the developers resources left for Section 106 contribution to add quality improvements when a specific housing develop is approved.	Noted. Any impact upon viability will be tested through the plan process. Consultation on the CIL process will be in accordance with the Adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
POPD1661	Stuart & Hannah Smith	22	Neighbourhood Plans are mechanism for the protection of a quality environment and should have a stronger role in any future option plan. This should be a stated recommendation.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1662	Stuart & Hannah Smith	23	This question is about Lichfield's protects locate heritage and the answered is the same as as for Q22.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1663	Brian Hawthorn	2	The basis for choice - towns at the end of the cross city line being easily reached by rail bring no economic or social benefits to Shenstone and Little Aston. These are not for communities suitable for extensive growth.	Comments and preferences noted. The Sustainable Settlement Study assessed settlements within the district and Shenstone and Little Aston are both considered as Level 3 - Larger Services Villages as they are considered to be larger rural settlements that have better access to public services
POPD1664	Brian Hawthorn	3	This ignores Green Belt provision - a dangerous strategy as Green Belt should be sacrosanct. If the transport hub was moved from Lynn Lane and re-sited where the depot for building the toll road was sited (i.e. by the island and at the side of the A38. This would free up a whole tranche of brown site land on Lynn Lane. The Neighbourhood Plan citing not developable land should be given credence.	
POPD1665	Georgia Whorton	2	We do need to get cars off the road. Traffic is becoming snarled up and air quality is poor in towns. More houses will only exacerbate this situation.	Comments noted.
POPD1666	Brian Hawthorn	4	Sustainability is crucial and this proposal simply 'swamps' while adding nothing to the local economy or transport points.	Comments noted. The preferred policy approach relating the local economy and transport is set out in Chapter 15 and Chapter 13 respectively.
POPD1667	Brian Hawthorn	5	This is a complex question but the adopted sustainability standard is unacceptable and therefore more rigorous criteria should be adopted.	Comments noted.
POPD1668	Annette Wragg	1	This goes totally against the Local Plan. We need to keep our village status	Comments noted.
POPD1669	Georgia Whorton	3	Agree with comments made by Parish Council and SOS	Comments noted.
POPD1670	Brian Hawthorn	6	Flood risk is increased markedly when more ground is covered by tarmac and slabbing. Shenstone is particularly low lying with areas of wetland. This is a major issue.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be informed by a SFRA
POPD1671	Annette Wragg	2	We have a poor bus service - when it runs. There are too many cars already in the village with overcrowded nearby roads	Noted
POPD1672	Annette Wragg	3	This is a green belt area!	Comments noted
POPD1673	Annette Wragg	4	The preferred policy approach must protect our natural environment. The majority of fields around here are farmed and productive.	Comments noted.
POPD1674	Georgia Whorton	4	Agree with the views expressed by the Parish Council and SOS group, No development of the Millbrook site should be permitted due to the local habitat. It is a flood plane and wildlife corridor.	Comments noted.
POPD1675	Brian Hawthorn	7	Increased use of car transport (car numbers would increase by hundreds if not thousands) will greatly increase air pollution. Train services can help but people increasingly require individual car transport, this can be four or more cars per dwelling.	Comments noted.
POPD1676	Georgia Whorton	5	Support the comments in the consultation questions and responses	Comments noted.
POPD1677	Georgia Whorton	6	Flood risk is vitally important.	Noted.
POPD1678	Annette Wragg	5	Yes	Noted.
POPD1679	Annette Wragg	6	Yes	Comments noted.
POPD1680	Annette Wragg	7	Air quality is of vital importance - extra traffic - more fumes.	Noted.
POPD1681	Annette Wragg	8	Yes.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1682	Brian Hawthorn	8	Rail lines need to be electrified north of Lichfield whilst a reliable service needs to be introduced.	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1683	Annette Wragg	9	No - Brownfield sites should be used.	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing a Urban Capacity Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1684	Annette Wragg	10	Too many 4-5 bedroom houses are being built. First buyer homes and pensioner smaller homes should be considered but lack of public transport hinders.	Comments noted
POPD1685	Georgia Whorton	7	Development should not increase pollution, whether it be housing, industrial or commercial. Enhancement of the railway system will hopefully reduce reliance on car usage and pollution.	Comments noted.
POPD1686	Brian Hawthorn	9	This proposal ignores the all important Green Belt Review and the Neighbourhood Review. It would potentially destroy these existing communities. It ignores the role of brownfield sites in the wider area.	The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review and Urban Capacity Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1687	Annette Wragg	11	As recorded in the Neighbourhood Plans more housing is not needed	Noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1688	Brian Hawthorn	10	It is essential that varied housing needs are met but safeguards must be put in place to avoid the area being swamped with 'investment buying' leading to properties only being available to rent.	Comments noted.
POPD1689	Georgia Whorton	8	Agree	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1690	Brian Hawthorn	11	It is crucial that the Neighbourhood Plans proposals in this area are taken into account. Over intensification will make it impossible to provide a meaningful infrastructure.	Noted. Neighbourhood plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1691	Georgia Whorton	9	This is a wide ranging West Midlands issue with competing councils which makes it difficult to form a reasonable judgement.	Comments noted.
POPD1692	Brian Hawthorn	12	This could lead to a glut of expensive housing and planning permission must monitor this very carefully.	Comments noted.
POPD1693	Brian Hawthorn	13	This is a complex area and one for specialist attention.	Noted
POPD1694	Annette Wragg	12	To build where??	Noted
POPD1695	Annette Wragg	13	No	Noted
POPD1696	Annette Wragg	14	Fradley, the A38 is a nightmare. Lorries, really heavy vehicles also in Shenstone and Lyn Lane are too big and a menace on our lanes	Duly Noted Addressed through the review of the transport evidence base.
POPD1697	Annette Wragg	17	In Tonal fields and lanes frequently used by horse riders, runners and dog walkers, playing field used for football etc. all year round	Noted
POPD1698	Annette Wragg	20	Yes	Noted
POPD1699	Annette Wragg	22	The environment should be protected	Noted.
POPD1700	Brian Hawthorn	14	Fradley Park particularly offers scope for this type of development,	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1701	Brian Hawthorn	15	Any growth by definition, will put strain on the respective centres and growth in the centres is very difficult and character changing.	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD1702	Brian Hawthorn	16	There are many cyclists, walkers and others seeking there types on non-urban activities. The proposals in theses centres as elsewhere in the country are under threat.	Duly Noted
POPD1703	Brian Hawthorn	17	There are many cyclists, walkers and others seeking there types on non-urban activities. The proposals in theses centres as elsewhere in the country are under threat. Mental health also needs to be considered in this area. A recent Green Party report deals with this issue.	Noted
POPD1704	Brian Hawthorn	18	It is important to note the proximity of Birmingham in this area along with the Garrick Theatre and the new library in Lichfield (read Sally Vickers The Librarian).	Noted
POPD1705	B Boffy	1	Have Council considered relocating the Industrial Estate from Lynn Lane to either Wyvale Garden Centre and field behind on triangle of land between M6 Toll road A5 and main roundabout thus taking out commercial traffic and lorries through Shenstone and Stonnall. If absolutely needed, more housing could be built on this site. A larger scheme may enable developer/council to provide more school places, doctors surgery appointments and increase railway station parking.	Comments noted. The vision iprovides a broad overarching statement at district wide level. Site specific suggestions will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.
POPD1706	Brian Hawthorn	19	It is important to note the proximity of Birmingham in this area along with the Garrick Theatre and the new library in Lichfield (read Sally Vickers The Librarian).	Noted
POPD1707	Brian Hawthorn	20	Crucial. Physical helth & wellbeing are fashioned by the enviornment. Swamping an area with housing doesn't help existing or future residents	Noted
POPD1708	B Boffy	2	I acknowledge the primary goal of taking cars off the road but the reality of parking around the station needs to be resolved. Any additional housing would exacerbate the current situation.	Comments noted.
POPD1709	B Boffy	3	This is crucial. It is important to note the proximity of Birmingham in this area along with the Garrick Theatre and the new library in Lichfield (read Sally Vickers The Librarian). Physical and mental health are fashioned in part by environment and 'swamping' an area with housing helps neither existing residents or newcomers.	Comments noted
POPD1710	Brian Hawthorn	21	Unable to comment due to the technical nature of this question. I refer you to the 'Save our Shenstone Green Belt' Document.	Referral noted.
POPD1711	B Boffy	4	I agree with the view expressed by the Parish Council and Save our Shenstone Group. No development of Millbrook should take place as it is vital to protect the natural environment as it is a wildlife corridor and a flood zone.	Comments noted.
POPD1712	B Boffy	5	I support the comments in the consultation question and responses.	Noted.
POPD1713	B Boffy	6	Flood risk is critically important and needs to be fully taken into account when considering where new developments take place. In the opinion of current experts, global warming will increase flooding risks. Bearing in mind that this is a long term plan to 2036 we can only rely o the existing flood maps.	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be informed by a SFRA
POPD1714	B Boffy	7	All development proposals should not increase pollution be it housing, industrial or commercial. If enhancement of the railway system takes place this could reduce reliance on car usage thereby lowering pollution. The wind direction in this area is predominantly south west. Moving the industrial estate (as mentioned) would also have some benefit.	Comments and preferences noted.
POPD1715	B Boffy	8	Agree	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1716	B Boffy	9	Clearly this is such a wide ranging West Midlands issue with competing councils which makes it difficult to form a reasonable judgement.	Noted
POPD1717	duplicate of POPD1718			
POPD1718	Georgia Whorton	10	Agreed. This needs to comply with the neighbourhood plan	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1719	B Boffy	11	Agree	Support noted
POPD1720	B Boffy	12	Agree	Support noted.
POPD1721	B Boffy	13	Agree	Noted
POPD1722	Georgia Whorton	11	Agree	Support noted.
POPD1723	Georgia Whorton	12	Agree	Support noted.
POPD1724	Georgia Whorton	13	Agree	Noted
POPD1725	Georgia Whorton	14	Reference to possible relocation of Shenstone Industrain Estate. It would increase local employment.	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for empoyment development needs. Our Spatial Strateg identifies the preferred location for housing growth.
POPD1726	Brian Hawthorn	22	Much time was spent on the Neighbourhood Plan it would be wrong and immoral to ignore the document.	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1727	Brian Hawthorn	23	This is a broad question with national implications. We have to decide what sort of country we want and protection of Greenbelt is crucial. People need places to live but brown site development improves existing urban areas whilst protecting Green Belt.	Noted. Policies and strategies established through the Local Plan will guide the future growth of the District.
POPD1728	Georgia Whorton	15	Agree	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1729	Georgia Whorton	16	Tourism is important to Lichfield City but of no relevance to Shenstone	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1730	Georgia Whorton	17	Black Brook running through Lammass Land is well utilised by dog walkers, walkers fit in with the policy. This area is beneficial to residents well being and must be cherished and not forsaken to development.	Noted
POPD1731	B Boffy	14	The reference to possible relocation of the Shenstone Industrial Estate in question 1 would maintain or increase local employment	Duly Noted the Housing and emplyment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for empoyment development needs. Our Spatial Strategy identifies the preferred location for housing growth.
POPD1732	B Boffy	15	Agree	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1733	B Boffy	16	Tourism is clearly important to Lichfield and Lichfield City but do not see any relevance to Shenstone itself.	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1734	B Boffy	17	The Brook passing through the rear of Millbrook is well used by walkers/runners which fits in with the policy. In addition to the problem of obesity, anxiety seems to be prevalent in society. Having a beautiful and peaceful area on hand is enormously beneficial to residents well being and must not be forsaken to housing.	Noted
POPD1735	B Boffy	18	We are well served because Shenstone has a tight community who work together on many social aspects.	Noted
POPD1736	Georgia Whorton	18	Shenstone is very fortunate as within this tight knit community and work together on many social aspecits. Many classes, choir, bell ringing etc are available	Noted

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1737	B Boffy	20	I agree that the contribution of the Neighbourhood Plan should be recognised.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment contribute.
POPD1738	B Boffy	21	As a resident, I think any new development in Shenstone should lead to a contribution to community resources in Shenstone itself.	Noted.
POPD1739	B Boffy	22	Neighbourhood Plans need to have a stronger role in future decisions	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment.A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1740	B Boffy	23	It is essential that existing policies for protecting green belt, conservation areas, listed buildings and wild life areas are adhered to.	Noted.
POPD1741	Georgia Whorton	19	No	Noted
POPD1742	Georgia Whorton	20	I agree that the contribution of the Neighbourhood Plan should be recognised.	Neighbourhood Plans provide useful evidence for the Local Plan and designate areas such as Local Green Space which can then be incorporated into the Local Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans do not exist or are out of date the Local Plan enables the opportunity for residents to comment / contribute.
POPD1743	Georgia Whorton	22	Neighbourhood Plans need to have a stronger role in future decisions	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1744	Georgia Whorton	21	As a resident any new development in Shenstone should lead to a contribution to community resources in Shenstone itself.	Noted.
POPD1745	Georgia Whorton	23	It is essential that existing policies for protecting green belt, conservation areas, listed buildings and wild life areas are adhered to.	Noted.
POPD1746	Susan Guy	1	Lichfield's plan should concur with the Local Plan Vision. Housing development on green belt / agricultural land will destroy 'pride in local communities' which LDC says it supports.	Comments noted. The vision provides a broad overarching statement at district wide level under which the strategic policies will be located to address identified issues. Specific proposals and concerns for particular areas will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review. A neighbourhood plan is required to support the delivery of strategic policies set out in a Local Plan.
POPD1747	Susan Guy	2	Little Aston and Shenstone are detailed as 'capable of growth'. Has LDC considered the impact on schools, increase in traffic on narrow roads, lack of footpaths.	Comments noted. Shenstone and Little Aston are identified as level 3 settlements in the settlement hierarchy having regard to their attributes (facilities + services) relative to other settlements within Lichfield District and neighbouring towns and settlements. A wide range of evidence base is being assembled to support the local plan review and to further refine the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1748	Susan Guy	3	Priority must be given to brownfield / industrial unused sites / urban areas for housing development. Have LDC carried out an audit on the above options and sustainable development needs good transport and infrastrucutre.	Noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by a range of evidence including an Urban Capacity Assessment and Transport Modelling which will inform the next stage of the plan process.
POPD1749	Susan Guy	4	The natural environment / open space / wildlife corridors should be protected.	Comments noted.
POPD1750	Susan Guy	6	Flood risk areas means housing development would always be at a greater risk, all the data should be acknowledged.	Comments noted
POPD1751	Susan Guy	7	Noise and air pollution should not be allowed to have a detrimental affect on small communities	Comments noted.
POPD1752	Susan Guy	9	Need to be clear on urban / brownfield sites suitable for development. Traveller sites to be identified to prevent the misuse of green belt and agricultural sites.	Comments noted. The Council will be preparing a comprehensive Green Belt review, Urban Capacity Assessment and a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Accommodation Assessment as part of the Local Plan Review evidence base to inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1753	Susan Guy	10	The policy needs to concur with neighbourhood plans and the consideration proposed at ready	Comments noted. Neighbourhood Plans will need to be in accordance with national and local policy.
POPD1754	Susan Guy	13	Previous lack of provision has already had an impact on Stonnall. Need to be honest and direct about where you proposed to locate traveller sites.	Noted
POPD1755	Susan Guy	15	Each of these areas has a hall or commuity centre for use by locals. Hope these would be maintained.	Duly Noted Preferred strategic policy Sustainable development principles and Preferred policy Direction: Delivering our infrastrucutre addresses these concerns.
POPD1756	Susan Guy	17	Strongly believe schools / hospitals / council centres should not have vending machines and stalls selling fizzy drinks, sweets etc. Schools should start healthy eating patterns and sports at early stage of education. Vital recreation centres are open / green spaces are kept and maintained.	Noted. Some comments are beyond the scope of a Local Plan.
POPD1757	Susan Guy	18	Lichfield City provide for this. Do not believe that extra funding needs to be provided to extend the provision.	Noted
POPD1758	Susan Guy	21	Maintain historic aspects of Lichfield City and maintain its attractive qualities. Housing developments should be of high quality and aesthetically pleasing.	Agreed.
POPD1759	Susan Guy	22	Take notes of the views of local residents in outlying areas. Quality of environment for residents should be the priority.	Noted.
POPD1760	Susan Guy	23	Small communities wish to remain as exactly that - urban over development would be detrimental to local culture and is not sustainable.	Noted.
POPD1761	Lesley Everton	1	Areas good, but growth not needed around Shenstone and surrounding villages	Comments noted. The evidence base is being updated and LDC is working with other authorities in the wider Housing Market Area through the duty to cooperate with regard to meeting housing need.
POPD1762	Lesley Everton	2	Don't agree. Roads cannot cope with more use, Train doesn't always stop and unreliable.	Comments noted. However, no justification / suggestions provided. Evidence base is being assembled to refine settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.
POPD1763	Lesley Everton	3	There is strong evidence of the inappropriateness of selecting Shenstone and Little Aston & Stonnall for growth. Green Belt should not be used when very small areas already in use can be used. there are a lot of areas that are not developable	Comments noted. The Local Plan Review will be supported by an extensive evidence base including a comprehensive Green Belt Review and Urban Capacity Assessment which will inform the next stages of the plan.
POPD1764	Lesley Everton	4	We should be protecting our natural environment	Comments noted. Chapter 17 of the consultation document relates to the natural environment.
POPD1765	Lesley Everton	5	Potential housing growth should be identified in local plan preferred options	Comments noted. The consultation document sets out the preferred settlement hierarchy and growth option.
POPD1766	Lesley Everton	6	The more houses built reduces green areas / trees which can help reduce flood risk. There is evidence that housing development can cause flood risk.	Comments noted.
POPD1767	Lesley Everton	7	Any changes will affect air quality and by reducing Green Belt areas, more pollution will occur. Railway service will not improve so will be increase in vehicles.	Comments noted.
POPD1768	Lesley Everton	8	Maybe open up unused railway line	Duly Noted, The additional evidence base will identify future priorities. The policy makes reference to the District Council working with partners to improve accessibility.
POPD1769	Lesley Everton	9	It is not comprehensive enough	Noted
POPD1770	Lesley Everton	10	This is being met in Lichfield. Does not need to include the villages. Change use of some buildings to accommodate affordable flats.	Comments noted.
POPD1771	Lesley Everton	11	New build needs to be required in rural areas by keeping large areas as green belt / using condensed areas fully / changing use of buildings to accommodate more housing needs.	Comments noted.
POPD1772	Lesley Everton	12	Yes if utilised correctly / overseen properly	Comments noted.
POPD1773	Lesley Everton	14	Agree with development focus on Burntwood, Fradley, Lichfield, industrial areas. Feel Shenstone's should be reduced or revaluated due to the traffic / size of lorries	Duly Noted the Housing and employment development needs assessment (HEDNA) is currently a piece of evidence that is being reviewed and will enable the District Council to understand and plan for employment development needs. Our Spatial Strateg identifies the preferred location for housing growth.
POPD1774	Lesley Everton	15	Future growth should not include rural areas / villages as this is what they are meant to be.	Duly Noted Comment refers to Our Spatial Strategy in terms of housing growth and is not relevant to Preferred policy: Our Centres
POPD1775	Lesley Everton	16	Should encourage more visitors to see Lichfield heritage. Cheaper parking and better bus station	Duly Noted No Further Action
POPD1776	Lesley Everton	17	Green Belt and Green Field areas should remain. Areas in Shenstone are well used.	Noted
POPD1777	Lesley Everton	18	No comment as good provision	Noted
POPD1778	Lesley Everton	21	Lovely area which should be kept.	Noted.

Representation Reference	Consultee/Agent	Question	Comment Summary	Officer response
POPD1779	Lesley Everton	22	We need to ensure we protect the quality of our environment long term. Neighbour plans should play important role in this	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment.A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.
POPD1780	Lesley Everton	23	We need to ensure we protect the quality of our environment long term. Neighbour plans should play important role in this	Not all areas have a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be kept up to date as are Local Plans and will continue to provide local opportunities for protection of the environment. A neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan.