

APPENDIX G

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA1	Mr Peter Roberts	12.5		No	No			Suggests Land to the rear of 18 Mill End Lane, Alrewas as suitable for housing development for five houses, including the two for which permission has already been given. States the site is deliverable, developable and sustainable.
LPA2	Mrs Elaine Willett	1.4		No	No			Disagrees with building on the Green Belt. Suggests bringing forward more brownfield sites for housing development.
LPA3	Mrs Emma Matthews	1.3		Yes	No			Infill development of Burntwood's Green Belt between the Burntwood town and St Matthews estates would have negative impact on existing social and community infrastructures, including schools and doctors and the local road network
LPA4	Mr Andrew Smith	1			No			Feels that there is a urgent need for the reopening of the Burntwood to Derby railway line. Concerned about the increase traffic on notorious A38. With many traffic accident spots on this busy stretch of road at Alrewas, Barton, Branston interchange.
LPA5	Mr & Mrs Brian & Pam Stretton	9						Disagrees with building on the Green Belt. Suggests building on disused industrial sites. States that housing growth will put too much pressure on existing infrastrucure.
LPA6	Mr Robert Fenton	12.17			No			Disagrees with releasing Green Belt land in the villages. States that villages are over-allocated and growth should be met at SDAs in Lichfield.
LPA7	Mr Robert Fenton	12.19			No			In the event that the Planning Inspector deems it appropriate to recommend a Green Belt release at the village of Whittington, we consider that there are less environmentally impacting options available than 'land west of common lane' as set out in draft Policy W1(4)
LPA8	Theatres Trust - Mr Ross Anthony	8.9		Yes	Yes			Site L26 (Lichfield 26): Friarsgate, Birmingham Road. It is important that any redevelopment does not impact on the operation of the theatre, particularly in terms of noise and heavy vehicle access to the rear loading dock to get in. We therefore request that an additional point is added to the Key Development Considerations, along the lines of: Design should take in to account the operational needs of the Garrick Theatre, including maintaining heavy vehicle access. This reflects advice in para 70 and 123 of the NPPF relating to the safeguarding of existing cultural facilities
LPA9	Mr Peter Orgill	12.19						If Site W4 land allocation does go ahead then the following should happen: 1) the gradient of the field should be significantly reduced so that the houses are not visible from Common Lane approach and the existing houses on Church Street are not overlooked. 2) Alternative parking for the school needs to be provided. 3) The plot of land on Back Lane that was originally being considered for allocation but has now dropped off the list seems to better meet the needs ie flat land , not on a main entry road to the village, has a natural boundary, would not add to the Common Lane traffic problems, would allow more houses to be built. .

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA10	Mr & Mrs Richard & Brenda Stewart-Jones	12.17		Yes	No			The development is not appropriate to the village at all. However, accepting that the local authority has to comply with directives from central government in respect of additional housing, and that the village must bear some of the burden, the scale of development needs to be substantially reduced. Credible proposals to improve health, education and traffic infrastructure to cater for the increase in population must be put forward. The impact of HS2 (which will result in long term closure of some roads in and out of the village) and the relocation of the Golf Club cannot simply be ignored. The impact on green belt and the conservation area is not in accordance with the NPPF and should at least be reduced.
LPA11	Whittington Neighbourhood Group - Mr. Gareth Hyde	Lichfield District Local Plan Allocations		Yes				Too much emphasis on Green Belt allocation over brownfield site development in some areas. There are better Green Belt areas in Whittington which could have been used in the allocations document
LPA12	Whittington Neighbourhood Group - Mr. Gareth Hyde	12.17		Yes				Failed to consider better alternative sites within the Green Belt which would not cause such traffic problems as the Huddlesford Lane site. Traffic cannot access Huddlesford Lane without a demolition of property, new access and a complete revision of Back Lane. Traffic parking is already a problem on this bus route and this would not alleviate it as the proposed new junction would remove the ability for car parking and add pressure on an already congested road system. The land in Huddlesford Lane is not contiguous with the Village, and other sites ignored are more infill sites and would not increase the envelope of the village. The second site in Common Lane next to the school has not been considered and this would be infill between the school and a bungalow. The increase in traffic would be less and there would be scope for assistance with parking at school times. Land off Back Lane by Baxters Farm would yield sufficient numbers with Common Lane to fulfil the LDC allocations without the need for all the access problems off Huddlesford Lane.
LPA13	Mrs Susan Fletcher	9						Very concerned about the proposed development on land South of Highfields Road and land East of Coulter Lane. Disagrees with building on the Green Belt. Feels that there should be more development on brownfield sites before Green Belt land is allocated.
LPA14	David Gibson	9						Objects to development on land South of Highfields Road. Concerned about the impact it will have on the sewage system and flood risk.
LPA15	Janet Beeston	9						Objects to development on land South of Highfields Road. Concerned about the impact the development will have on traffic levels, air quality and local infrastructure. Notes that there is a stream which flows through the proposed site, which if developed, may heighten the risk of flooding.
LPA16	Dilys Stokes	9						Objects to building on the Green Belt. Concerned about the impact on local infrastructure
LPA17	Sharon Beardsmore	9						Objects to development on land South of Highfields Road. Concerned about the impact on traffic, flooding, loss of farmland and green space and the impact on local infrastructure. Is concerned that the loss of Green Belt will result in the merging of Burntwood and Brownhills

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA18	David Rathband	9						Strongly objects to development at East of Coulter Lane and South of Highfields Road. Does not agree with building on the Green Belt. Concerned about the pressure the development will put on roads, local schools, the emergency services and local GP surgeries. Suggests bringing forward brownfield sites instead.
LPA19	Pauline Rathband	9						Strongly objects to development at East of Coulter Lane and South of Highfields Road. Does not agree with building on the Green Belt. Concerned about the pressure the development will put on roads, local schools, the emergency services and local GP surgeries. Suggests bringing forward brownfield sites instead.
LPA20	Helen Fuller	9						Strongly objects to development on the Green Belt, particularly at Coulter Lane. Is concerned about the loss of greenspace to wildlife and local residents for recreational use. States that the roads in this area are inadequate and would not be able to cope with the increase in traffic. Suggests that brownfield sites are developed first.
LPA21	Miss Hannah Shepherd	9						Objects to the proposed development at Land South of Highfields Road. Does not agree with building on the Green Belt as it acts as a buffer between Burntwood, the M6 Toll and Brownhills. Concerned about the loss of countryside views and the impact on local infrastructure.
LPA22	Mrs Mandy Burbey	9						Very concerned about the development on Green Belt land at Coulter Lane. The lane is not wide enough to cope with the extra traffic and there could be accidents
LPA23	Victoria Whitehouse	9						Does not agree with building on Green Belt land. Concerned about the impact that construction and development will have on her health. Is worried about the extra traffic and the lack of local infrastructure in the area.
LPA24	Gill Perkins	9						Objects to building on Green Belt land and suggests developing brownfield sites instead.
LPA25	Mr Steve Cowley	9						Objects to removing land from the Green Belt. Suggests developing brownfield sites, particularly the Blue Hoardings site. Is concerned about the loss of green space and impact on local infrastructure.
LPA27	Mr Ian Yapp	Lichfield District Local Plan Allocations		No	No			Shenstone Parish Council were not consulted. The Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan states that sites 2 and 3 are not suitable for housing. Suggests that site 1 - Lynne Lane could accommodate further housing.
LPA28	Canal & River Trust - Mr Ian Dickinson	12.5						Delete Site A5 : land east of A513/south of Bagnall Lock from the list of sites to be allocated within the document. Bridge 49 is owned and maintained by the Canal & River Trust; the road over it is not public highway. The bridge has a narrow deck with insufficient width for two vehicles to pass; forward visibility when approaching the bridge from either direction is also limited, and there is only limited space available for vehicles to pull over on the bridge approaches to allow vehicles already crossing the bridge to pass.
LPA29	Mr R Gardner	12.16						Objects to building on Green Belt land adjacent to Lynn Lane. Concerned about the extra traffic this would cause. Is also concerned about the risk of flooding.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA30	Victoria Whitehouse	9						Lists 8 actions to save the planet from World Earth Day's website. States that building on Burntwood's Green Belt is in direct contravention of these points.
LPA31	Mrs Ruth Marion Cooper	9						Concerned about the proposed development at Coulter Lane and Highfields Road. Is very worried about Abnalls Lane becoming a rat run and the dangers of increased traffic in Hammerwich village
LPA32	Ray & Eleanor Lloyd	12.17						Concerned about the proposed development at Land west of Common Lane, particularly the impact it will have on loss of light to their property, drainage and increased traffic.
LPA33	Terence Lee	12.16						Objects to the proposed developments off Millbrook Drive and land adjacent to Shenstone Pumping Station, Lynn Lane. Is concerned about the impact the developments would have on the pleasant country views, wildlife habitats, flooding and increased traffic.
LPA34	Carol Eyles	12.16						Concerned about the impact development at Millbrook Drive and Lynn Lane will have on flooding.
LPA35	Cannock Chase AONB Unit - Mrs Ruth Hytch. Agent - Clive Keble	6		Yes	Yes			The AONB Partnership supports the inclusion of Policy NR10. No modifications are needed to the wording of the policy NR10 but in the explanatory text (6.6) line 3, reference is made to: " long term management of the site and the accessibility of the site. " The AONB is not, strictly speaking, a site and it would be better referred to as the "Designated area" e.g., " long term management of the designated area and the accessibility of the AONB "
LPA36	Phil Jones	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S3 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S3 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S3 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S3 was not suitable for new house building.
LPA37	Mrs Lorraine Allport	9						Objects to building on Green Belt land at Highfields Road, Burntwood. Concerned about noise levels from the M6 Toll and the increased traffic in the local area
LPA38	Mr Philip Walker	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA39	Mr Philip Walker	12.16		No	No			The Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Appraisal concluded that the adverse environmental impact, loss of agricultural land, adverse ecological impact and adverse landscape impact all pointed to the exclusion of S2 as a site for new house building. The NP Appraisal in 2015 as has been stated earlier rigorously followed the National and Local Planning guidelines and was approved by external examination and by LDC following. The removal of S2 would allow further investigation of the potential of the Shenstone Business Park sites opposite.
LPA40	deleted rep							
LPA41	Mr John Callaghan	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA42	Mr John Callaghan	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA43	Mrs Virginia Callaghan	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA45	Peter Gravestock	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA46	Peter Gravestock	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA47	Matthew Ellis	12.14		No	No			The council's objective assessment of site S3 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S3 was not suitable for new house building

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA48	Matthew Ellis	12.14		No	No			The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA49	Samuel Finnikin	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA50	Samuel Finnikin	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 51	Stuart Woodley	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 52	Stuart Woodley	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 53	Alison Woodley	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 54	Alison Woodley	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA55	Mike Fletcher	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA56	Mike Fletcher	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA57	Cllr Paul Ray	8						We do not have any specific objections to any of the allocated sites in Lichfield except the former Norgren site, Eastern Avenue. Concerns about lack of affordable housing and impact on viability of Friarsgate
LPA58	Mrs Bronwen Ross	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 59	Mrs Bronwen Ross	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 60	Mr Robert Grundy	9						Objects to building on Green Belt land at Highfield Road due to increased pressure on infrastructure.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 61	Miss Faye Grundy	9						Objects to building on Green Belt land at Highfield Road due to increased pressure on infrastructure.
LPA 62	Mr John Davis	12.14						The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 63	Mr John Davis	12.14						Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 64	Margaret Young	12.14						The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 65	Margaret Young	12.14						Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 66	Roy Young	12.14						The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 67	Roy Young	12.14						Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 68	Barbara Boffy	12.14						The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 69	Barbara Boffy	12.14						Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 70	Peter Boffy	12.14						The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 71	Peter Boffy	12.14						Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA72	Sharon Jones	12.14						Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA73	Jean Burton (Alrewas Parish Council)	12.15		No	No			The proposal will exceed the capacity of the infrastructure of the existing community. The facilities of the village will not cope. Therefore it is not sustainable.
LPA 74	Emily Roberts	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 75	Emily Roberts	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 76	Lynn Hill	9						Objects to building on Green Belt land in Burntwood and Hammerwich due to increased pressure on local infrastructure. Suggests that the land alongside Highfields Road could be used as a 9 hole golf course, an extension to the country park with a children's farm, solar panel farm or arable farm.
LPA 77	Anthony Marks	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 78	Anthony Marks	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 79	Diane Marks	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 80	Diane Marks	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 81	Rachael Capper	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 82	Rachael Capper	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 83	Russell Capper	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan that a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 84	Russell Capper	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 85	Cathy Cutting	12.14		No	No			The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan that a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 86	Cathy Cutting	12.14		No	No			Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 87	Kate Brinkworth	12.16						Object to development on land adjacent to the Lammas Land in Shenstone. Adjacent land is a key asset to the village used for running and walking. To build along it would change the nature of this tranquil spot. There is precious little space like thius as it is, urge you to proteect it for future generations.
LPA 88	Ken Oginsky	12.14		No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan that a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 89	Ken Oginsky	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 90	Patricia Oginsky	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan that a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 91	Patricia Oginsky	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 92	Robert Share	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan that a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 93	Robert Share	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 94	Clare Eggington (Cannock Chase DC)	2.2	Yes			No	Yes	The Council supports the approach to safeguarding the route of the Lichfield Canal as set out in Policy IP2 and the statement in paragraph 2.2. which references the need for further work in terms of avoiding any impacts upon the Cannock Extension Canal SAC. This is considered to be consistent with the approaches taken by other Local Authorities affected by the route.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 95	Clare Eggington (Cannock Chase DC)	12.13	Yes				Yes	Policy GT1 is supported. Lichfield District Council has written to Cannock Chase Council asking for assistance in meeting its need. Cannock Chase Council replied on 4 th April 2017 advising that it was currently trying to address its own needs which are significant for such a small and tightly constrained district (41 Gypsy and Traveller plots, 5 transit plots and 4 Travelling Showpeople plots) furthermore Cannock Chase District is already reliant upon Lichfield to deliver some of its housing need. Notwithstanding this, Cannock Chase Council has only recently finished consulting on its Issues and Options document (Local Plan Part 2: Allocations Plan) and therefore may need to provide an update once the representations have been analysed. This work has not been completed at the time of providing this representation but could be provided in due course.
LPA 96	Clare Eggington (Cannock Chase DC)	1.10	Yes				Yes	Cannock Chase Council continues to engage constructively with Lichfield District Council on a range of cross boundary matters under the Duty to Co-operate. Cannock Chase Council supports the approach undertaken by the Allocations Plan including the commitment in paragraph 1.10 and 4.7 to a full review of the plan to address the housing shortfall in the GBHMA.
LPA 97	Clare Eggington (Cannock Chase DC)	11.1	Yes				Yes	Cannock Chase welcomes and supports the ongoing commitment of Lichfield District Council to deliver 500 homes to meet the needs of Rugeley. Cannock Chase Council supports Chapter 11 and Policy R1. It is noted that LDC employment site reference '9' (LDC Employment Land Capacity Assessment 2016 site ref), is not proposed to be taken forward for allocation for employment uses at this time. This approach is understood and supported in the wider context of the ongoing work on the adjacent power station site. However, it should be noted that LDC employment site reference '9' is part of a cross boundary site with CCDC (CCDC site ref RE3) which had outline planning consent for employment uses (CH/03/0378 granted Sept 2005). Given that a shortfall in employment land is flagged in CCDC's Issues and Options document it is requested that LDC retains a flexible approach to employment site ref '9' and that the two authorities continue to work together to secure an appropriate use, which may ultimately mean that CCDC allocates its part of that site
LPA 98	Alex Yendole - Stafford Borough Council	1.10						There are no proposals that will adversely affect Stafford Borough. The Council notes the future requirement to meet the needs of the Birmingham HMA arising from Tamworth Borough's shortfall and agrees that this issue should be considered through the wider HMA context through a review of the Local Plan. The Council would appreciate continued dialogue on the issue through the DtC process.
LPA 99	Clare Eggington (Cannock Chase DC)	1.1	Yes				Yes	Cannock Chase Council appreciates that the 2016 supplementary Green Belt Review is a partial review specifically undertaken to inform the allocations process which focuses upon edge of settlement options in line with the Local Plan Strategy. However it is important that a full review is undertaken to inform the review of the Local Plan and Cannock Chase Council welcomes the commitment to this as set out in paras 1.10 and 4.7 (ie that the review will be informed by a comprehensive review of the evidence base). Further detail is provided in paragraph 1.1 of the Supplementary Green Belt Review 2016 which explains its targeted role and

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								states: 'the report should be considered a technical supplement to existing evidence rather than a comprehensive Green Belt review. Any such comprehensive review will be undertaken as part of the evidence supporting any plan review.' This approach is supported.
LPA 100	Dr Peter Hedges	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 101	Dr Peter Hedges	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 102	Mrs Elisabeth Larner	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 103	Mrs Elisabeth Larner	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 104	Dr Trevor Davies	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 105	Charlotte Whitworth	9.9						Objects to plans to build 480 houses on the green belt by Coulter Lane. The green belt is continuously shrinking and the day will come when there are no gaps between cities. Written a poem to express the terrors of what might come.
LPA 106	Dr Trevor Davies	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 107	Pauline Davies	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 108	Pauline Davies	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 109	Margaret Jones (Wigginton & Hopwas Parish Council)	10.1						With reference to the section on North of Tamworth in the Allocations Document, Wigginton and Hopwas Parish Council reiterates its opposition to the building of 1000 homes at Arkall Farm until the appropriate infrastructure has been put in place. The Council does not believe that the current road network, even with the minor improvements recently put in place, can support this amount of building, which was recently approved by the Planning Committee in spite of considerable local opposition. This location is therefore not sustainable without the provision of a relief road.
LPA 110	deleted rep							
LPA 111	Adrian Oliver	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as they have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 112	Kathryn Young (Turley) on behalf of Antony Rowan (David Wilson)	10.1	No	Yes	No	Allocate further sites to the shortfall arising from the wider HMA. Promotes land to the south west of Limburg Avenue, Lichfield as a sustainable location for the future growth of the City. The land is controlled by a house builder and subject to the site being removed from the Green Belt it could begin to deliver housing immediately.	Yes	<p>The Local Plan Allocations Document does not comply with DtC. Further evidence is required to demonstrate that Lichfield District Council has co-operated meaningfully with its neighbours, particularly Tamworth, Birmingham and North Warwickshire and as a result more sites are likely to be required to be allocated. The Inspectors report to the Tamworth Local Plan confirms Tamworth's residual shortfall will be shared between Lichfield and North Warwickshire. Para 181 of NPPF requires LPA to demonstrate evidence of effectively cooperating to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts and until there is clear evidence of this and that LDC honours the commitment to accommodate some of Tamworth's residual shortfall then the plan does not meet the DtC.</p> <p>The Local Plan document is not positively prepared. Local Plans need to meet the full objectively assessed housing need including unmet housing requirements from neighbouring authorities. Birmingham's shortfall is to be distributed between 12 HMA authorities including Lichfield. The Local Plan Allocations is inconsistent with the Local Plan Strategy as it does not meet identified objectively assessed housing needs and is not positively prepared. Careful consideration needs to be given to the wider context and distribution of housing across the HMA to ensure the Allocations document is positively prepared.</p> <p>The Local Plan document is not considered effective as there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Council has explored all available options to work on cross-boundary strategic priorities.</p> <p>The Local Plan document is not considered to be consistent with NPPF as there are available sites which can deliver residential development within the administrative boundary of LDC that should be allocated to deliver housing that is required within LDC boundary and to meet the needs of Tamworth and the wider area.</p>
LPA113	Philip. G. Sharpe (Inland Waterways Association)	2.2	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<p>The final sentence of para. 2.2: "Since the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy further work has been undertaken by the Lichfield and Hatherton Canal Restoration Trust (LHCRT) which has identified an alternative route which seeks to avoid impact upon the Special Area of Conservation however this will need further studies to establish." is misleading and should be modified. It was the Hatherton Canal that was re-routed to avoid impacting the Cannock Extension Canal SAC, which is not relevant to this policy. The Lichfield Canal route has never had any connection with or possible effect on the SAC. The further work undertaken relates to the water supply study. The Duty to Co-operate with adjacent councils should have clarified the distinction between the two separate canals being restored by</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								LHCRT, the Hatherton Canal in Cannock, South Staffordshire and Walsall districts, and the Lichfield Canal which is entirely within Lichfield District.
LPA 114	Philip. G. Sharpe (Inland Waterways Association)	Local Plan Allocations Consultation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The Handsacre Link section of the HS2 Route is incorrectly shown on the Policies Map key plan as crossing the Trent & Mersey Canal in 2 places around Woodend. This earlier route proposal was changed by Additional Provision 2 in 2015 at the request of the Inland Waterways Association and the Canal & River Trust to avoid these canal crossings. Correct the alignment of the HS2 route on the Policies Map to that in AP2 and the final authorised route.
LPA 115	Philip. G. Sharpe (Inland Waterways Association)	Local Plan Allocations Consultation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The policy should include reference to essential infrastructure provision. Although the details are covered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the 3 South Lichfield SDAs this does not carry the same weight as a policy, and also does not cover the remainder of the route where other developments may conceivably be proposed within the lifetime of the Plan. The provision of essential new infrastructure, e.g. access bridges over the canal route, should be referenced in the policy to make it clear to developers that the canal route safeguarding needs not only passive provision but may require physical infrastructure. After the first sentence of Policy IP2: Lichfield Canal add: “Development on or adjacent to the route should provide any infrastructure necessary to maintain the integrity of the route.”

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 116	Adrian Oliver	12.14 - 12.16	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 117	Terence Lee	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 118	Maggie Taylor (Sport England)	Local Plan Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	L27 should not constrain the use of Lichfield City Football Club site by introducing noise sensitive residential properties. B3 - Confirm the requirement for playing field replacement. NT1 - Will generate a need for additional sports facilities and cross boundary co-operation. The location may mean raising planning contributions in Lichfield but spending them in Tamworth. R1 - The plan fails to recognise the existence of a community sports facility on site
LPA 119	Mandy Bates	12.14						Objects to the proposed housing development on Court Drive, Shenstone. The land should remain green belt. There is unused brown belt land available so this directly contravenes the Shenstone/ LDC NP. Giving this permission would make a village into a town.
LPA 120	Terence & Ruth Cox	Burntwood						Objects to removal of land surrounding Burntwood from the Green Belt ie Site B14 and Site B14. Burntwood has been allowed to spawl across green land for several decades now time to protect Green Belt and use infill sites. The infrastructure is inadequate and roads in poor conditions and will not be able to cope with increased numbers. Burntwood does not have capacity to support additional people.
LPA 121	Terence Lee	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as they have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 122	Robert Tompkin	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 123	Robert Tompkin	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 124	David Pyner (Highways England)	Local Plan Allocations						Has suggested the following amendments: Site L9: Land off Burton Road (East) Add reference to the need to consider interaction with slip roads when dealing with access arrangements within the ‘Key development considerations’ section. Suggested wording: ‘Suitable access to be provided...that considers the interaction with the A38 slip roads and the transition from dual-carriageway to urban environment.’ Site FZ1: Land west of Sir Robert Peel Hospital, Lichfield Street - Add reference to the need to consider the interaction with the A5 boundary with regards to noise and drainage within the ‘Key development considerations’ section. Suggested wording: ‘Boundary treatment along the A5 should be considered in consultation with Highways England, to determine matters such as drainage, noise and fencing’ R1: Former Rugeley Power Station - Add reference to the need to encourage the use of existing and improved sustainable transport options, particularly for commuting trips into Stafford, Lichfield, Birmingham, which otherwise could place unnecessary pressure on the strategic road network. This should be added to both the allocation summary and the Concept Statement. Suggested wording: ‘Rugeley benefits from its location on both the West Coast Main Line and Chase Line. Steps should be taken to encourage journeys to be made by rail, for example by providing bus links, and walking and cycling routes to the existing stations.’ EMP1: Land South of Fradley Park - Add reference to the need to consider the interaction with the adjacent A38 Hilliard’s Cross junction and the A38 boundary in regards to noise and drainage within the ‘Key development considerations’ section. Suggested wording: ‘Appropriate access to the site should be provided...that considers the interaction with the adjacent A38 Hilliard’s Cross junction and does not prevent future improvements being made to the junction (see Policy ST5)’ ‘Boundary treatment along the A38 should be considered in consultation with Highways England, to determine matters such as drainage, noise and fencing’

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 125	Phil Cotterill	12.17						Objects to building at least 110 houses in Whittington due to increased pressure on local infrastructure. A minimum of another 220 people and cars will have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of the existing villagers, not just more vehicles, longer waiting times at the doctors and over crowding at the school but poorer air quality and loss of green space. The village maybe able to absorb the small developments provided they are built over a period of time and adequate off road parking is made. This should be 3 spaces minimum per property. The proposal for 60 homes on greenbelt should not be considered as it is prime agricultural land and will destroy wildlife habitats, some of which are endangered. It is not clear if this development would mean the loss of the allotments and play area. The village will also have to cope with disruption from constructing HS2. Empty properties in Lichfield should be brought back into use before new homes are built.
LPA 126	Cynthia Lee	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 127	Cynthia Lee	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 128	Lee Davies	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 129	Dave Blakemore	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 130	Christopher Timothy (CT Planning) on behalf of Mr P Smith	12.8	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Policy Arm4 of the Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy 2015 identifies a requirement for some 120- 220 homes within Armitage with Handsacre. Subsequent appeal decisions have indicated that these figures are minimal. Policy AH1 of the Local Plan Allocations document only provides for one site within Armitage with Handsacre and that site does not achieve the minimum housing requirement identified in the strategy (Policy Arm4). It is proposed that the land at Church Farm, Church Lane, Armitage be allocated for housing development. The site comprises of some 0.9 hectares. The site is capable of accommodating up to 25 dwellings and could provide variety in terms of their type, design, size and tenure. The land at Church Farm, Church Lane, Armitage has been promoted throughout the Local Plan process and is included within SHLAA 2016 as suitable, available, achievable and deliverable for development. (Site Ref: 379).
LPA 131	Dave Blakemore	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 132	Graham Slight (Alrewas Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group)	Lichfield District Local Plan Allocations (Policies Maps, Inset 4)			No	Yes	Yes	No requirement for the village settlement boundary for Alrewas shown in Inset 4 to be as large as has been proposed. The housing allocation for Alrewas has been exceeded. The village settlement boundary should exclude the Conservation Area which is bounded by Dark Lane and Essington Farm to the west as it will be the only remaining green space accessible from the village. Village settlement boundary should follow the lines of River Trent and garden boundaries of houses in Cotton Close

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 133	Will Brearley (CT Planning) on behalf of Mr R. Cork	8.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Endorses the allocation of Site L9. There are no known technical or environmental constraints which would preclude the site from going forward and the proposed housing allocation for some 20 dwellings is supported. The development of the site will make good use of under-used land which is too small for commercial agricultural purposes and does not serve an important visual or recreational role as open space. There are also no ecological constraints that would prohibit the development of the site. The site can be safely accessed along the Burton Road frontage without undue harm to highway safety or the free flow of traffic. A Noise Survey has been undertaken and demonstrates that the A38 does not create an unsuitable environment for new homes, subject to design and layout. The site is evidently located within a sustainable location with there being easy access to a wide range of community and social facilities; where there is a need to travel, there is an option of doing so by public transport.
LPA 134	Kevin Hession	9				Yes		Objects to development on the Green Belt at Highfields Road. Wants LDC to safeguard Burntwood from being absorbed into the West Midlands conurbation. Suggests that inappropriate industrial sites in residential areas should be re-developed for housing eg. Mount Road and Queens Drive. Also suggests reclaiming vacant retail properties and converting to housing. If this is not possible, LDC should look to alternative green belt sites eg. Land West of Stables Way and bounded by Old Ironstone Road and Severns Road Chase Terrace. b) Land South of the M6 Toll and north of the A5, bounded by the A5, B5195 Ogle Hay Road and B5195 Burntwood Bypass. c) The large site bounded by Rugeley Road, Nether Lane, Coulter Lane and Church Road Burntwood.
LPA 135	Rachel Whittaker	Site B14 (Burntwood)						Objects to the proposed development off Highfields Road, Chasetown due to poor infrastructure locally. The local primary school is at capacity, the health centre is overstretched and the high street is particularly busy with traffic.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 136	Rosemary Lawrence	12.14-12.16						Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. Confused as to why in so short a period after the completion of the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan, LDC is questioning the exclusion of sites S2 and S3 within the plan and proposing that the sites are suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 137	Susan Simcox	Site B14 (Burntwood)						Objects to the proposed development on Greenbelt off Highfields Road. Want to keep what little greenery and nature we have. Must be other wasteland sites to build on.
LPA 138	Mrs S Afzal	9 Burntwood						Strongly protests the plans of LDC to build on the Green Belt. All part and parcel of their general attitude to village areas. First the bus service and now this. Lives not far from the proposed area.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 139	Janet Hodson (JVH Planning) on behalf of Aucott Group	4.6	No		No	Yes	Yes	There should be a review of the 2015 Strategy to take into account the further development that will be required to meet Birmingham's housing shortfall. The LPA makes no allowance for "safeguarded land" to be taken out of the green belt to meet future needs or make provision for reserve sites. Does not believe the Plan provides for a robust 5 year land supply. Suggests increasing the flexibility allowance to 20% and allocating more smaller sites which can be developed more speedily. Suggests Fazeley land allocations should incorporate Bonehill Mill, which would require the green belt boundary to be moved up to the canal in the north.
LPA 140	Rachel Stych	Site B14 (Burntwood)						Objects to development off Highfields Road between existing houses and toll road. There are not enough green areas or natural wildlife corridors as it is.
LPA 141	Sophie Baggot	12.14-12.16 Site S3	No	No	No	Replace, revise or amend LDC Local Plan SA conclusions for site S3 with the Shenstone NP Sustainability Appraisal. Removal of S3 would allow further investigation of the potential of Shenstone Business Park	No	<p>LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself on page 24 of ensuring that evidence collected to support the SA is locally derived (b) it has not identified or considered in the SA that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of site S3 and ruled it out for new house building (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The LDC objective assessment of site S3 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S3 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S3 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S3 was not suitable for new house building.</p> <p>Consider other alternative strategy of releasing more land for housing adjacent to the existing Neighbourhood Plan approved 2.1 ha land at Shenstone Business Park (Site S1). SHLAA shows the whole of the Business Park as "developable" and this could have been explored further in the LPA document.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan process resulted in Site S3 being rejected for the building of new homes and LDC approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>
LPA 142	Stimson	9						Objects to any building on Green Belt land at Burntwood due to infrastructure being unable to support LDC's proposals.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 143	Sophie Baggot	12.14-12.16 Site S2	No	No	No	Yes		LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself on page 24 of ensuring that evidence collected to support the SA is locally derived (b) it has not identified or considered in the SA that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of site S2 and ruled it out for new house building (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. LDC have not met their procedural requirement under the cooperation obligations required in the Localism Act in that they have not (i) as the submitting authority demonstrated effective cooperation with the Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (ii) started amendment discussions early and carried on (iii) arrived at decisions that reflect contrary evidence (iv) worked in partnership with the accountable body for a Neighbourhood Plan. The four reasons listed are identified in the LGA Localism Act Duty to Cooperate good practice guidance Dec 2014. The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S3 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S3 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S3 was not suitable for new house building. Consider other alternative strategy of releasing more land for housing adjacent to the existing Neighbourhood Plan approved 2.1 ha land at Shenstone Business Park (Site S1). SHLAA shows the whole of the Business Park as “developable” and this could have been explored further in the LPA document. The Neighbourhood Plan process resulted in Site S2 being rejected for the building of new homes and LDC approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 144	Melanie Lindsley (The Coal Authority)	Local Plan Allocations Document	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The Coal Authority notes that there is a concentrated area of coal mining legacy on the southern edge of the District, predominantly on the edge of Burntwood. Having considered the allocations proposed it does not appear that any of the sites identified fall within the defined Development High Risk Area. Should any allocations/ developments be proposed in this area consideration should be given to the risks posed by past coal mining activity.
LPA 145	Jean Simpson	Local Plan Allocations Document	No	No	No	Yes	No	The new boundary for Alrewas does not take into account the preferences of the inhabitants, the parish council or district Cllrs. States the area for development north of Alrewas should be 50% of that shown and the area to east of Alrewas should be included for development. Concerned additional housing could cause flood risks.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 146	Paul Glover	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations						Urge council members to reject the revised plan to restore good faith with the villagers of Shenstone. LDC has ignored the democratic process, the Shenstone NP and the Localism Act in stating that the original Local Plan Allocation is insufficient
LPA 147	James Hollyman (Harris Lamb) on behalf of Davy Developments Ltd	S1	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Welcomes the Council's aim to provide allocations to meet the upper limit of the housing range for Shenstone.</p> <p>Concerns about the deliverability of proposed allocation S1 - Land at Lynn Lane. Policy EMP2 seeks to protect existing industrial uses within the district and Para 22 of NPPF requires there to be 'no reasonable prospect' of land remaining in employment use before it is considered for alternative uses. Concerns relating to flood risk, noise, density of design and access in relation to the allocation Site S1.</p> <p>Promotes land off Court Drive as a more suitable and deliverable site for a range of house types, in particular retirement homes and affordable homes to satisfy local needs. Policy S1 should not allocated Site S1 for development as it is inappropriate and has not been justified. Land off Court Drive is a more suitable site</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 148	Andrew Tyzzer	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 149	Lisa Farrington	9						Objects to developing the Green Belt in Burntwood due to concerns about merging urban areas and the loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats. Is also concerned about the increase in traffic and pressure on local schools and doctors surgeries

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 150	Joanne Tyzzer	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concerns relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 151	James Gibson	Local Plan Allocations Document	No	No	No		No	It doesn't seem plausible that Local Plan Allocations document which includes the contentious Arkall Farm scheme complies with Duty to Co-Operate. The Local Plan Allocations document is silent over the consent for 750 homes granted by Curborough Craft Centre. The NPPF protects Green Belt and ignoring the consent undermines the case for using Green Belt land.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 152	Louise Fairweather	12.14 - 12.16 Policy S1, S2 & S3	No	No	No	Site S2 should be deleted Site S3 should be deleted Consider releasing more land for housing adjacent to the NP agreed 2.1 ha of land at Shenstone Business Park (Site S1)		Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concerns relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 153	Cynthia Gravestock	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 154	Julia Spencer	Local Plan Allocations Document			No	Yes	Yes	Concerns over site W1: Land at Huddlesford Lane, citing traffic issues due to the rural nature of the lane alongside current congestion and parking issues. Development on the site would have a detrimental effect on the Conservation Area and Whittington's historical and rural character. Suggests Site W6 as an alternative due to better access and development would be more contiguous with existing dwellings along Back Lane.
LPA 155	Linda Ashwood	9.9						Supports the proposed development of plans submitted by Burntwood Action Group for Burntwood Town Centre. A shopping centre away from the main road would help cohesion and safety. Businesses would bring economic benefits if Burntwood could have walking access from Town Centre to Chase Water.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 156	Mary Pole	12.14 - 12.16 Policy S1, S2 & S3	No	No	No	Yes		Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 157	James Larner	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 158	James Larner	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 159	Will Brearley (CT Planning) on behalf of Mr D. Burton	Lichfield District Local Plan Allocations (Policies Maps, Inset 19)						Supports the amended settlement boundary in the vicinity of Tufon Cottage, Roman Road, Little Aston. This is a logical change that brings Tufon Cottage within the settlement boudary and, thus, outside of Green Belt and is supported within the 'made; Neighbourhood Plan for Little Aston.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 160	David Thompson on behalf of Shenstone Parish Council	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 161	Richard Shaw (Savills) on behalf of Barwood Strategic Land II	10	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The inclusion of Site NT1 is welcomed. However, NT1 is not effective in terms of further meeting the housing requirement of the adjacent authority. The site has the potential to accommodate additional housing, by reconfiguring the masterplan and increasing density in parts of the site. The development of the site can further assist with meeting Tamworth's housing needs under the Duty to Cooperate. The 'key development considerations' in this policy could, however, reflect the planning issues identified and addressed to the satisfaction of the Council as part of the outline planning application process, particularly addressing infrastructure considerations. This policy could also refer to the fact that the Council has resolved to grant outline planning permission for the development of this site at its meeting on 27 February 2017 (application 14/00516/OUTMEI). The Infrastructure Delivery

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								Plan notes (Para 5.45) the need for the infrastructure requirements to deliver development in the North of Tamworth BDL and that 'Details will be developed further through the Local Plan Allocations document and the IDP will be updated accordingly'.
LPA 162	Stephen Stoney (Wardell Armstrong) on behalf of The Leavesley Group	12.1			No	Yes	Yes	<p>This representation refers 2016 SHLAA site ref. ID:436 Hay End Lane for which a planning application is currently being prepared. The site comprises sustainable development in a sustainable location, where the Paragraph 197 presumption in the NPPF should prevail. For the Local Planning Authority to justify its primary SDA in order to deliver at least 21% of the Plan housing target, and then to state that 'there are sufficient sites to meet the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy' (Para 12.2) and to thereafter propose to tightly draw a Village settlement boundary (Para 12.3 and Inset 12).</p> <p>This approach is unjustified and unsound in that it conflicts with the NPPF principles as set out in Paras 14 and 15 of the NPPF, and Para 151 which firmly sets the principle that Plan making should take a positive approach to achievement of sustainable development. One cannot make a case that development in the SDL area is unsustainable. History reflects that the site was in agricultural use, but this is no longer the case and it is available for development forthwith. The directly adjacent site being promoted has exactly the same sustainable credentials. It is therefore unsound to draw such a restricted boundary to restrict development within the SDA, particularly the opportunity of integration already accepted by the council.</p> <p>On the matter of the former Rugeley Power Station, the proposal of allocation of a minimum of 800 homes. Such long-term projection of development that is yet unproven as developable, deliverable and viable is unjustified in a NPPF Paragraph 173 context. This site has not been formally decommissioned, is stated to be preferred for power re-use or employment generation in order to maximise service supplies.</p>
LPA 163	Jessica Blocksidge	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 164	Mathieu Evans	Local Plan Allocations			No	Yes	Yes	Concerned about the growing and unmet housing need emanating from Birmingham. Gladman are concerned therefore that the Council is not more actively seeking to review its Local Plan, we would consider that such a review should take priority for the Council. There is significant danger that the Local Plan could become out of date, and create problems in the wider housing market area as significant housing needs go unmet. Gladman do not consider that as written policy BE2 is in conformity with the NPPF, as such it is considered unsound. This is supported in paragraph134 of the NPPF which states:- "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use." We would therefore suggest that the first paragraph of policy BE2 is changed to reflect the wording of paragraph 134 of the NPPF.
LPA 165	Jessica Blocksidge	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan that a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 166	Victoris Dawson	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	LDC has failed to discharge the Duty to Cooperate as it has not collected locally derived evidence, considered in the SA the Shenstone NP in regards to sustainability assessment of site S2 or has not specifically consulted with the Parish Council/ relevant resident groups associated with the "made" Neighbourhood Plan. The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that site S2 was not suitable for new house building as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone NP, a 2016 Independent Planning Inspectors Report, and the passing of the Shenstone NP through cabinet in December 2016. The application for planning permission applied for by CT Planning the South Staffordshire Waterworks in Planning document CET/3511 On 6th October 2016LA was not considered in the Local plan. Main objection is that Site S2 is housing development on Green Belt and LPA has not shown exceptional circumstances as required in the NPPF. The development would be classed as high density, which is out of character with local area. Local school is already oversubscribed. Increase in traffic and accessibility to the site is also a concern. The document does not mention the net gain of 20 houses from the redevelopment of Anson Rd by Bromford Housing Association. Although no planning application has been submitted for this, plans are sufficiently progressed for this to be taken into account. Taken together these additions would add 31 houses to the existing allocation, exceeding the housing requirement for the village. The area being considered for open space is therefore not required for

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								future housing development. There would also be a stronger case for refusal of permission on any additional significant development proposals.
LPA 167	Helen Fisher on behalf of Burntwood Conservative Group	Local Plan Allocations			No			Opposes housing being built on the green belt. Concerned what will happen to Burntwood if more large scale development is allowed to take place before infrastructure is improved. Development at Highfields Road would leave no distinct division between Staffordshire and West Midlands. Lacking infrastructure & facilities to support families living in Burntwood - local schools are already full, sewerage and drainage issues, lack of public transport and poor road conditions which need to be looked at before Burntwood takes more housing. Concerns over the impact more houses will have on the local road network. Not enough has been done to bring Mount Road forward. Supports BAG vision for a Better not Bigger Burntwood.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 168	Andrew Skidmore	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 169	Phillip Metcalfe (The National Forest Company)	NR11	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The proposed policy address the expectation within The National Forest that new development contributes towards the creation of the Forest. The policy approach that has been adopted elsewhere across the Forest has been adapted here to take into account the District Council's adopted approach to biodiversity offsetting. The resulting policy expects new developments to contribute the same amount of Forest creation expected elsewhere across The National Forest, however, in this Policy, the calculation is in terms of biodiversity units rather than area. This makes the policy more locally relevant and follows the approach to ensuring a biodiversity net gain promoted within the adopted Local Plan and the NPPF. The National Forest Company request that a link is provided to our Guide for Developers and Planners (as referred to in paragraph 6.12) within the Our Local Evidence box. http://www.nationalforest.org/woodlands/woodlandcreation/development/

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 170	Louise Ann Skidmore	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 171	Peter Wray	Policy A1: Alrewas Housing Land Allocations				Yes		The LPA was compiled before the result of the appeal on land north of Dark Lane was published and the boundary of the housing site should be amended to reflect this. The boundary of the site map implies all vehicular access and egress will be via Dark Lane into Park Road. The Lioncourt Planning application included an access road from near the start of Micklehome Drive for incoming traffic from the A38 slip road. The boundary of the allocation area should be amended to reflect this. The boundary of the site shown in the LPA seems to go right up to the edge of Flood Zone 2. Part of this area will be required for Flood Compensation measures and will not be available for dwellings. The Parish Council are building a case for the western end of the land north of Dark Lane to form part of a Green Space for the village. The current application shows this as open space but there is no guarantee that this would not be built on at a later stage. The Green Space would ideally extend from the canal locks along the Trent to the A38. For this reason, the village would wish the western boundary of the Land North of Dark Lane Allocation to be pulled back to the edge of the Conservation Area, while this proposal is developed. The consultation document allocates 110 dwellings to the land north of Dark lane, whereas the application and the appeal decision were for 121 houses, an addition of 11 houses. The document does not mention the net gain of 20 houses from the redevelopment of Anson Rd by Bromford Housing Association. This involves the replacement of 20 Smiths houses with a total of 40 new houses. Although no planning app has been submitted for this, plans are sufficiently progressed for this to be taken into account. Taken together these additions would add 31 houses to the existing allocation, exceeding the housing requirement for the village. The area being considered for open space is therefore not required for future housing development.
LPA 172	Gareth Blocksidge	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 173	Gareth Blocksidge	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 174	Alice Fitton (Turley) on behalf of Alex Waterworth (Legal and General Property Fund)	EMP1			No	Yes	Yes	Broadly supports policy EMP1 but thinks that it's negatively worded, indicating that the starting point for a planning application for any non-traditional complementary use class is refusal unless it can be demonstrated otherwise. L&G propose modifying policy EMP1 to be more positively worded. The modification would mean the starting point for planning applications for complementary uses, which can be demonstrated benefit Fradley Park, will be accepted. The policy would then not represent an over-burdened requirement on business as required by NPPF paragraph 21. Emerging Policy ST5 needs to go further than just protecting the land around Hilliard's Cross junction and commit both Staffordshire County Council and Highways England to exploring a single solution for future proofing to ensure it provides sufficient capacity to accommodate further employment development at Fradley Park.
LPA 175	Michael Taylor	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. Raises several concerns regarding the viability of Site S2 in terms of access and proposed housing. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 176	Heather Price	12.14			No	No		Objects strongly to building in the green belt as it is there to prevent urban sprawl, provide wildlife habitats, prevent flooding and absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. Why can't LDC use brownfield sites for development, as stated in the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan?
LPA 177	deleted rep							
LPA 178	Julie Haywood	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concerns relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. Raises several concerns regarding the viability of Site S2 in terms of access and proposed housing. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 179	Susan Craven Jones	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concerns relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 180	Sarah Williams	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 181	Marina Dufaye	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 182	Tamiko Jones	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 183	Andre Dufaye	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 184	Alex Capper	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 185	David Thompson (Shenstone Parish Council)	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 186	Andrew Baker	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 187	Luke Walker - Lichfield & Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust	2.2	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has a Duty to Co-operate with Cannock Chase District Council on cross-boundary matters. We feel there is some confusion in the LPA document as the Lichfield Canal does not cross the boundary with Cannock Chase District. We propose that paragraph 2.2 be amended to read 'The route positively contributes to a restored Lichfield Canal and the associated Heritage Towpath Trail. The positive contribution is established within the Local Plan Strategy. Its connection to the wider canal network is subject to a detailed water study demonstrating an adequate water supply can be provided to support its use and the existing network. The assessment will also need to demonstrate that there will be no significant impact on the functions of the ecology of the wider canal network.'
LPA 188	deleted rep							

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 189	Adrian Scattergood	Local Plan Allocations			No	Yes		Believes that the LPA has been produced against inadequate and unfair evidence, particularly with regard to the Green Belt Reviews carried out in 2012, 2013 and 2016 and the Urban Capacity Assessment 2016. States all these documents and the LPA is unsound and wants a full review of Lichfield District Council's Local Plan Allocations document, with the full removal of Green Belt development from the plan. States there is enough evidence to support alternative development on available Brownfield sites, but only once Burntwood has achieved greater sustainability. Green Belt and unaltered Green Belt boundaries require full and permanent protection. Has also stated that the Sustainability Appraisal is unsound (summarised in separate SA spreadsheet)
LPA 190	Debbie Scattergood	Local Plan Allocations			No	Yes		Believes that the LPA has been produced against inadequate and unfair evidence, particularly with regard to the Green Belt Reviews carried out in 2012, 2013 and 2016 and the Urban Capacity Assessment 2016. States all these documents and the LPA is unsound and wants a full review of Lichfield District Council's Local Plan Allocations document, with the full removal of Green Belt development from the plan. States there is enough evidence to support alternative development on available Brownfield sites, but only once Burntwood has achieved greater sustainability. Green Belt and unaltered Green Belt boundaries require full and permanent protection. Has also stated that the Sustainability Appraisal is unsound (summarised in separate SA spreadsheet)
LPA 191	Janet Hodson (JVH Planning) on behalf of Shipley Estates/Baxter Estates	4.6	No		No	Yes		In principal we support the allocation of Site FZ1. We object to the development considerations set out under FZ1 which are of concern. It is not clear what is envisaged by the note regarding the edge of vilage location in design terms and an urban to rural transition. The site adjoins the existing development south of Lichfield Street and similar frontage is found south of the Mile Oak Crossroads, fronting the A453. The development on the corner of these roads is currently 3 storeys. It is not clear what other considerations should apply to the design and layout. It is not clear how the development should deal with the criterion related to landscape character and crop marks. If this is a matter of recording the crop marks prior to development then the Plan should say so.
LPA 192	Mr P T Bassett	9				No		Objects to plans to remove green belt land surrounding Burntwood and believes there are fundamental problems with the Supplement to the Green Belt Review 2014 document. Fully supports Burntwood Action Group's submission regarding sites B14 and B15. Asks whether planners have fully considered the use of old and dilapidated industrial sites for housing developments? Is also concerned about the increased housing exacerbating the traffic problems in Burntwood.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 193	Lynette Wadlow-Smith	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). Questions why other villages such as Stonnall or Little Aston could not absorb some of these numbers. The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross-boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC.</p> <p>LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>
LPA 194	deleted rep							

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 195	Janet Hodson (JVH Planning) on behalf of Walton Homes	4.6	No		No	Yes	Yes	There should be a review of the 2015 Strategy to take into account the further development that will be required to meet Birmingham's housing shortfall. It is more appropriate to consider the settlement boundary and green belt alterations once the Birmingham requirement is known and reduce the need to undertake two plans. The buffer of 11% flexibility allowance is not considered appropriate and should be increased to 20%. The Plan should allocate additional smaller sites to ensure a deliverable supply. The plan as drafted does not provide for a robust 5 year supply. Objection is made to the omission of Brick Kiln Farm site (SHLAA 92) from Policy AH1. The site forms a natural extension to the settlement and is surrounded by development on three sides, therefore not extending the built up area out into the open countryside. Only 200 dwellings are allocated to Armitage with Handsacre which does not reflect the level of service and facility available in the settlement. The plan should make provision for additional land.
LPA 196	Janet Hodson (JVH Planning) on behalf of Mr B Gough	4.6	No		No	Yes	Yes	There should be a review of the 2015 Strategy to take into account the further development that will be required to meet Birmingham's housing shortfall. It is more appropriate to consider the settlement boundary and green belt alterations once the Birmingham requirement is known and reduce the need to undertake two plans. The buffer of 11% flexibility allowance is not considered appropriate and should be increased to 20%. The Plan should allocate additional smaller sites to ensure a deliverable supply. The plan as drafted does not provide for a robust 5 year supply. We object to the development boundary at Hill Ridware on the basis that the land at Ridware House should be included within the settlement boundary. The area is contained by residential development and the inclusion of this area would allow for the construction of two dwellings as infill development. The development boundary is being changed to include HR1, this change means that it is logical to bring the western boundary of the settlement up to Wade Lane and include the subject land within the defined area of the settlement.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 197	Richard Wadlow-Smith	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). Questions why other villages such as Stonnall or Little Aston could not absorb some of these numbers. The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross-boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 198	Janet Hodson (JVH Planning) on behalf of Mr Bliss/Messrs Argyll	4.6	No		No	Yes	Yes	There should be a review of the 2015 Strategy to take into account the further development that will be required to meet Birmingham's housing shortfall. It is more appropriate to consider the settlement boundary and green belt alterations once the Birmingham requirement is known and reduce the need to undertake two plans. The buffer of 11% flexibility allowance is not considered appropriate and should be increased to 20%. The Plan should allocate additional smaller sites to ensure a deliverable supply. The plan as drafted does not provide for a robust 5 year supply. Objection is made to OR1 on the grounds that the policy makes no provision in Hopwas for new housing development and omits SHLAA site 1033 Land at Plantation Lane Hopwas. A viable and sustainable mixed development can be achieved on the site which includes a linear open space to link through to Nursery

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								Lane. The green belt boundary would need to be relocated to the south and would enable a softer boundary to the settlement which would be an improvement over the existing hard built edge.
LPA 199	Janet Hodson (JVH Planning) on behalf of Mr & Mrs Hodgetts	4.6	No		No	Yes	Yes	There should be a review of the 2015 Strategy to take into account the further development that will be required to meet Birmingham's housing shortfall. It is more appropriate to consider the settlement boundary and green belt alterations once the Birmingham requirement is known and reduce the need to undertake two plans. The buffer of 11% flexibility allowance is not considered appropriate and should be increased to 20%. The Plan should allocate additional smaller sites to ensure a deliverable supply. The plan as drafted does not provide for a robust 5 year supply. Objection is made to Policy OR1 on the grounds that the policy makes no provision in Elford for new housing development and omits SHLAA site 86. The plan should increase the land allocations for the rural area and include the subject land as a suitable site for residential development to meet part of the housing needs of the rural areas. Elford can accommodate a modest amount of development to support the future of the settlement.
LPA 200	Joan Miles	Policy S1						Objects to proposed housing development on Court Drive, Shenstone as this land is green belt and should stay green belt. The village does not have the infrastrucure to support this development e.g extra school places, extra places at the doctor surgery and the traffic problems this will cause in the village.
LPA 201	Janet Hodson (JVH Planning) on behalf of Mr M Neachell	4.6	No		No	Yes	Yes	There should be a review of the 2015 Strategy to take into account the further development that will be required to meet Birmingham's housing shortfall. It is more appropriate to consider the settlement boundary and green belt alterations once the Birmingham requirement is known and reduce the need to undertake two plans. The buffer of 11% flexibility allowance is not considered appropriate and should be increased to 20%. The Plan should allocate additional smaller sites to ensure a deliverable supply. The plan as drafted does not provide for a robust 5 year supply. The proposal to allocated 209 dwellings in Fazeley is insufficient for its scale and size. SHLAA site 95, occupying the area north of Lichfield Road and West of the The Green should be excluded from the green belt and allocated for development in this plan or safeguarded land for development in a a Plan Review. The 2016 SHLAA notes that the site lies within the Conservation Area but this is not the case and the SHLAA is in error. SHLAA site 94, north of the Green and east of Plantation Lane, could be developed and deliver around 100 dwellings. This site should be excluded from the Green Belt and allocated.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 202	Janet Hodson (JVH Planning) on behalf of Mrs M Wiseman	4.6	No		No	Yes	Yes	There should be a review of the 2015 Strategy to take into account the further development that will be required to meet Birmingham's housing shortfall. It is more appropriate to consider the settlement boundary and green belt alterations once the Birmingham requirement is known and reduce the need to undertake two plans. The buffer of 11% flexibility allowance is not considered appropriate and should be increased to 20%. The Plan should allocate additional smaller sites to ensure a deliverable supply. The plan as drafted does not provide for a robust 5 year supply. Objection is made to the omission of the Court Drive site (SHLAA site 684) from Policy S1. The site forms a natural extension to the settlement and is well contained by the A5127. Only 140 dwellings are allocated to Shenstone, which does not reflect the level of service and facility available in the settlement.
LPA 203	Angela Anderson	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP.</p> <p>At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building.</p> <p>Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1).</p> <p>The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3.</p> <p>The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC.</p> <p>LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								<p>sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>
LPA 204	Janet Hodson (JVH Planning) on behalf of Mr Bhagi	4.6	No		No	Yes	Yes	<p>There should be a review of the 2015 Strategy to take into account the further development that will be required to meet Birmingham's housing shortfall. It is more appropriate to consider the settlement boundary and green belt alterations once the Birmingham requirement is known and reduce the need to undertake two plans. The buffer of 11% flexibility allowance is not considered appropriate and should be increased to 20%. The Plan should allocate additional smaller sites to ensure a deliverable supply. The plan as drafted does not provide for a robust 5 year supply. Objection is made to the omission of SHLAA site 380, Land South of the Golf Course, Little Aston. The site forms a natural extension to the settlement and is well contained by the railway line to the south, residential development to the east and woodland to the west.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 205	Janet Hodson (JVH Planning) on behalf of Mrs E Sketchley	EMP1	No		No	Yes	Yes	Objection is made to policy EMP1 on the basis that there is no employment allocation made within the area of Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill. Land west of Sutton Road Mile Oak is considered to be an appropriate site for the expansion of the existing commercial uses or additional complimentary commercial uses. This area is very well contained by the A5, the A453 and existing commercial uses. The site has excellent linkages to the A5. The existing allocations in Fazeley are simply the existing employment areas and there is no allowance for future employment development. Policy EMP1 is not clear. The policy sets out that an additional 10 ha of employment land is to be allocated, yet the sites in the table are substantially more than 10 ha. The plan sets out that there is flexibility to provide 6.5 ha of employment land that cannot be found within Tamworth. It is not clear where this land is identified in this Plan and needs to be clarified
LPA 206	RNP Roberts							Attached copy of SHLAA plan identifying Land at the rear of 18 Mill End lane Alrewas (Reference Numbers 439 and 550) shown as 'not currently developable' on the plan, after a submission has been made for 10 houses. Neighbourhood Plan contains a matrix that indicates a low massing scheme of 5 units would be acceptable. Part of the site was removed from SHLAA because permission had been given on part by April 2010. LPA excludes the site as it appears to be derived from the SHLAA when permission has been given on part of 550 for two dwellings The indication in the NP pre-submission consultation was the wording should be amended to ensure development was appropriate in design and scale. The Matrix included in the NP scored the site as developable.. Site 439 should be included in the LPA document for 8 further or an amendment be made to the introduction as follows 'to identify land allocations of five units or more associated with meeting with growth requirements'...
LPA 207	Nick Misselke (Acquireland) on behalf of Philip Carter (Edenwood Ltd)	LC1	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	LPA does not meet local needs for housing. None of the allocations are specifically for self build and custom houses. The LPA should consider allocating land at Fosseway Lane for housing and specifically housing that is either self build or custom houses. Promotes land at Fosseway as capable of accommodating up to 15 dwellings.LPA is not justified insofar as no specific provision is made for self build and custom homes. Not clear from the SA or LPA why the LPA has chosen not to identify potential self build and custom house sites.LPA should provide for a range of housing in terms of its type and design including self build and custom housing. Promotes site (SHLAA reference 633) for release from the Green Belt and confirms there are no known constraints that prevent the site from being developed.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 208	Mr Steven Keyte	Policy S3: Shenstone Housing Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 209	Mr Ben Smith	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Disapproves of the way the consultation has been hidden from the public. Sites S2 and S3 are not sustainable development sites. Questions why S1 has been allocated when it is already allocated by Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan. LDC never clearly advised that, if the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan did not allocate or recommend sites in the green belt for release to, as a minimum, meet the higher end of the Policy Shen4 requirement of 150 dwellings, then LDC would allocate sites itself. Only one engagement event was held in Shenstone between 3:30pm and 6:30pm when many people were unavailable due to work and family commitments. Objects to building on the pumping station and Lammas land as it will ruin the aesthetic. Mr Smith states he is a Scout Leader and regularly uses the Lammas field for scouting activities..

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 210	Mr Keith Goldsworthy	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). Questions why other villages such as Stonnall or Little Aston could not absorb some of these numbers. The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross-boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 211	Donja Martin	12.14			No	No		Believes that the LPA is unsound and objects to removing land from the Green Belt. The Plans want to use the land adjacent to ancient woodland and to the Lammas land to build houses. This land was meant to be used by the residents of Shenstone for enjoyment. The impact of the noise from the Toll Road and the increased traffic around our village means that we value these green spaces even more. Green space is vital to the well-being of the residents of Shenstone and should be cherished. It is also suggested that priority species inhabit these areas. Insufficient effort has been put into bringing forward old and dilapidated industrial sites for housing development. The brownfield site on Birchbrook Industrial Site has many options

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 212	Richard Smith	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	The Lichfield District Local Plan Allocation for Shenstone has completely ignored the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan that so many people took time out of their busy lives to bring together for the good of the wider community. The additional S2 and S3 sites were considered but discarded as development of them would spoil Shenstone. By withdrawing greenbelt status and allowing development on sites S2 & S3 would not in any way help solve the issues we face of high and increasing traffic volumes through the narrow village streets (Pinfold Hill) including the Heavy Goods articulated Vehicle menace. The LDC planners, by suggesting S2 & S3 have shirked their responsibility and have completely ignored the well publicised issues of HGV's and Shenstone Railway Station's parking issues. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing, resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park (S1), Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Approximately 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 213	Heather Price	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations			no	Yes		Without strong protection for our Green Belt the countryside will be lost. For example, the city of Los Angeles sprawls more than 50 miles eastwards from its centre. I do not want that in the UK. Housing needs can be met while sustaining our Green Belts for future generations by using brownfield land. Protecting the Green Belt encourages the revitalisation of these sites. Why can't LDC use brownfield sites for its development as stated in the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan? LDC must ensure the countryside is protected for now and future generations.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 214	Alex Smith	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 215	Tim Johnson	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 216	David Hooson	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 217	Lisa Ergun	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 218	Elizabeth Strachan	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 219	Ian Price	Policy S1				no		Dismayed at Green belt allocations which fly in the face of the NP agreed between Parish and LDC

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 220	Stuart Brennan	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 221	Helen Brennan	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 222	Joanne Smith	12.14	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). Questions why other villages such as Stonnall or Little Aston could not absorb some of these numbers. The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross-boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 223	Ian Strachan	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 224	Network Rail (Mrs Diane Clarke)	Local Plan Allocations						<p>This representation includes a number of generic matters some of which relate more to planning applications. The consultee did not respond as per the structured questions. The full technical advice regarding the LPA is too lengthy for this can be found in the full representation. As such this summary only includes those points which relate directly to the LPA: Within the Local Plan Allocations document there are sites that are adjacent to the existing railway infrastructure. Development considerations include noise mitigation due to the adjacent railway boundary. The LPA and the developer (along with their chosen acoustic contractor) are recommended to engage in discussions to determine the most appropriate measures to mitigate noise and vibration from the existing operational railway to ensure that there will be no future issues for residents once they take up occupation of the dwellings. The document makes reference to allocated areas in high risk flood zone areas with consideration on flood risk mitigation measures and surface water run off management. The NPPF states that, " 103. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere ," We recognise that councils are looking to proposals that are sustainable, however, we would remind the council in regards to this proposal in relation to the flooding, drainage, surface and foul water management risk that it should not increase the risk of flooding, water saturation, pollution and drainage issues ' elsewhere ', i.e. on to Network Rail land. Development proposals should therefore include consideration of surface water/flooding risk in relation to the existing operational railway land and infrastructure.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 225	Fiona Willimott	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 226	Roy Foster	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions. Shenstone has a thriving hedgehog population which could be affected.</p>	

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 227	Helen Goldsworthy	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 228	John Thompson on behalf of Lichfield Civic Society	Local Plan Allocations	Possibly	No	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Commitment in the approved Local Plan to undertake an early review or partial review if it is evident that the needs of Birmingham City require such action. Considers the progression of the Local Plan Allocations is appropriate at this time. Watery Lane, Curborough decision increases the numbers allocated by 19% higher than the 10,030 requirement in the Local Plan Strategy. Society agree the site at Curborough is not in line with the Planning Strategy and should not become the basis for the location of further housing development as it is too close to the urban edge of the City. The 750 dwellings at Watery Lane should be included in the total numbers of dwellings allocated so it is clear what the current factual situation is. Burntwood although similar size to City is only allocated 13% of the District's housing allocations compared with the City at 36. Consideration should be given to additional housing allocations within Burntwood Town Centre. Site L2: East of Lichfield (Streethay) SDA extension seems unnecessary in the view of the excess provision already existing and should be removed. Site B14: Land South of Highfields Road should be reduced. Insufficient provision is being made to secure infrastructure for development proposals. In relation to Burntwood there is a pressing need to improve social and community facilities and infrastructure including highways. It is not evident that the additional sites or those allocated in the Local Plan will do anything other than exacerbate the deficiency in respect of the provision of essential infrastructure. In relation to Lichfield City, concern regarding Policies ST3 Road Line Safeguarding and ST4 Junction Improvements - Lichfield City. The policies are listed for planning protection but their provision should be made a pre-requisite of the Local Plan housing and employment proposals being implemented. Introduction of significant Green Belt allocations in Burntwood and Hammerwich are inconsistent with Local Plan policies and the NPPF. It is not necessary to meet the numbers required by the plan. Since the Council is exceeding its housing numbers by 11% there is no case of 'very special circumstances' on the grounds of shortage of sites allocated. It is not evidence what the Council considers 'very special circumstances' that necessitate further release of Green Belt sites.</p> <p>Concerns over the allocation of B14 Highfields Road for 250 dwellings. Concern the allocation is the first step in release of the whole site as the SHLAA indicates the site submission area has a capacity of 500 dwellings. No clear and defensible Green Belt boundary and it is essential that it is clarified what "must be designed to maintain openness" means in practical terms and in respect of legal obligations. Council's parish maps indicate this site is not in Chasetown Ward as stated in the SHLAA but in Hammerwich parish.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 229	David Tomlinson	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP.</p> <p>At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building.</p> <p>Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1).</p> <p>The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3.</p> <p>The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC.</p> <p>LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 230	Julie Hession	Site B14 (Burntwood)						Site B14 is essential Green Belt seperating Burntwood from the West Midlands and should be preserved. Other Brownfield sites areavailable and these should be used first before Green Belt. If Greenbelt has to be used there are other sites within Burntwood and theDistrict that are more suitable including a) Land West of Stables Way and bounded by Old Ironstone Road and Severns RoadChase Terrace.b) Land South of the M6 Toll and north of the A5, bounded by the A5, B5195 Ogley HayRoad and B5195 Burntwood Bypass.c) The large site bounded by Rugeley Road, Nether Lane, Coulter Lane and ChurchRoad Burntwood. This is already identified as a long term strategic solution. Suggests that inappropriate industrial sites in residential areasshould be re-developed for housing eg. Mount Road and Queens Drive.
LPA 231	Patrick Martin	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP.At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1).The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3.The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan.The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 232	Diane Lucas	12.14 - 12.16 Policy S1, S2 & S3	No	No	No	Yes	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.	

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 233	Jayne Fishwick	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 234	Charles Anderson	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 235	Louise Flowith	Local Plan Allocations Document	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	LDC have failed to consider the strategic priorities of their neighbouring authorities and therefore not fulfilled the requirements of the Localism Act. Gives example of Arkall Farm which Tamworth Council opposes, which has now been called in by the Secretary of State. Local Plan Allocations Document should have been postponed a few months until the broad locations for the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area shortfall are known given the clear weaknesses in the document. Not positively prepared as the Watery Lane development has not been included in the draft document despite having planning permission for 750 dwellings. Whereas the Dark Lane site was granted planning permission by the Secretary of State on the same date has been included within the Local Plan Allocations. Local Plan Allocations is not consistent with the NPPF in that Green Belt should be protected and boundaries amended only in exceptional circumstances. LDC also ignored

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								February 2017 White Paper. Suggests that the consultation should be started again taking account of issues mentioned.
LPA 236	Paul Rouse (Savills) on behalf of Rugeley Power Limited	Appendix E	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Appendix E contains a number of requirements which are unreasonable and in appropriate.</p> <p>Supports E2 that states development should ensure that it makes best use of the land and that E3(1) for a minimum of 800 homes</p> <p>E3(2) enhancement of ecological interests goes beyond NPPF requirements (para 109-117). Where NPPF does seek enhancement of biodiversity it is with regard to specific circumstances set out in para 118</p> <p>E4(2) requires net gain in biodiversity and goes above NPPF requirements. Large areas of site are overlain with PFA which in accordance with Environmental Permits needs to be removed, relocated or stabilised and therefore vegetation and mature trees in PFA will need to be removed.</p> <p>E4(3) seeks to retain existing sports facilities within the site. Sports facilities aren't natural assets and are constructed on PFA therefore may be an environmental requirement that PFA and hence sports facilities are removed. E4(3) preference for retention of Borrow Pit as a water feature is contrary to LPS Policy CP6 and requires a formal review of LPS to change adopted policy.</p> <p>E4(6) Policy R1 can be connected with Borrow Pit component of East of Rugeley SDA as in same ownership, other elements of SDA are constrained by third party ownership and therefore may be difficult to achieve active linkages if landowners unwilling to cooperate.</p> <p>E4(7) land ownership's constrain where second access point can be taken from E4(14) public art may be appropriate but should not be a specific requirement</p> <p>E4(15) allotments are not located within R1 allocation site as currently defined on proposals map</p> <p>No justification for community hub to incorporate sports building, retail provision and new primary school</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 237	Jim Pole	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 238	Paul Rouse (Savills) on behalf of Rugeley Power Limited	Paragraph 11.1 - 11.3 Policy R1 Inset East of Rugeley	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Supports allocation for a minimum of 800 dwellings Para 11.3 refers to Borrow Pit being anticipated to deliver 450 dwellings within the East Rugeley SPD. Appendix E notes the Borrow Pit is to be retained as a landscape water feature – it is not possible for Table 4.1, Policy R1 or Appendix E to change adopted LPS Policy CP6. LPA seeking to impose site specific policy on Borrow Pit which is outline the area to which the site specific policy applies as defined on the Proposals Map Policy R1 allocation boundary should be amended to include Borrow Pit area and balance of Rugeley B Power Station site up to its boundary with A513. This is necessary for access to R1 allocation and to enable efficient use of land around the Borrow Pit in the redevelopment of Rugeley B Power Station. Policy R1 amended to clarify 800 dwellings is in addition to the Borrow Pit contribution to the East of Rugeley SDA. Proposals map amended to include area of Borrow Pit and all of Rugeley B Power Station land within LD administrative area, within the R1 allocation.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 239	Paul Rouse (Savills) on behalf of Rugeley Power Limited	Table 4.1	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Table 4.1 identifies residual balance to be delivered in SDAs including East of Rugeley. East of Rugeley is allocated for 1,125 dwellings in LPS. Table 4.1 states 543 dwellings have been completed and residual balance is 79 dwellings – this figure is incorrect and should be 503 dwellings.</p> <p>Attempting to change adopted LPS Policy CP6 through allocations document and this can only be done through a formal review of the LPS - there is a policy conflict between the LPS and LPA Policy R1 and Appendix E attempt to change policy CP1 and CP6 by deleting the contribution of the Borrow area at RPS. Table 4.1 identifies balance from the remainder of SPD as 79 therefore Borrow Pit site should provide 503 dwellings.</p> <p>Proposals Map inset to show the Borrow Pit within East of Rugeley SDA, LPA must be amended to be consistent with itself and the LPS.</p> <p>Allocation for 800 for East of Rugeley should be retained because it relates to Rugeley Power B Station and is separate from the SDA in LSP CP6.</p> <p>LPA should be amended to correctly reflect the balance of housing to still be delivered in East of Rugeley SDA to 582, this comprises of 79 dwellings on land outside of Rugeley B Power Station and 503 dwellings on the Borrow Pit.</p>
LPA 240	Ken Connor	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan that a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building</p>
LPA 241	Ken Connor	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Objects to the development at site S3 due to flooding issues and increased traffic. The existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park, Lynn Lane, Shenstone. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 242	Pauline Sampson	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	No	<p>Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period . Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 243	Aidan Hearne	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1).The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan.The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 244	Christopher Timothy(CT Planning) on behalf of St Johns Hospital Trust	Site L12 (Lichfield)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Supports the land allocation at St Johns Hospital, Birmingham Road (Site L12) for up to 36 dwellings which assists in meeting the local need for housing. The site is vacant previously developed land which is deliverable for development within the plan period, therefore the site should be developed for specialist housing. Feasible to deliver specialist housing that is compatible with sites location within a Conservation Area. Site is in a sustainable location - 250m from Lichfield City train station, 300m from Lichfield bus station.
LPA 245	Christopher Timothy (CT Planning) on behalf of South Staffordshire Water Plc	Site L10 (Lichfield)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Supports the allocation of the land off Burton Road (West) Streethay (Site L10) for 38 dwellings. Committed to bringing the site forward for residential development within the next five years. 2016 SHLAA identifies the site to be suitable, available, achievable and deliverable for housing. Well located to provide for a balanced residential development to meet the needs of Lichfield and the surrounding District for housing. Streethay has the benefit of being located outside of the Green Belt and is well served by public transport and in close proximity to a major trunk road. Within 2kms of Streethay can be found a range of doctors, dentists and a hospital, primary and secondary schools, retail services and other social and community facilities.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 246	Sandra Brett	Burntwood						Supports Burntwood Action Group submission relating to Supplement to the Green Belt Review 2014, Sustainability Appraisal 2017 and Site B15 Land east of Coulter Lane. Supports Hammerwich Action Group submission relating to Site B14 Land South of Highfields Road. Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl across valuable green land and its not time to value all the Green Belt which surrounds it. Green Belt sites on the periphery of Burntwood are not sustainable. Expansion of Burntwood will exacerbate existing congestion out of the area at peak times and LDC must work with local community and their representatives for the release of brownfield sites for housing.
LPA 247	Christopher Timothy (CT Planning) on behalf of Mr J Duncan	Policy W1: Whittington Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No (consistent with NPPF)	Yes	Yes	Objects to the Allocations document as the plan does not fully meet the local need for housing within Whittington. Proposes land to East of Common Lane be allocated for housing development (21 homes). Allocations document is not justified as it has allocated sites that are not considered the best when compared to the alternatives. Site W1 (60 dwellings) is not being actively promoted and can only be delivered by undertaking significant alterations to the highway network. Sites W1 and W3 should be deleted and replaced by the land East of Common Lane and land at Church Farm, Back Lane, Whittington
LPA 248	Dominic Brett	Burntwood						Supports Burntwood Action Group submission relating to Supplement to the Green Belt Review 2014, Sustainability Appraisal 2017 and Site B15 Land east of Coulter Lane. Supports Hammerwich Action Group submission relating to Site B14 Land South of Highfields Road. Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl across valuable green land and its not time to value all the Green Belt which surrounds it. Green Belt sites on the periphery of Burntwood are not sustainable. Expansion of Burntwood will exacerbate existing congestion out of the area at peak times and LDC must work with local community and their representatives for the release of brownfield sites for housing.
LPA 249	William Brett	Burntwood						Supports Burntwood Action Group submission relating to Supplement to the Green Belt Review 2014, Sustainability Appraisal 2017 and Site B15 Land east of Coulter Lane. Supports Hammerwich Action Group submission relating to Site B14 Land South of Highfields Road. Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl across valuable green land and its not time to value all the Green Belt which surrounds it. Green Belt sites on the periphery of Burntwood are not sustainable. Expansion of Burntwood will exacerbate existing congestion out of the area at peak times and LDC must work with local community and their representatives for the release of brownfield sites for housing.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 250	Ellen Bird on behalf of Hammerwich Parish Council	Burntwood					Yes	Support local opinion that says no to green belt destruction. Green Belt Review Assessment assessed land off Highfields Road (Parcel S1) as "important" on three grounds: 1. to check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas, 2. preventing neighbouring towns from merging 3. maintaining local settlement pattern and hierarchy and the proposal would narrow the gap between Burntwood and Brownhills and the three Important purposes of Green Belt prevent this happening. Need to consider alternative uses for the site such as for outdoor sport and recreation. Do not consider strategic housing growth to be exceptional circumstance to justify the release of Green Belt. The third Green Belt review is attempting to overturn the first review for Parcel S1 (Highfields Road) and Parcel E1 (West of Coulter Lane). E1 has only overall moderate score and in accordance with the suggested principles for Green Belt release should be the first to go. Policy Burntwood 3: Economy sets out vision for Town Centre and Employment. The existing provision for shopping on Inset 3: Burntwood Plan has developed without strategy to meet the needs of local people. Burntwood cannot be sustainable until it provides a lot more jobs and reduces the need for cars.
LPA 251	Christopher Timothy (CT Planning) on behalf of S Day (Lichfield Care Development Ltd)	Policy LC1	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	LPA does not meet local needs for housing in particular local need for care home bed spaces. LPA document only provides for 62 dwellings of a specialist nature and evidence suggests a considerably greater number of care home spaces need to be provided for. Promotes land at Eastern Avenue to be allocated for a care home to deliver up to 71 care beds.
LPA 252	Christopher Timothy (CT Planning) on behalf of Elford Homes	Policy W1: Whittington Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No (consistent with NPPF)	Yes	Yes	Objects to the Allocations document as the plan does not fully meet the local need for housing within Whittington. Proposes land at Church Farm, Back Lane be allocated for housing development (50 dwellings). Allocations document is not justified as it has allocated sites that are not considered the best when compared to the alternatives. Site W1 (60 dwellings) is not being actively promoted and can only be delivered by undertaking significant alterations to the highway network. Sites W1 and W3 should be deleted and replaced by the land East of Common Lane and land at Church Farm, Back Lane, Whittington
LPA 253	William Brearley (CT Planning) on behalf of Touch Properties	Paragraph 4.7	Yes	Yes	Yes (not positively prepared)	No	Yes	The Local Plan Allocations makes a commitment to review the Allocations document and the Strategy on the basis of addressing the housing needs of the GBHMA and Tamworth. However, there is no mention within the Allocations document about how best this need is met and the possible housing required. The Peter Brett report explains how the shortfall should be met on the edge of the Birmingham conurbation, which is washed over Green Belt towards Shenstone and Little Aston. Suggests that the Allocation Document indicates how it intends to assess sites. Proposes a Green Belt site at Shenstone Wood (16.2ha) which could deliver 400 dwellings at 35 dwellings per hectare with public open space and infrastructure.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 254	Christopher Timothy (CT Planning) on behalf of S Day (Lichfield Care Development Ltd)	Proposals Map	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	The Proposals Map should be amended to delete from the Green Belt the area of land north of Lichfield Road, west of Grange Lane, east of Stafford Road from the Green Belt. The area contains Friary School, leisure centre, Nearfield House, care home, police training centre and a number of dwellings. The area identified to be deleted from Green Belt lies immediately adjacent to the Development Boundary of Lichfield, it is well related in terms of its scale and form to the established pattern of built development. All of the land uses are uses that are not appropriate within Green Belt.
LPA 255	Christopher Timothy (CT Planning) on behalf of South Staffordshire Water Plc	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Supports allocation of Site S2: Land adjacent to Shenstone Pumping Station. The SHLAA identifies the site to be suitable, available and achievable for development and that there are no known constraints. The site is within 500m of the majority of services and facilities within the village, including its railway station. Capable of supporting 40 dwellings. South Staffordshire Water Plc are committed to bringing this site forward for development within the next five years.
LPA 256	William Brearley (CT Planning) on behalf of Mr Fateh	Proposals Map	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Promotes land at High Street, Colton for development. Argues there is evidence to demonstrate a need for affordable and open market housing within Colton. Council should be proactive to ensure that the housing needs of the rural hinterland of the district are met.
LPA 257	Christopher Timothy (CT Planning) on behalf of Mr Minshall	Policy AH1: Armitage with Handsacre Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Local Plan Allocations document has not been positively prepared as it does not meet the local needs for housing arising from Armitage with Handsacre. Although the document allocates a site that in addition to completions and committed sites exceeds the identified requirement of between 120-220 homes, the Council are relying on a single large site. Out of the 5 Key Rural Settlements Armitage with Handsacre has the least constraints as 3 of the others are constrained by Green Belt. Proposes land adjacent The Crown Inn, Uttoxeter Road as a site for 88 dwelling as it is well related in terms of scale and location to the existing scale of development in the village. Proposes that the settlement boundary be extended to incorporate the site.
LPA 258	William Brearley (CT Planning) on behalf of Friel Homes	Policy LC1: Lichfield City Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No (consistent with NPPF)	Yes	Yes	Allocations document has not been positively prepared as it does not allocate an important, undeveloped site within the City, the site located between and to the rear of Angel Croft Hotel and Westgate House. The Urban Capacity Assessment acknowledges that the site was available and a revised scheme forthcoming. The District and City relies on large urban extensions to deliver the majority of housing. Smaller sites within the City should be allocated to ensure adequate flexibility in the housing supply. Allocation of the site would provide opportunity for the community to experience heritage assets and views towards Darwin House and the Cathedral.
LPA 259	Christopher Timothy (CT Planning) on behalf of Essington Park Ltd	Policy A1: Alrewas Housing Land Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Supports the proposed allocation of Site A2: Land North of Dark Lane. The SHLAA notes that development of the land north of Dark Lane is suitable, available and achievable for housing and that there are no known constraints to the site's development. The Local Plan Allocation document understates the yield for the land of North Lane. Planning permission has been granted for 121 dwellings on the eastern portion of the proposed allocation. Further 19 dwellings can be

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								accommodated increasing the yield to 140 dwellings, which would be within the range identified by the Local Plan Strategy (minimum 90-180 homes).
LPA 260	Christopher Timothy (CT Planning) on behalf of Essington Park Ltd	Local Plan Allocations document	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Local Plan Allocations document is not positively prepared as it fails to meet local needs for infrastructure, particularly the need for roadside service areas on the Strategic Road Network. District is on three major road networks; A5, A38 and M6 toll. Proposes allocating a Roadside Service Area to the north of Alrewas which could include provision for a petrol filling station, food outlet, hotel accommodation and 24 hour HGV parking. Could replace Ivy Garage in Alrewas providing opportunity to remove HGV traffic from the village. No specific policy in the Allocations document that addressed road side services.
LPA 261	Chontell Buchanan (First City Ltd)	4.1-4.8	No	Yes	No			<p>LDC should consider accommodating Birmingham & Tamworths unmet housing need at this stage.</p> <p>Supports Policy B1 and the allocation of B:14 Land south of Highfields Road, Burntwood. Council have taken a pragmatic approach to meet housing needs of the District and acknowledged there is insufficient land to meet the needs of the District on brownfield land therefore allocated Green Belt land to meet the need. Consider the Council should allocate additional sites that can be removed from Green Belt to accommodate future growth beyond the plan period and these should be identified as Safeguarded sites.</p> <p>Clear evidence the urban capacity is unable to accommodate the required growth for the district. Consider Councils approach for the release of land within greenbelt and greenfield sites on the edge of villages is the only justified approach to meeting the housing requirements. It will not be possible to meet the needs of the greater Birmingham housing market area within the urban area and there is a need to consider additional greenfield sites and greenbelt sites. It is an appropriate time for consideration of additional sites that will need to be removed from the Green Belt to assist with the further needs of Lichfield District beyond the plan period and needs of the GBHMA and this should not be left until a review of the local plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 178-181 NPPF references DtC and makes it clear the current housing land supply issue within the GBHMA should be considered at this stage. The LPA should consider safeguarding Green Belt land for future development.</p>
LPA 262	Richard Brown (CBRE Ltd) on behalf of IM Properties	Local Plan Allocations Document						Objects to the omission of the Watery Lane development as an allocation within the Allocations document. Site has extant planning permission granted by the Secretary of State on 13th February 2017. Also subject to a S106 agreement dated 20th December 2016. Discussions are being advanced by Planning Officers to coordinate the discharge of various planning obligations, pre-commencement

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								conditions and certain reserved matters applications to facilitate delivery of the development. The site should be identified in the Allocations document for these reasons.
LPA 263	Karin Hartley (Delta Planning) on behalf of New Street LLP	Site L27 (Lichfield)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Supports the allocation of Site L27: Former Norgren Site, Eastern Avenue for a mixed use allocation under policy LC2. Site will provide up to 70 homes on a brownfield site within the urban area contributing to the District's housing supply in a sustainable location. Also provides bulky good retail scheme to meet requirements identified by Policy Lichfield 3 in the Local Plan Strategy. Provides a suitable and sustainable location for proposed uses and the site is considered developable within the Local Plan period.
LPA 264	Karin Hartley (Delta Planning) on behalf of Prologis UK Ltd	Site F2 (Fradley)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Support the allocation of 18.2ha of employment land at Site F2: Land south of Fradley Park. The allocation will make significant contribution towards the District's employment land supply. A planning application for the site is currently being considered by LDC. There is active market interest to bring forward employment development at the earliest opportunity, therefore it is considered deliverable within the Local Plan period. Considers the additional employment land in the Allocations document increases flexibility and choice, supporting the Government's commitment to secure economic growth.
LPA 265	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Lioncourt Homes	Policy A1 (Alrewas Housing Allocations)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Supports the Dark Lane site being recognised in the Allocations. It should be appropriately described as a commitment and included within the settlement boundary. The identification of the site to accommodate 110 dwellings in the Allocations document should be increased to 121 dwellings in line with the planning permission granted. The extent of the site in the plan should be amended to reflect the site for planning permission granted and should also include additional land to the north and east as they are intergral parts of the planning permission area as they provide floodplain compensation works and adequate space for vehicular access onto Micklehome Drive

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 266	Chontell Buchanan (First City Ltd)	Policy B1, Site B14	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>LDC should consider accomodating Birmingham & Tamworths unmet housing need at this stage.</p> <p>Supports the allocation of Site B14: Land south of Highfields Road, Burntwood. Site will provide approx 250 dwellings that will help meet the needs of Burntwood. Burntwood is set in the greenbelt, due to lack of capacity within urban area it is absolutely necessary that a greenbelt site would need to be allocated to assist Burntwood in meeting its adopted housing land supply requirements</p> <p>Site B14: Land south of Highfields Road is the most appropriate green belt to be allocated for residential development and there are not any other reasonable alternatives. Green belt Review 2016 identified parcels land to the north of Burntwood are important to safeguard the countryside from encorachment, and carry greater importance in regards to the purpose of the Green Belt and therefore should not be removed.</p> <p>Confirms Site B14 is sustainable and deliverable within 5 years of the adoption of the Local Plan Allocation Document. A range of technical documents have been prepared to support development and there is no reason from a technical perspective why the site cannot be allocated and developed.</p> <p>Does not consider the Watery Lane, Curborough decision has any bearing on the requirements of Burntwood and requirement for the LPA to confrom the to Local Plan Strategy.</p>
LPA 267	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Paragraphs 1.10, 4.7 &4.8	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>The paragraphs (1.10, 4.7 & 4.8) confirms the Council is committed to review its Plan in full to address the GBHMA shortage. It also confirms that the Council continues to work proactively with partners to identify appropriate amount of growth to be accommodated within the District. The commitment to a Review of the Plan is supported. Now the unmet housing needs of Tamworth are now known (further 825 dwellings beyond 1000 accommodated in part between Lichfield and North Warwickshire) they should be addressed as part of the Allocations Plan. A more dispersed strategy over concentrating delivery in certain key locations will promote delivery within the District.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 268	Chontell Buchanan (First City Ltd)	9.4-9.9	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	LDC should consider accomodating Birmingham & Tamworths unmet housing need at this stage. Paragraph 9.4-9.9 make clear that their focus is on providing the needs for Burntwood, these do not make any reference to meeting the needs of adjoining local authorities. Burntwood is in close proximity to the West Midlands Conurbation and is identified alongisde Lichfield as the most sustainable settlements within the District therefore it woould be appropraite for both settlements to assist ahead of smaller less sustainable sites when it comes to allocating additional sites to meet housing need. Consider the Council has taken a pragmatic approach to allocating sites for residential development and supports the allocation of Site B14: Land south of Highfields Road. Giving the circumstances of Burntwood being inset within the greenbelt and the urban area being unable to accommodate the residential needs of the settlement it is justified for the removal of sites from the greenbelt to meet the required housing need. Consider exceptional circumstances have been proven by the fact that during the greenbelt review sites B14 have been identified as not performing well when considered against the reasons for including land within the greenbelt and due to the need of land in order to meet the housing needs. The local plan allocates sufficient sites to meet the housing numbers for Burntwood in accordance with the Local Plan Strategy.
LPA 269	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Policy A1 (Alrewas Housing Allocations)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Sites at Alrewas should be reconsidered as follows ; A1 – Park Road Printers – the site (net) is so small it should be treated as a windfall A2 – the land north of Alrewas – the site has permission and should be recognised as a commitment A3 – Bagnall Lock and A4 – New Lodge should be treated as a commitment Sites should be deleted or proposed yields reduced in line with objections raised.
LPA 270	Chontell Buchanan (First City Ltd)	Policy B1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Supports Policy B1 and the allocation of Site B14: land south of Highfields Road. Considers the most appropraite strategy has been presented against reasonable alternatives based on proportionate evidence. Clear there is insufficient land within the urban area and on brownfield land to accommodate the needs of Burntwood there need to allocate greenfield sites and greenfield sites will have to be selected from the Green Belt that surrounds Burntwood on all sides. Policy B1 is the most appropraite strategy in providing a deliverable and justified plan. Consider it is of upmost importance for the 19 allocations identified in policy B1 to remain in the Local Plan Allocations to meet the needs of Burntwood. It is imperative that site B14 is removed from the Green Belt.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 271	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Policy FZ1 (Fazeley Housing Allocations)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	FZ1 - Land west of Sir Robert Peel Hospital – the site is in close proximity to the A5 which because its dual carriageway at this point – the potential for the need for significant landscaped buffers to screen the development and provide appropriate noise bunding would reduce the net developable area and potential dwelling yield from this development.FZ2 –Tolsons Mill – Whilst the principle of development at this valued listed building is not objected to, no reliance upon delivery of housing from this site should be placed in the Local Plan – the development is complex involving the conversion and adaptation of listed buildings – there has been no financial feasibility to demonstrate development yield not its financial viability.FZ3 – The Green – the site does not have a clear and suitable access to support the development. The sites should be deleted or proposed yields reduced in line with the objections raised.
LPA 272	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Policy OR1 (Other Rural Housing Allocations)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	KB1 – Lichfield Road, Kings Bromley and OR2 – Lamb farm - these sites have planning permission and should be treated as a commitment. OR1 –Packington Hall and OR4 –Derry Farm – these sites are in remote locations and the number of dwellings proposed should be reduced considerably in order to minimise travel. OR3 - Footherly Hall – The contribution of development from this site should be considered in net terms given its former use - the site has planning permission and should be treated as a commitment. OR5 – Station Works – the shape and form of this site only lends itself to minimal development, especially given the proximity of the railway line – the scale of development proposed for this site should be reduced. The sites should be deleted or proposed yields reduced in line with the objections raised.
LPA 273	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Policy AH1: Armitage with Handsacre Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Land adj Hayes Meadow School (Site AH1) has planning permission and should be treated as a commitment.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 274	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Paragraph 4.1	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>It is noted and accepted that the Allocations document is not revisiting the overall need for housing which was set out in the Local Plan Strategy. It is critical that the Allocations document makes sufficient land available in viable and deliverable locations to provide choice and range throughout the plan period. Significant reliance on Strategic sites (SDAs) – not yet provided the increase to supply required. Allocation sites will have key role in providing additional range of small to medium sites which are key to effective delivery. Plan confirms that in the 8 years to 1 April 2016 the District has delivered an average of 235 dwellings per year (1,881 net new homes); significantly lower than the average annual requirement of nearly 480 dwellings to meet the Plan requirement (even more factoring the shortfall). Addressing shortfall and promoting a deliverable trajectory will require a broad range of sites. 2,299 homes are left to be identified after the SDAs (5,850 dwellings) and completions are taken into account on the assumption the SDAs deliver within the plan period. Concern that the overall delivery within the Plan is going to be compromised. It is noted that Table 4.1 (Housing Distribution and Delivery) replaces similar Table (8.1) in the Local Plan Strategy. Overall distribution remains consistent with the LPS but there are subtle changes in allocations and distributions between settlements which could have implications on delivery. The additional 10% provision over the minimum requirement in the LPS is supported, but over reliance upon windfalls and the strategy which focused 36% of growth in Lichfield may need to be reconsidered if the overall Plan requirement is to be met. Over reliance is also placed on sites within urban area which have known to be available for some time. Given the modest delivery rate over the first 9 years of the plan and the limited number of years left in the Plan, a greater range of sites is required. The NPPF states that “The Government’s key housing objective is to increase significantly the delivery of new homes”. It goes on to state that “to enable this the planning system should aim to deliver a sufficient quantity, quality and range of housing”. If the Plan doesn’t deliver the housing growth it would have significant impact on housing affordability which is a major factor affecting the District. It could also lead to unsustainable patterns of work.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 275	Chontell Buchanan (First City Ltd)	4.1 - 4.8	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Para 4.1 identifies the requirement to deliver a minimum of 10,030 dwellings by 2029. Document confirms 1881 dwellings have been completed since the start of the plan period however it fails to identify this number includes any from the SDA, this should be clarified to ensure there is no duplication of housing figures. Agrees with the approach to focus housing growth on a number of key sustainable settlements. Important to Burntwood to accommodate 13% of the overall housing target. Appreciate Councils approach towards meeting its own housing needs in the first instance, however need to consider the requirements of neighbouring authorities where it is possible to do so. The need within the GBHMA are immediate and cannot be put off for a significant number of years. Supports Policy B1 and allocation of site B14. The plan should be effective and deliverable in regard to housing provision given the Councils calculations of housing need taking into consideration that Council have allowed for an approx 11% supply of dwellings in excess of the minimum 10,030 dwellings required of the local plan.
LPA 276	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Site F1 (Fradley)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	The land at Bridge Farm Fradley should be treated as a commitment.
LPA 277	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Policy R1: Rugeley Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Land at Rugeley Power Station is not objected to, in principle it is a significant brownfield site suitable for development. Full 800 dwellings should not be allowed for in this plan period as it is a complex development which requires remediation and specialist developer. Unlikely to be remediated, readied for development, permission granted and development progressed such that 800 homes would be delivered in 10 years. Part of site falls within adjoining District and is not allocated for development - a consistent and co-operative approach needs to take place between two Authorities.
LPA 278	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Policy BE2: Heritage Assets	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	The general approach to preservation and enhancement of heritage assets is supported however the Policy is not consistent with national planning policy in that it doesn't recognise the difference between substantial and less than substantial harm, or the appropriate balance within the Framework that may judge benefits against harm. The Policy suggests that development may be supported where there will be no harm to heritage assets and this is not consistent with the Framework.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 279	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Policy NT1: North of Tamworth Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NT 1 – Arkall farm – The site is allocated for 1000 dwellings however the full 1000 dwellings should not be allowed for in this plan period – a detailed trajectory needs to be prepared in order to understand the likely realistic delivery of development on this site given the likely need for new infrastructure, the site preparation for development, permission granted and development progressed such that 1000 dwellings would be delivered within the remaining 10 years of the Plan from adoption, noting also other competing sites for delivery concurrently in this part of Tamworth.NT2 - Browns Lane should be treated as a commitment
LPA 280	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Site S1 (Shenstone)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Whilst its recognised that the site is allocated in the adopted Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan, there does need to be some consideration of the likelihood of this mixed use proposal delivering housing in the Plan period, particularly given the existing established uses on site.
LPA 281	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Policy B1: Burntwood Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	<p>Proposes a site at land west of Farewell Lane for up to 305 homes providing a deliverable and sustainable housing site option at Burntwood. The site extends 15.87ha with good access to local services and infrastructure, and is being actively promoted for development.</p> <p>The site has potential to deliver 7.13ha of Green Infrastructure including Public Open Space, areas of structural planting, potential access from Farewell Lane, central Greenspace with equipped play areas, preservation of existing Public right of way, extensive new planting.</p> <p>A detailed understanding of the site and its development potential has been gained through research into transport, access, ecology, green infrastructure, heritage and landscaping informing an emerging Illustrative Development Framework for the sites development.</p> <p>There are no environmental impediments to the sites delivery. Development at the site would provide contribution in the early part of the Plan period, protect environmental assets and development would not affect historic character or setting of the District, nature conservation, green infrastructure or floodplain.</p> <p>If the site is not allocated then at the least the land should be removed from Greenbelt and safeguarded for future development.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 282	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Policy B1: Burntwood Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Site B1 and B17 - sites are so small so should be treated as windfall and does not need to be allocated. Site B3 - loss of playing field is contrary to national policy, residential development should be focused on previously developed part of site. Site B4 and B10 - sites are within established employment area therefore not appropriate to allocate for housing. Site is also adjacent to employment uses which would detrimentally impact future residents. May be suitable for employment allocation. Site B5 - unique opportunity for use by Primary School therefore not allocated for housing. Access to serve onto Chase Terrace is unsuitable for housing. Site B8 - Site is in active use and delivery from this site shouldn't be relied upon. Site B9 - Scale of development amounts to over 100dph therefore too high - should be treated as windfall. Site B14 - Object to this Green Belt allocation, development would significantly erode gap at Brownhills. Detrimental to role of Green Belt to the south of Burntwood at the back of Highfields Lane. Site is close to M6 toll, potential for noise which casts doubt on the sites suitability for housing. B15 - Questions whether site would accommodate suggested number of dwellings given density of surrounding area. Access constrained by Coulter Lane whose rural character would be affected by highway upgrades. Site more suited to smaller low density development. B6, B11, B12, B18, B19 - site should be treated as a commitment.
LPA 283	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of The Crown Estate	Policy LC1 (Sites L3, L8, L20, W4 and OR4)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Promotes land to the south of Abnalls Lane, Lichfield (SHLAA ref 16) for development to deliver between 19-23 dwellings. Consider Abnalls Lane offers a more suitable and sustainable alternative to the proposed sites L3, L8, L20, W4 and OR4. The SHLAA assessed land south of Abnalls Lane is a more suitable, available and achievable and it can be delivered immediately. Although the site is within Green Belt it was not assessed within the Green Belt Review. Consider that the site does not have the essential Green Belt characteristic of openness. Do not consider the Council has provided enough evidence to justify why the Abnalls Lane site has not been selected.
LPA 284	Richard Brown (CBRE Ltd) on behalf of landowners in respect of land adjacent to Crown Inn, Handsacre	Table 4.1 and Armitage with Handsacre	Yes		No (not positively prepared)	Yes	Yes	Promotes land adjacent to the Crown Inn, east of Uttoxeter Road, Handsacre. Consider the Council has under-allocated housing sites to robustly meet the LPS housing requirements for the Key Rural Settlements and does not ensure a flexible supply of land across the plan period. The LPS currently fails to provide sufficient land in Armitage with Handsacre to meet its requirements. Council should consider allocating land adjacent to the Crown Inn, Handsacre for 88 dwellings.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 285	Jason Tait (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Wallace Land Investments	Policy LC1: Lichfield City Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Site L1 - Scale of housing is too high given that in policy the existing building is out of scale and character with the area. Site L2 - Further increasing the size of the SDA is objected to and should not be part of the Allocations Plan which should focus on range of alternative additional sites. Site L3 - Site is within established employment area therefore not appropriate to allocate for housing. Site is also adjacent to employment uses which would detrimentally impact future residents. May be suitable for employment allocation. Site L4 - Plan recognises with the demolition of former building, proposals for housing on this site should be considered in net terms only. Site L6 - Site is in higher risk flood area, not been demonstrated sequentially other sites are not available to justify development outside of FZ1. Site is also in mixed commercial area with uses that could be detrimental to the amenity of future occupiers. Site L7 - Site dominated by existing trees subject to Tree Preservation Order, site is not likely to deliver 27 dwellings on 0.7ha site with significant tree protection areas reducing net developable area. Site L8 - Loss of playing field contrary to national policy, part of site should be retained for recreation use. Site L9 - Site is unsuitable for housing due to elevated position in direct proximity to A38 and Burton Road. Site L10 - Principle of site is accepted however site adjoins an existing intrusive employment use including trailer park which has potential to impact upon amenity of future residents. Site is only 1ha and with constraints and in context of other nearby residential areas would not be appropriate for 38 dwellings. Site L11 - Planning permission for 6 dwellings should be treated as a commitment. Site L12 - Sensitive site due to its setting adjacent to Grade 1 listed St Johns Hospital, prominent trees along boundary of site subject to TPO. Unclear of sites extent of balance beyond the permission for 18 dwellings and therefore its suitability to accommodate the further development proposed. Sites L13, L15 and 25 - Sites should be treated as a commitment. Site L14 - Principle of site is accepted however site adjoins West Coast mainline which has the potential to impact on future residents. Significant buffer landscaped area and bund will be required. Site is only 2.7ha with constraints and in context of other nearby residential areas would not be appropriate for 99 dwellings. Site L16 - Site shouldn't be allocated, could be treated as windfall. Site has been vacant for some time and is in the urban area. Scale of housing is too high given its immediate context. Site L17 - Site shouldn't be allocated, could be treated as windfall. Site has been vacant for some time and is in the urban area. Scale of housing is too high (nearly 100dph) given its immediate context. Site affected by TPO which limits net developable area. Site near to heritage assets and listed buildings further limiting its potential.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								<p>Site L20 - Site does not have suitable access for proposed 9 dwellings, it is substandard in width and visibility at Trent Valley Road. Site L21 - Site is in active use, consideration should only be given to net gains from proposed development. Site L22 - Mixed use opportunity - highly constrained site, locally listed frontage and part in conservation area. Important to demonstrate viable feasible development before relying on contribution of 38 dwellings from the site. Site L23 - Scale of development is too high (nearly 100dph). Site should be treated as windfall. Site L24 - Object to the increase in size of the SDA at Streethay. Should not be included in Allocations Plan which should focus on alternative additional sites. Site is highly constrained with boundary to West Coast Mainline and opposite an employment area which would reduce net developable area when buffer planting and bunds are allowed for. Site L26 - Complex multi ownership and mixed use development which while suitable for redevelopment in principle, should not be relied upon for housing delivery given complexities and uncertainty surrounding its delivery. Feasibility and viability of delivery of site has not been demonstrated. Site L27 - Mixed use site and uncertain as to the extent of residential development likely to be achievable given the need to integrate it with bulky good retail and constraint of the West Coast Mainline at the rear of the site. Site L28 - Principle of development is accepted consideration should be given to only net gains. Site is complex likely to involve the conversion and adaption of buildings and carefull attention of listed buildings on site and nearby. Site should not be relied upon as no evidence of viable and deliverable development. Site L29 - Should not be relied upon due to complexities of multi ownership and mixed use development. Feasibility and viability of delivery of this site has not been demonstrated.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 286	Gill Brown (Nigel Gough Associates) on behalf of Booth Trustees	Table 5.1				Yes	Yes	Land at Fradley (SHLAA Ref: 132) has had an employment allocation since 1980s and is incapable of development for employment, its land use allocation should be amended. It cannot be reasonably and positively delivered for employment as the only access would be through the existing site where there are already pre-existing and long term arrangements for the existing committed development. With regards to DtC, question whether sufficient housing growth has been incorporated into the Lichfield Site Allocations to 2029 to defray its appropriate share of the emerging housing shortfall projections that will emanate from the the review of BCC Development Plan. With regards to legal and procedural requirements, Policy EMP1 indicates proposals outside tradition use classes will not usually be supported. SHLAA ref 132 is not suitable for this Use Class. Local Plan Allocations document could be more positively delivered if existing allocations were fully appraised on a, say 5 year basis to ensure that it is kept up to date. Where land use allocations do not 'fit', there must be the ability for reasonable changes to be made to allocations to reflect the location and settings of landholdings. Table 5.1 indicates employment at Fradley through the implementation of existing commitments and development / redevelopment within existing employment areas. The site (SHLAA Ref 132) has had an employment allocation since 1980s and is incapable of development for employment. The site could better serve the need of Lichfield DC if the land were allocated for housing.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 287	Geoff Armstrong (Armstrong Rigg Planning) on behalf of Avant Homes	Policy B1: Burntwood Housing Allocations						Proposing a site at Land at Ogle Hay Road/ Rake Hill/ Meg Lane, Burntwood with indicative yield of 246 dwellings. Site has been submitted through Call for Sites on 12th February 2016 which included indicative master plan, context plans to local services, public transport facilities, landscape constraints, transport review and flood risk review. Supplemented by comparative assessment of the site with other potential sites in Burntwood's Green Belt and performed well compared to others. Above information has either been ignored or overlooked as 2016 SHLAA assessment is identical to 2015 SHLAA, no explanation from the Council has been forthcoming regarding this issue. The assessment of this site is identical in every version of the SHLAA since 2009. A proactive and positive approach be adopted towards identifying sites which could contribute to meeting unmet needs from Birmingham and Tamworth. As there is no timetable for the Local Plan Review the Local Plan Allocations DPD should identify reserve sites capable of accommodating unmet needs from Tamworth and Birmingham. Site B15 only fulfills minor or moderate roles in Green Belt functions in the 2016 Green Belt Assessment. However, in a previous assessment of the site submitted Feb 2016 as part of the comparative assessment of Green Belt sites there was constrained access from Coulter Lane to the west. The sustainability of the site also scored poorly due to the distance from shops and services, public transport and employment centres. The proposed site is considerably closer and therefore a more sustainable choice. In the 2016 Green Belt Review, Site B14 is considered to perform an important role in preventing the merging with Brownhills. The allocation does not provide the type of permanent boundary described by the NPPF (para 85). Allocation would also bring development closer to major noise source of M6. By contrast the proposed site would have a permanent boundary in the form of Meg Lane. It serves a minor function in preventing the merging of neighbouring towns. The proposed site serves no greater Green Belt purpose than Sites B14&15 but has additional benefits in terms of loss of Green Belt function. The proposed site should replace B14 and Site B15 should be omitted. If B14 and B15 are retained, the proposed site should be identified as a reserved housing site.
LPA 288	David Stanton (Burntwood Churches United)	Section 9: Burntwood						Support the proposals of Burntwood Action Group to create shopping and residential hub to include Emanuel Church. Concerned about growth of town without further shopping and leisure facilities. Concerned about development on Green Belt land altering drainage patterns and risk of localised flooding. Not enough homes suitable for first time buyers and single parent families, provision of 1/2 bedroom apartments will redress the imbalance. Emanuel Church does not have space to expand their Foodbank, the Foodbank would be better placed at a centre so whole community can benefit.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 289	James Beynon (Quod) on behalf of Evans Property Group	Policy EMP1, Site Allocation F2, Proposals Map & Fradley Existing Employment Area Boundary	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Supports the principle of employment and supporting uses in Fradley. However as currently prepared the Draft Plan is unsound in respect of the following matters, as the approach is not justified as the most appropriate strategy considered against reasonable alternatives. The policy text to Site Allocation F2 should be made explicit that non-B Use Class operations are acceptable, particularly given the site's historical allocation for a hotel (in-part). Draft Policy EMP1 should be amended to positively support non-B Use Class operations where these are appropriate, and to ensure the flexible use of land consistent with the NPPF. Notwithstanding the above recommendation RE Policy EMP1 to support appropriate non-B Use Class uses within the 'Existing Employment Areas', the Council's inclusion of 'Employment Sites 1-3' (as shown at Appendix 1) within the Existing Employment Area at Fradley, and the acceptance of B1/b2/b8 uses in principle at these locations, is welcomed. The Midland Karting site should be included within the Fradley 'Existing Employment Area.' This site is brownfield land, it functions as part of the Fradley Business Park area and it would effectively round off the employment boundary in this location. The Council's preference to consider land to the west of Gorse Lane as part of any future plan review is noted. In line with the Government's Housing White Paper, the Council should commit to a review of their Local Plan every 5 years to ensure that it is kept up to date.
LPA 290	Tom Armfield (Turley) on behalf of Bovis Homes Ltd	Policy NT1: North of Tamworth Housing Allocations	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Plan doesn't comply with DtC in terms of housing delivery. The Local Plan Strategy is clear that the Tamworth shortfall should be addressed through the Allocations document and not a review of the strategy. No clear evidence that there is constructive dialogue between the three authorities as required by para 181 of the NPPF. Until LDC accommodates some of Tamworth's shortfall through the Allocations document the Plan does not comply with DtC. Not positively prepared in current form. Unreasonable to delay accommodating Tamworth's shortfall until future Local Plan Review when the GBHMA shortfall is also addressed. Sustainability Appraisal only considers options in regards to Lichfield's own needs and appraises no options that would accommodate Tamworth's shortfall. Proposes site at Gillway Lane, Tamworth (15.8ha) for 375 dwellings, benefits from variety of services nearby in Tamworth and Wigginton. Well located near to public transport. Site is wholly located in Flood Zone 1, no TPO's, no listed buildings or monuments on site. The SHLAA 2016 considered the site to be suitable, available and developable for residential development. Technical evidence base being prepared ahead of outline planning application.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 291	Robin Stubbs	12.14 - 12.16 Policy S1, S2 & S3	No	No	No	Site S2 should be deleted Site S3 should be deleted Consider releasing more land for housing adjacent to the NP agreed 2.1 ha of land at Shenstone Business Park (Site S1)	Yes	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross-boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 292	Julie O'Rourke (Tetlow King Planning) on behalf of West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium	Policy EMP1: Employment Areas and Allocations						Understands the Councils aspirations to protect and redevelop employment sites to contribute to delivery of 79.1ha of employment land, however encourages the Council to consider para 22 of the NPPF that states the long term protection of sites should be avoided when there is no real prospect of a site being used for employment. Employment land has not been designated in perpetuity so if more suitable uses are available the Council should take this into consideration via policy similar to that of para 22 of the NPPF. This will ensure the Plan is in accordance with national policy and is found 'sound' at examination.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 293	Yvonne Stubbs	12.14 - 12.16 Policy S1, S2 & S3	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concern relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 294	Laura McCombe (Asbury Planning) on behalf of Muller Property Group	Local Plan Allocations Document	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Promotes land to the north of Alrewas Road, Kings Bromley for the development of approx 77 dwellings. Consider Council's 5 yls is marginal given that there is only at best a surplus of 307 dwellings. Council have been over optimistic in their approach to assessing housing delivery on a number of sites and it is highly likely that the Council will experience continuing delays on their committed and allocated sites, in particular the larger sites the Council are heavily dependant on. Council have adopted a minimalist approach to allocating sites in the Allocations Document and place emphasis on delivery on larger allocated sites. This is not a positive approach.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 295	James Chadwick on behalf of Staffordshire County Council	Local Plan Allocations						<p>TransportLocal Plan Allocations Document proposed some changes to distribution of development that could necessitate a refresh of the Lichfield District Integrated Transport Strategy that was last updated following Local Plan adoption in November 2015. The Transport Strategy should be broadly still fit for purpose but may need review and some revisions where the distribution of development has changed, alternative sites are proposed or have secured planning permission. Policy Lichfield 3: Lichfield Economy - CC recognises the importance of Friarsgate and is actively involved in detailed specification and delivery of mitigating highway works to make it acceptable in transport terms. Development of 12,500m2 Grade A office uses at Lichfield South Business Park extension is likely to lead to a significant increase in commuter journeys and measures to widen modal choice will need to be considered in any TA. Burntwood - Allocation B14: Land South of Highfields Road has potential to impact on Hospital Road route, which has previously been identified as being under route stress when a cumulative assessment was undertaken. Allocation B15: East of Coulter Lane requires assessment of A5190 Lichfield Road /Farewell Lane to establish whether traffic generated is likely to materially impact on junction capacity and route performance. North of Tamworth - North of Browns Lane benefits from planning permission. Arkall Farm requires further consideration. Based on existing evidence only 300 units can be deemed to be deliverable and Policy NT1 needs further explanatory text and should be expanded to explain the process and procedures where any deficit in housing capacity will be found. East of Rugeley - increase in 350 units compared to 450 units previously considered. Support the redevelopment of the former power station site and will continue to play an active role in the masterplanning. Once the appropriate technical work is complete, SCC will update the 2015 Lichfield District Integrated Transport Strategy with respect to the scale of junction improvements works previously proposed but also take into account additional mitigation identified through TA submitted pursuant to a grant of permission on allocated sites. East of Rugeley and North of Tamworth are likely to have cross border transport implications.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								Flood RiskUndertaken an automated review of all the sites to determine any issues or matters that need to addressed during the planning application stage.EducationThe proposed allocations are in line with the strategy for provision of additional school places that was set out to support the Local Plan Strategy and is detailed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The additional 200 dwelling at Streethay can be incorporated into the school that is to be delivered as part of the larger allocation as it was planned for the school to be expandable. The details will need to be fleshed out in any planning application for additional 200 units.Staffordshire County Council SitesProvides an update on sites L8, L21, L7, B5, B3 which the County Council are land owner or have an interest.
LPA 296	John Moran on behalf of HSE	Local Plan Allocations						Identified sites within HSE consultation zones, recommeded reference in key development considerations.
LPA 297	Matthew Fox (RPS Planning) on behalf of Fradley West Consortium	Policy F1: Fradley Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Proposes a site at Fradley Junction for c.250 dwellings and employment. Development is in accordance with the LPS but has been previously overlooked for allocation. Various iterations of the SHLAA have confirmed the site as suitable and available, although questioned "achievability" which promoters have confirmed is not in doubt. The development has previously been dismissed by Council Officers as it was deemed strategic in scale despite only being promoted for c.250 dwellings. Seven Green Belt sites have been released to provide over 500 dwellings rather than allocate a brownfield site. These sites have technical constraints as well as being in derect conflict with national planning policy and the emerging Housing White Paper. The proposed site should be allocated to offset the need for Green Belt release in Lichfield. It could also be allocated as part of the GBHMA shortfall shortfall or to ensure there are no shortfalls at Rugeley Power Station.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 298	Matthew Fox (RPS Planning) on behalf of Fradley West Consortium	Table 4.1: Housing Distribution and Delivery	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Considers that various aspects of the proposed supply are unsound: The housing requirement is expressed as a minimum - there is an 11% increase over the LPS housing requirement, this is insufficient when the housing requirement is expressed as a minimum. Housing supply in the Allocations document should be maximised to ensure Lichfield provides an appropriate contribution to the GBHMA's shortfall without the need for immediate Local Plan Review. Windfall Allowance should be offset in a Local Plan to avoid double counting with proposed allocations (many of the Key Rural Settlement allocations comprise of small windfall- type sites). Windfall allowance should only be included from 2025/26 onwards therefore the allowance should be reduced to 220 units. Housing supply from Rugeley Power Station is over-optimistic, should be reduced to c.550 dwellings.
LPA 299	Matthew Fox (RPS Planning) on behalf of Fradley West Consortium	Paragraphs 1.10, 4.7 & 4.8	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>The GBHMA Strategic Growth Study's findings will be available end of September 2017 - just before or whilst the Allocations Document is in examination. Not clear how LDC will respond to this evidence in preparing the Allocations Document. The GBHMA shortfall (37,900 dwellings to 2031) and the emerging shortfall identified by the Black Country Authorities (22,000 dwellings to 2036) means that LDC will have to make a significant contribution during the Plan period through the DtC process.</p> <p>Unsound and inefficient for Allocations Document to meet the needs identified in the Strategy and to review afterwards to address the shortfall. This would also exacerbate current delays to delivery of HMA's unmet needs.</p> <p>Allocations Document should make provision for additional residential site allocations to address Lichfield's contribution to the shortfall. Commitment to review should be delivered through policy in Allocations Document rather than through Explanatory text.</p> <p>LDC should allocate site at Fradley Junction for c.250 dwellings as part of the contribution to HMA's unmet needs in the Allocations document.</p>
LPA 300	Steven Normal	Burntwood						Object to the use of Green Belt land for housing unless there are exceptional circumstances where the district and neighbours cannot accommodate more houses required. Curborough is not in Green Belt, is sustainable according to the SoS and so can lessen the pressure on the Green Belt which must take priority.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 301	Kezia Taylerson on behalf of Historic England	Local Plan Allocations Document						<p>Policy IP: Lichfield Canal - support inclusion of this policy and welcome reference to Heritage Towpath Trail. Consider the policy would benefit from text that makes reference to enhancing the historic environment. Policy ST3: Road Line Safeguarding - has there been any assessment as to the impact to heritage as a result of the proposed route allocation Chapter 7 Built and Historic Environment - supportive of inclusion of historic environment policy. Recognise what the Council is trying to achieve however in its current form the policy is unsound as it is not effective or compliant with NPPF. Suggests amendments to the policy are required and recommends the Council refer to the NPPF and reword the policy. Makes a number of site specific comments, referring the SA in relation to site L1, L3, L4, L5, L6, L8, L11, L12, L13, L17, L18, L19, L20, L21, L22, L26, L27, L28, L29, L30, B15, NT1, R1, F1, A2, A3, A4, AH1, FZ2, W2, W3, W4, OR1, OR3, OR4 and HR1. Support approach set out in Appendix E and the preparation of a design brief / SPD. Where sites are proposed for allocation and SA identified harm may occur HE consider the inclusion of a design consideration to ensure that harm is avoided / mitigated. Where there are heritage assets on site or the setting of Grade II* or Grade I asset is affected HE require further assessment to be satisfied that the Plan complies with NPPF. HE comments focus on the need for some additional considerations or refinement of considerations as a result of the evidence base. Consider objections can be overcome by suggestions within the rep and would be willing to work with the Council to prepare a SOCG.</p>
LPA 302	Michael Fox (RPS Planning) on behalf of Fradley West Consortium	Policy R1: Rugeley Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No (positively prepared = yes)	Yes	Yes	<p>No objections to proposed allocation of Rugeley Power Station, but objects to the quantum of residential dwellings assumed to be deliverable/ developable during the plan period (minimum of 800).</p> <p>LDC and Cannock Chase District Council are preparing joint SPD, unlikely to be adopted before 2020 due to timescales associated with Allocation Document and CCDC's Local Plan Part 2 document. Further to this planning permission is unlikely to be secured until 2022 and remediation implemented before any completions are delivered. Completions will only deliver in the last 6 years of the plan and taking into account the annual average delivery rate for Rugeley (91dpa between 2010/11 and 2015/16), around 550 dwellings could be delivered during the Plan period. Assumed contribution from Rugeley Power Station is unjustified and overly optimistic and should be reduced to c.550 dwellings.</p> <p>Proposed site at Fradley Junction for 250 dwellings and employment land could address loss of deliverable/ developable supply from the Power Station site during the Plan period.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 303	Rachel Jones (How planning) on behalf of Grasscroft Homes & Property Ltd	Fradley	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Promotes site to the south of Church Lane, adjacent Fradley Urban Area for development. Argues the site is in a sustainable and accessible location and development will provide economic, social and environmental benefits. The site is available, suitable and deliverable. Urban Capacity Assessment acknowledges there is evidence that Strategic Development sites in Fradley are likely to under deliver to the upper limit of the outline permission. As such, further sites should be allocated to accommodate for this. LPA document does not deliver enough housing for Lichfield. LPA document does not take account of any portion of the 37,900 additional homes which need to accommodate across the GBHMA. It is important that Lichfield District Council includes a clear mechanism for a full or partial review of its Local Plan within the Local Plan Allocations document for it be found sound. The Local Plan review mechanism should include specific timescales for an immediate Local Plan review following the publication of the Greater Birmingham Strategic Growth Study.
LPA 304	Michael Fox (RPS Planning) on behalf of Fradley West Consortium	Sustainability Appraisal	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	<p>SA contains factually inaccurate assumptions relating to site 838 (Fradley Junction). Obj 4 Q4 states that "there is a significant gap between the site and the key rural settlement of Fradley" and scored a double negative when the site will directly adjoin the new extended settlement boundary shown on Inset 12 of the Policies Map and should score at least a minor negative.</p> <p>Objective 5 Q1 states that the site is greenfield. The site is previously developed land with permanent structures. The sites brownfield status has been confirmed in the SHLAA.</p> <p>These factual errors render the SA process as flawed.</p> <p>Site at Fradley Junction should be allocated under Policy F1 for approximately 250 dwellings and employment land. Supporting document includes "Vision Document for Fradley Junction" including framework plan, planning context, environmental considerations and design evolution.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 305	Sushil Birdi on behalf of Tamworth Borough Council	Local Plan Allocations	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Tamworth is unable to meet all of its housing, employment and gypsy and traveller needs. Lichfield Local Plan Strategy commits to the provision of 500 houses towards the unmet need of 1,825 homes and to continue to work collaboratively on any further shortfall including a review of the plan or to be dealt with through the Allocations document. North Warwickshire have committed to provide 500 homes to meet the shortfall so there remains a 825 housing shortfall, a minimum of 14 ha of employment land and 1 Gypsy and Traveller pitch. Whilst some work has been undertaken at HMA level no further work has taken place within the two authorities on potential levels of affordable housing, sports and lesiure facilities and infrastructure to support the level of housing proposed at the boarder. Arkall Farm development remains a serious concern for TBC in terms of the scale of development promoted and the impact on infrastructure. TBC objected to the allocation and planning application on the basis that the existing infrastructure is unable to support this level of development. It is not a susitanable site. There have been no discussions on the mechanisms to provide further infrastructure within Tamworth which would be needed to mitigate the impact of this or other allocations and no discussions about the provision of affordable housing within the scheme to meet Tamworths needs. Arkall Farm proposes a contribution of 500 units to meet TBC unmet housing need, given the concerns it would be appropraite to consider an alternative site to meet the 500 units but also the balance of unmet need which amounts to 825 units. Commitment of 6.5ha of employment land to meet some of Tamworths unmet needs is welcomed, however, clarification is sought on the basis of this figure. The Local Plan Strategy delegated the Tamworth shortfall to the Local Plan Allocations and it is now proposed to push this back to be considered with the HMA as part of the Local Plan Review. The matter is not being dealt with and it should not continue to be left unresolved. The LPA document should deal with the matter at this stage and the HMA shortfall can be addressed at the Local Plan Strategy Review. The housing allocations proposed at Fazeley should be considered to assist in meeting Tamworth's shortfall given their proximity to Tamworth.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 306	Michael Davies (Savills) on behalf of Barratt West Midlands	Policy B1: Burntwood Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Consider that the Council's approach to site selection in Burntwood has not been soundly considered. Proposed site (land to the east of Rugeley Road, SHLAA ref 404) is a more suitable and sustainable alternative to Sites B14 and B15 and could deliver around 175 dwellings. Supporting technical documents including transport, flood risk and drainage, heritage and ecology. Proposed site was considered as "suitable, available but not achievable" due to the "unknown impact of SFRA, highway mitigation measures and sustainability impact on viability". SHLAA concluded the site was not developable, but LDC have provided no evidence to justify the conclusion that the site is unviable. Site B14 is not as well connected to the nearest neighbourhood centre as the proposed site it is also nearer to a primary school than site B14. Site B14 is part within Flood Zone 3 although the Allocations document states it is Flood Zone 1. If development is avoided in FZ3 it would reduce the net developable area from 11.8ha to 9.8ha and reduce the yield from 250 to 200 dwellings. Site B15 is identified in the SHLAA as being c.1.34ha and capable of delivering 31 dwellings, however the plan in the SHLAA is substantially larger. The plan should be amended to provide a more accurate site boundary reference. In the Supplementary Green Belt Report the proposed site was labeled under parcel BE1 and was assessed as moderately performing overall. In comparison site B14 (parcel BS1) was assessed as performing an important overall role. Parcel BE1 was the only moderately performing parcel that was assessed around Burntwood, all others served an important Green Belt role. In the Supplementary Green Belt Report it states that the site being able to accommodate 589 dwellings which is significantly more than is required to meet the LPS housing requirement for Burntwood. The figure of 589 dwellings has come from two separate promotions of land (SHLAA ref 494 for 444 dwellings and 404). Erroneous for the two sites to have been combined as they are distinctly different land parcels and also promoted by different land owners/ agents. Strongly consider parcel BE1 to have been incorrectly assessed therefore the site allocations in Burntwood is considered to be unsound.</p> <p>In the Sustainability Appraisal site B14 scored worse than the proposed site on "Within a Mineral consultation area". B14 scored better on; Landscape character, Historic buildings, value and protect distinctive character, close to sustainable transport.</p> <p>Site B15 scored worse than the proposed site on; Site not within a main settlement, not close to sustainable modes of transport, walking/cycling/bus/rail networks and accessible green space. Site B15 scored better than the proposed site on; landscape character, historic buildings and value and protect distinctive character.</p> <p>Proposed site should be considered for release before Site B14. Although Site B15 also scored moderately in the Green Belt Review, it is in a less sustainable location and not within close proximity to public transport, services and facilities.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 307	Peter Harris on behalf of Burtwood residents							Save Our Green Belt petition with 278 comments opposing development in the green belt at Burntwood. Petition with 1006 signatures. Argue building should take place on Brown Field sites primarily and that housing should be affordable to local people, supported by more school places, better transport links and more GP and health services. Want to build a better Burntwood and not just a bigger Burntwood.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 308	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) on behalf of Smith Brothers Farms Ltd	Local Plan Allocations Document	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Promotes land adjacent Birchbrook Industrial Estate (SHLAA Ref: 953) as a sustainable location to meeting housing or employment needs in Shenstone. Table 4.1 of the draft Local Plan Allocations document is intended to replace Table 5.1 and Table 8.1 of the adopted Local Plan Strategy. Paragraph 1.3 suggests the remit of the Local Plan Allocations document is to deliver growth requirements in accordance with the LPS rather than establish a new distribution strategy as appears to be the case. The growth strategy contained in the LPS has been scrutinised and found to be most sustainable option for delivering growth across the District, concerned the apportionment set out at Table 4.1 of LPA document does not appear to have been tested within the most recent Sustainability Appraisal. The spatial distribution should remain consistent with the Local Plan Strategy, unless an alternative approach, with evidence to support it is prepared to fully justify it. The figures set out in Table 4.1 appear to be led by decisions already made rather than an attempt to deliver growth strategy of the adopted Local Plan. Concerned Table 4.1 includes sites intended for allocation, many of which have planning permission. No need to allocate sites where they are under construction as they clearly no longer require policy support to assist their delivery. Consider number of sites potentially undeliverable, or the Council's expectation on their yield seem very optimistic for example all three sites in Shenstone. Suggests Table 4.1 should be updated to show the overall requirement for each settlement, based on the percentages set out at Table 8.1 of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites that have been completed or under construction should be added to completions or commitments figures and not be included as proposed allocations and the capacity of several proposed allocations need to be revisited. Paragraph 1.10, Pg 7 and Paragraphs 4.7-4.8, Page 15: Important the LPAs document explicitly commit the Council the submit a replacement or revised Local Plan for examination by January 2020 and to incorporate an appropriate contribution towards Birmingham's housing needs. There needs to be a policy commitment to undertake a Green Belt and Local Plan Review by 2020. Housing Land Supply - Urban Capacity Assessment concludes additional sites beyond the existing settlement boundaries are required to ensure the delivery of the housing requirement and to realise the spatial development strategy established through the Local Plan Strategy. UCA provides a breakdown of completed, committed and additional supply by settlement within the conclusions and recommendations section at Chapter 5. There are a significant number of proposed allocations where there is a evidence to demonstrated undeliverability, or that a reduced yield should be assumed. The proposed allocations should be reassessed and sites should be removed as proposed allocations or their potential contribution to the supply reduced accordingly. Land at Birchbrook Industrial Estate should be included as an allocation to meet Shenstone's housing needs or allocated for employment purposes if it would assist with the delivery of Site S1. Sites S1, S2 and S3: capacity of S1 needs to be scrutinised further, Sites S2 and S3 should be removed as their are serious issues regarding their deliverability. Provides a proposed concept plan</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								for Land at Birchbrook Industrial Estate and confirms the site is suitable and deliverable.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 309	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) on behalf of Mr D Wright	Local Plan Allocations Document	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Promotes land adjacent Birchbrook Industrial Estate (SHLAA Ref: 953) as a sustainable location to meeting housing or employment needs in Shenstone. Table 4.1 of the draft Local Plan Allocations document is intended to replace Table 5.1 and Table 8.1 of the adopted Local Plan Strategy. Paragraph 1.3 suggests the remit of the Local Plan Allocations document is to deliver growth requirements in accordance with the LPS rather than establish a new distribution strategy as appears to be the case. The growth strategy contained in the LPS has been scrutinised and found to be most sustainable option for delivering growth across the District, concerned the apportionment set out at Table 4.1 of LPA document does not appear to have been tested within the most recent Sustainability Appraisal. The spatial distribution should remain consistent with the Local Plan Strategy, unless an alternative approach, with evidence to support it is prepared to fully justify it. The figures set out in Table 4.1 appear to be led by decisions already made rather than an attempt to deliver growth strategy of the adopted Local Plan. Concerned Table 4.1 includes sites intended for allocation, many of which have planning permission. No need to allocate sites where they are under construction as they clearly no longer require policy support to assist their delivery. Consider number of sites potentially undeliverable, or the Council's expectation on their yield seem very optimistic for example all three sites in Shenstone. Suggests Table 4.1 should be updated to show the overall requirement for each settlement, based on the percentages set out at Table 8.1 of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites that have been completed or under construction should be added to completions or commitments figures and not be included as proposed allocations and the capacity of several proposed allocations need to be revisited. Paragraph 1.10, Pg 7 and Paragraphs 4.7-4.8, Page 15: Important the LPAs document explicitly commit the Council the submit a replacement or revised Local Plan for examination by January 2020 and to incorporate an appropriate contribution towards Birmingham's housing needs. There needs to be a policy commitment to undertake a Green Belt and Local Plan Review by 2020.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								Housing Land Supply - Urban Capacity Assessment concludes additional sites beyond the existing settlement boundaries are required to ensure the delivery of the housing requirement and to realise the spatial development strategy established through the Local Plan Strategy. UCA provides a breakdown of completed, committed and additional supply by settlement within the conclusions and recommendations section at Chapter 5. There are a significant number of proposed allocations where there is a evidence to demonstrated undeliverability, or that a reduced yield should be assumed. The proposed allocations should be reassessed and sites should be removed as proposed allocations or their potential contribution to the supply reduced accordingly. Land at Birchbrook Industrial Estate should be included as an allocation to meet Shenstone's housing needs or allocated for employment purposes if it would assist with the delivery of Site S1. Sites S1, S2 and S3: capacity of S1 needs to be scrutinised further, Sites S2 and S3 should be removed as their are serious issues regarding their deliverability. Provides a proposed concept plan for Land at Birchbrook Industrial Estate and confirms the site is suitable and deliverable.
LPA 310	Neil Cox (Pegasus) on behalf of Clearwater Properties	Local Plan Allocations Document	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	<p>Supports the allocation of Site B4: Land at Mount Road/ New Road for approximately 95 dwellings. LDC is justified in removing the site from the employment land portfolio. Mount Road Industrial Estate scored the lowest of all existing employment estates within the District for its role and importance in the Employment Land Review. Condition of buildings on the estate are of low quality; general external environment is of poor quality; number of buildings are unsuitable for continued employment use; vacancy rates on the estate are high.</p> <p>In the SHLAA the site is identified as suitable, available and achievable. It is also subject to a live outline planning application. The site is brownfield land which comprises of a number of commercial buildings that have been vacant for a number of years.</p> <p>The allocations document contains an updated housing trajectory at Appendix D, however no site specific information has been published alongside to allow for interrogation of the trajectory.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 311	Neil Cox (Pegasus) on behalf of Drayton Manor Park	Chapter 5			No	Yes	Yes	<p>Drayton Manor Park is currently covered by Policy Emp.5: Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt of the Saved Local Plan which is due to be deleted. Saved Policy Emp.5 is no longer consistent with national policy and requires reviewing in the context of the Local Plan Allocations document. Seeking continued protection from the full effect of national and Development Green Belt policy through the inclusion of a specific policy allocation within the Local Plan Allocations document to facilitate long term sustainable development and growth at Drayton Manor. Vision Document submitted in support of representation to provide an overview of long term development proposals for the Park along with a phasing plan and envisaged timescales for their delivery. It is estimated that future planned growth at the Park could see visitor spend increase by around £13 million per annum. The Local Plan Allocations document does not make any reference to Drayton Manor Park nor does it propose to replace Policy Emp.5 with a suitable alternative that is in line with currently policy. If the Allocations document was to be adopted deleting saved policy Emp.5 with no credible alternative the whole fo Drayton Manor Park would become subject to full weigh of Green Belt policy. This could have significant detrimental economic impacts to the District and neighbouring LPAs. Allocating land at Drayton Manor Park provides an opportunity for a SPD to be prepared which could take the form of masterplan and development strategy. Argue Drayton Manor Park should be considered witin Chapter 5 of the Local Plan Allocations.No assessment of Drayton Manor Park is included within the Green Belt Report 2012.Landscape and Visual Statement is submitted in support the representation. Provides comparison to Staffordshire Moorlands DC policy approach to Alton Towers and Wyre Forest District Council approach to West Midlands Safari & Leisure Park. Seeks a similar policy allocation for Drayton Mannor as afforded to West Mdilands Safari Park as this would provide an opportunity to produce a SPD for the Park's long term growth. Provides potential policy wording relating to development within the Park boundary.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 312	Neil Cox (Pegasus) on behalf of Richborough Estates	Local Plan Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Supportive of the approach that LDC have taken and the Allocations Document has taken a robust and well considered approach to site selection and Green Belt release within Whittington. The timing of the LDC Local Plan review should be brought forward and shouldn't be constrained by the timing of other emerging plans. Urban Capacity Assessment contains many inconsistencies with the approach taken and calculations within it. Many of the allocations within the Allocation document are already under construction and therefore should be recategorised as commitments or completions. A number of the allocations within the Allocations document are not deliverable or developable and therefore shouldn't be identified as allocations. As a result of this to maintain a buffer of supply, additional sites should be identified that are deliverable particularly where there is a heavy reliance on brownfield and strategic sites. Supporting document covers site issues such as sustainability, highways, infrastructure, landscape, environment, heritage, flooding and development options

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 313	Mark Dauncey (Pegasus) on behalf of Wetenhall Properties	Local Plan Allocations	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Promoting land off London Road (SHLAA Ref: 955) as a sustainable location to meet the growth needs of Lichfield City. Paragraph 1.3 suggests the remit of the Local Plan Allocations document is to deliver growth requirements in accordance with the LPS rather than establish a new distribution strategy as appears to be the case. The growth strategy contained in the LPS has been scrutinised and found to be most sustainable option for delivering growth across the District, concerned the apportionment set out at Table 4.1 of LPA document does not appear to have been tested within the most recent Sustainability Appraisal. The spatial distribution should remain consistent with the Local Plan Strategy, unless an alternative approach, with evidence to support it is prepared to fully justify it. The figures set out in Table 4.1 appear to be led by decisions already made rather than an attempt to deliver growth strategy of the adopted Local Plan. Concerned Table 4.1 includes sites intended for allocation, many of which have planning permission. No need to allocate sites where they are under construction as they clearly no longer require policy support to assist their delivery. Suggests Table 4.1 should be updated to show the overall requirement for each settlement, based on the percentages set out at Table 8.1 of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites that have been completed or under construction should be added to completions or commitments figures and not be included as proposed allocations and the capacity of several proposed allocations need to be revisited. Paragraph 1.10, Pg 7 and Paragraphs 4.7-4.8, Page 15: Important the LPAs document explicitly commit the Council to submit a replacement or revised Local Plan for examination by January 2020 and to incorporate an appropriate contribution towards Birmingham's housing needs. There needs to be a policy commitment to undertake a Green Belt and Local Plan Review by 2020. Housing Land Supply - Urban Capacity Assessment concludes additional sites beyond the existing settlement boundaries are required to ensure the delivery of the housing requirement and to realise the spatial development strategy established through the Local Plan Strategy. There are a significant number of proposed allocations where there is evidence to demonstrate undeliverability, or that a reduced yield should be assumed. The proposed allocations should be reassessed and sites should be removed as proposed allocations or their potential contribution to the supply reduced accordingly. To maintain a buffer of supply, additional sites should be identified that are deliverable such as land off London Road, Lichfield. Provides supporting technical documents in relation to land off London Road including an Ecological Appraisal, Transport Appraisal and Landscape and Visual Impacts Appraisal. Confirms site is suitable, available and achievable for development.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 314	Louise Whinnet (Pegasus) on behalf of Acre Architects	Local Plan Allocations			No	Yes	Yes	<p>Promotes land off Court Drive, Shenstone for approximately 100 dwellings. Consider that Part II of the Local Lane should respond positively to housing shortfall across the HMA in order to meet the test of soundness. The Local Plan Allocation needs to state a clear commitment to an early Plan Review, identify suitable sites as Safeguarded Land and as a minimum plan for the delivery of at least the minimum amount identified within the Local Plan Strategy and a 20% buffer should be applied. Assesses how Sites S1, S2 and S3 in Shenstone fail to satisfy the tests of soundness, particularly in respect of deliverability. Site S1 - large proportion of the site is located within FZ2 and FZ3, insufficient information available to understand why this site is the most appropriate location when assessed against alternatives. Local Plan Strategy identifies the site for employment and seeks to guide development away from areas of flood risk. Site S2 - Site is Green Belt, Fotherley Brook forms the eastern boundary of the site, therefore south east of site falls within FZ2 and FZ3 and the site is located within close proximity of two identified Biodiversity Alert Sites. Site S3 - close proximity to FZ2 and FZ3 located to north of the site. The Open Space Assessment identifies this area of land as 'amenity greenspace' within Shenstone and Policy HSC1 seeks to protect such land. Site is identified on SCC mapping system as Common Lane. Provides supporting technical documents in relation to land off Court Drive including an FRA, Landscape and Visual Statement and Green Belt Analysis and indicative masterplan. Provides an assessment of the SA.</p>
LPA 315	Neil Cox (Pegasus) on behalf of Richborough Estates	Local Plan Allocations Document	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Proposes a site at land off Plantation Lane, Bonehill for Green Belt release to meet the housing requirements for the Plan period in Fazeley, Bonehill and Mile Oak (2.34ha net developable area).</p> <p>There are clear difficulties with a number of brownfield and infill sites within the settlement boundary that cannot be relied upon (Tolsons Mill - lapsed planning permission). Therefore more Green Belt release should be considered as a result of the difficulties in the delivery of the North of Tamworth BDL.</p> <p>In the Supplementary Green Belt Report 2016 the parcel that the proposed site is within the lower section of Parcel Fazeley 4. The southern part of Parcel Fazeley 4 had a lesser impact on the role of Green Belt than the other surrounding parcels (excluding Parcel Fazeley 2).</p> <p>Local Plan should be replaced or reviewed by January 2020 to incorporate an appropriate contribution to unmet needs of the GBHMA. Tamworth's remaining unmet need (825 dwellings between Warwickshire and LDC) needs to be addressed within the Allocations Document.</p> <p>Housing trajectory at Appendix D has no site specific information to allow for interrogation.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 316	Rachel Jones (How planning) on behalf of Grasscroft Homes & Property Ltd	Policy F1: Fradley Housing Allocations	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Promotes land at Hay End Lane in Fradley as a sustainable location that offers an opportunity for allocation for housing development. References to the Urban Capacity Assessment 2016 and the SHLAA to highlight that the Council accept outline planning permissions and SDA sites in Fradley are likely to under deliver and further sites should be allocated to accommodate this. Lichfield will need to accommodate a portion of Birmingham's shortfall. Whilst it is clear from the Local Plan Allocations document that the Council is committing to a Local Plan review to address the housing requirements of the GBHMA, the Council should plan to meet its housing needs, including a contribution towards the needs of the GBHMA now. To achieve this, additional sites should be identified for housing allocations in the LPA document to address this shortfall. If the Council does not plan to contribute towards the GBHMA need now then a Local Plan Review mechanism needs to be clear as to when this review will take place. With regards to 5 year housing land supply, the Council currently use the Liverpool method, should the Council adopt the Sedgefield approach, HOW calculated the Council's currently land supply to be in the region of 4.31 years (20% buffer) or 4.65 (5% buffer). Policy F1 allocates Bridge Farm for 80 units. Compares Paragraph 12.2 and Urban Capacity Statement. UCS states that there is anecdotal evidence that certain parts of the SDA may not be built out to the upper limit of the outline permissions, therefore additional sites in Fradley need to be allocated. Land at Hay End Lane is a sustainable site and can deliver 54 dwellings. Outlines the key economic, social and environmental benefits associated with development at this site. Supporting technical studies submitted including a landscape appraisal and Phase 1 Habitat Survey. Confirms the site is available, suitable and achievable for development.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 317	Liz Boden (Pegasus) on behalf of C Zero Developments Ltd	Policy W1: Whittington Housing Allocations	Yes	Yes	No (NPPF)	Yes	No	Supports the inclusion of land west of Common Lane, Whittington as an allocation site. Exceptional circumstances to justify the Green Belt release have been demonstrated through housing needs and lack of affordability in the rural area. Site is promoted as 10 custom/ self build units. In the Sustainability Appraisal the site scored a single positive for close proximity to key services when it is contended that the actual scoring should be a double positive due to ease of access (including pedestrian) to amenities and facilities. The site also scores a single positive for location encouraging the use of existing sustainable modes of transport which again is contended as the site is adjacent to a bus stop and should therefore be a double positive. The Sustainability Appraisal's assessment of the site's contribution to a number of ecological sustainability objectives is a single negative however evidence from supporting documents suggest it should be scored as a neutral effect or minor positive effect on sustainability objective. Similar can be said of Objective 4 and 10 in that they should be neutral or minor positive scoring rather than single negative. The site is promoted as custom/ self build, the only multi-plot site proposed for custom build in the District, therefore the only opportunity for LDC to demonstrate compliance with Private Housebuilding legislation and policy. Private Housebuilding has not been considered through the LPS or the Allocations Document therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 50 and 159 of the NPPF. There is currently a shortage of self build plots in the District, LDC should work with the client to try to balance entitlement to a plot with plot opportunities. To make the Allocations document fully sound inclusion of policy support for custom/ self build dwellings; bringing it in line with Government guidance and in accordance with the NPPF.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 318	Neil Cox (Pegasus) on behalf of Persimmon Homes	Local Plan Allocations Document	Yes	Yes	No (justified and effective)	Yes	Yes	Representation relates to the South of Lichfield SDA which is within the control of Persimmon Homes. Supports that the Local Plan Allocation document does not propose to amend within the LPS policies which impact the Spatial Strategy or the SDA that relates to the St John's site within the South of Lichfield SDA. The Plan provides a commitment to undertake a review of the Local Plan to address shortfall within the GBHMA. This commitment is supported but needs to provide further clarity and certainty relating to the date by which a MOU to deal with the distribution of growth and unmet need of GBHMA will be signed and the date for adopted of an updated Local Plan. The Council should submit a replacement or revised Local Plan for examination by January 2020 in line with the Birmingham Development Plan. Confirms the S106 in respect of the South of Lichfield SDA is expected to be signed imminently. Provide a likely trajectory within the SDA which shows 25 units being delivered in 2017/2018 and the site being built out by 2023/2024. Support the Urban Capacity Assessment 2016 conclusion that completions, commitments and additional capacity on uncommitted sites within the existing urban area are not sufficient to meet the established 3,900 dwelling requirement. Question the purpose of allocating non-strategic sites that are already committed with detailed planning and are under construction. Policy ST3 (Road Line Safeguarding) proposed protection for the route of the Tamworth Road / London Road junction and Birmingham Road. The route of the proposed road between London Road / Tamworth Road and the Cross-City railway line will be secured through planning permission for the St John's scheme. As drafted Policy ST4 is not effective as it seeks to protect the land required to deliver road and junction improvements but the Policies Map fails to identify the necessary land. Question whether this policy is necessary as a number of junction improvements related to South of Lichfield SDA will be secured through planning condition and as all land required for delivery of the road and junction improvements is within the existing public highway there appears to be no justification for securing any additional policy protection

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 319	Jason Carwood	Site W1: Land at Huddlesford Lane, Whittington						Opposes the allocation of Site W1: Land at Huddlesford. Encroachment of development: Site W1 continues the function of the adjacent allotments and recreation area in the role as Green Belt land of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Green Belt Review 2012 and supplement 2013 give this site an overall 'important' status as a reflection of its role as Green Belt land. Core Policy 6 states the only development that will be permitted for rural areas is small scale development, does not consider W1 identified for 60 dwellings as small scale development. Openness: Site W1 is a notable approach to the village. The impact of inappropriate development, such as housing, would cause significant harm to the openness of this approach to the village. Compares to Site W4 and SHLAA Ref: 748 which are well screened from the highway and argues the contribution these sites make to openness is moderate or less than moderate. Community Use: Footpath 10(a) passes through Site W1 and is a well-used connection between the North and West quarters of the village, particularly for people walking their dogs. Local Infrastructure & Services: Impact the development will have on local services, particularly Doctors Surgery and local primary school which is already oversubscribed. Highways: Highlights difficulties in achieving safe access and states development of Site W1 would significantly increase congestion and be contrary to policy T & M1 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.
LPA 320	Susan Broughton	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 321	Susan Broughton	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as they have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 322	Neil Cox (Pegasus) on behalf of St Modwen Developments Ltd and Persimmon Homes	Local Plan Allocations Document	Yes	Yes	No (justified and effective)	Yes	Yes	Cricket Land SDA is in control of St Modwen and Persimmon Homes who are in the process of preparing a planning application to be submitted to LDC later this year. They support the continued recognition of the importance of SDA's in delivering homes, jobs and supporting infrastructure. The emerging scheme at Cricket Lane assumes the majority of employment floorspace will be provided within B8 and B1c/B2 uses. Local Plan should be replaced or reviewed by January 2020 to incorporate an appropriate contribution to unmet needs of the GBHMA. Tamworth's remaining unmet need (825 dwellings between Warwickshire and LDC) needs to be addressed within the Allocations Document. Commitment should be included in a specific policy in Chapter 4 to ensure the Local Plan is sound. Housing trajectory at Appendix D has no site specific information to allow for interrogation. Sites L3, L4, L11, L13, L15, L28 are non-strategic sites that are committed and are under construction, they should be removed from the Allocations document and Table 4.1 updated accordingly. Policy ST4 seeks to protect land required to deliver these roads and junction improvements, however the Policies Maps fail to identify the land. As the land required is within existing public highway land there is no justification for securing additional policy protection.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 323	Jane Field on behalf of Environment Agency	Local Plan Allocations Document						<p>Level 1 SFRA was updated in 2014 to take into account new model data, however does not take account of the revised climate guidance issues in 2016 which requires a greater allowance to be made than the 20% used within the SFRA. Do not necessarily need to update this to support the site allocation documents but recommend providing a brief addendum in order to clarify how applicants should consider flood risk issues when undertaking flood risk assessments. Seek to address implications of the increase in climate change allowances on the site allocations when carrying out a Level 2 SFRA. Sites Rugeley 1, Alrewas 2, Shenstone 1, Shenstone 2, Other Rural 3 and Other Rural 5 fall within the floodplain and if they are to be carried forward as an adopted allocation need to be sequentially tested using the mapped outputs of the Level 1 SFRA. Should any of the sites pass the Sequential Test and progress towards submission they will need to be supported by a Level 2 SFRA. Sites L2, L5, L6, L29, B14, NT1 and F2 may be affected by flooding from an Ordinary watercourse. Recommend SCC as LLFA advise on how any risk should be managed. Lichfield Canal: Concerned with wording with the IDP as it appears to discourage infiltration based SuDS techniques in favour of discharging surface waters into the canal as a water source. Recommend wording of draft Policy IP2 and supporting IDP are amended to bring in line with adopted CP3 and paragraph 2.2 should be amended. Groundwater Protection: Recommends sites that are located within Source Protection Zones 1 and 2 includes some reference to adopted Policy CP3 which acknowledges the risks to groundwater in these areas. IDP: Recommend Page 22 headed Water Resource Infrastructure Needs is amended to Water abstraction and impoundment and reference to Lock 26 be removed. Water Cycle Study: Discussions should take place with South Staffs Water to determine whether there are any implications of the Water Resources Management Plan for the recommendations of the WCS. Sustainability Appraisal: SA does not address the issues of the flood risk Sequential Test. Recommend the following sites Alrewas 28, Other Rural 935, Other Rural 1022, Rugeley 1031, Shenstone 30, Shenstone 480 and Shenstone 785 are checked within the SA to ensure they have the correct flood zones and are sited appropriately within Q10 to reflect this negative impact.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 324	David Onions (Pegasus) on behalf of Wilson Bowden Developments	Local Plan Allocations Document	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Representation relates to Land at Hay End Lane, Fradley, which is in the control of Wilson Bowden developments. Analysis of the site can be found in the background document submitted with representations. It is considered that the Local Plan does not go far enough to address the GBHMA. To help address the Birmingham overspill LDC should allocate further housing allocations in the Allocations document. This could include Land at Hay End Lane, Fradley which is well placed to meet the future housing needs of the area. Only one housing allocation for Fradley at Bridge Farm, which has outline planning permission for up to 80 dwellings, despite being a key centre for growth. The site is highly sustainable as 18.2ha of employment land has been allocated in Fradley. Failure to allocate further housing in Fradley could lead to unsustainable patterns of development and commuting. Allocating the proposed site would provide greater flexibility in the Local Plan which is necessary to deliver future housing needs. A number of allocated sites are already under construction or are completed, these should be recategorised within the Allocations document and the site allocation figures revised accordingly. Recommends that LDC's allowance of 55 dwellings per annum for windfalls is removed for the first 3 years of the total supply as they are already accounted for in the identification of supply. LDC are experiencing a delay in delivering homes as a result of the SDA's running behind the timescales set in the LPS. The Housing trajectory at Appendix D has no site specific information to allow for detailed commentary.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 325	Neil Cox (Pegasus) on behalf of Miller Homes Ltd	Local Plan Allocations Document	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Representation relates to land at Streethay (Phase 2) which is in control of Miller Homes Ltd. The Plan provides a commitment to undertake a review of the Local Plan to address shortfall within the GBHMA. This commitment is supported but needs to provide further clarity and certainty relating to the date by which a MOU to deal with the distribution of growth and unmet need of GBHMA will be signed and the date for adopted of an updated Local Plan. The Council should submit a replacement or revised Local Plan for examination by January 2020 in line with the Birmingham Development Plan. Housing delivery has not been realised as originally intended in the Local Plan Strategy, the deficit has not been addressed through alternative sites coming forward to take up any shortfall and the LPS made no provision for such an occurrence. Miller Homes welcomes the inclusion of an updated housing trajectory contained within Appendix D however no site specific information has been published. The updated trajectory reflects poor delivery performance experienced within the Plan period to date particularly the delay in delivering the SDAs. Good progress has been made on the East of Lichfield (Streethay SDA). Confirms the likely trajectory within this SDA is 100 units in 17/18 with the development being built out by 2022/2023. Disagree with the Urban Capacity Assessment 2016 conclusion that at Stage 1 the LPA document needs to make further provision for a minimum of 1,825 dwellings of which 789 need to be focused towards Lichfield City. UCS contains inconsistencies and problems with the approach taken and the calculations within it, many of allocations are already under construction and should not be identified as new allocations, many of the allocations are not deliverable or developable, once those sites not deliverable or developable are removed there will be a deficit across the District against the housing target and on this basis additional sites should be allocated to maintain a buffer. Supports Urban Capacity Assessment conclusion that completions, commitments and additional capacity on uncommitted sites within the existing urban area are not sufficient to meet the established 3,900 dwelling requirement. It is necessary to look beyond the existing urban area around Lichfield City. Supports the proposed extension to East of Lichfield SDA (Site L2).

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								<p>Unclear whether proposed extension to the SDA are intended to form part of the urban area of Lichfield City or whether it should be included within the Streethay village settlement boundary. Recommends Streethay village be extended to include East of Lichfield SDA and Site Ref L2 or remove the village boundary and combine with Lichfield City and Streethay. Miller Homes support the allocation of additional land to extend the existing SDA however questions the necessity to allocate sites that are already under construction. These sites should be removed from the Local Plan Allocations Document. Land East of Lichfield is not constrained by Green Belt and is a sustainable location for housing growth. Confirms Site L2 is suitable, available and achievable to deliver additional dwellings to meet longer term housing need. Provide a supporting opps and cons plan, Landscape and Visual Appraisal Plan and Illustrative Development Frameowrk Plan to idenfy how 200 homes culd be delivered on the site. Unclear whether proposed extension to the SDA are intended to form part of the urban area of Lichfield City or whether it should be included within the Streethay village settlement boundary. Recommends Streethay village be extended to include East of Lichfield SDA and Site Ref L2 or remove the village boundary and combine with Lichfield City and Streethay. Miller Homes support the allocation of additional land to extend the existing SDA however questions the necessity to allocate sites that are already under construction. These sites should be removed from the Local Plan Allocations Document. Land East of Lichfield is not constrained by Green Belt and is a sustainable location for housing growth. Confirms Site L2 is suitable, available and achievable to deliver additional dwellings to meet longer term housing need. Provide a supporting opps and cons plan, Landscape and Visual Appraisal Plan and Illustrative Development Frameowrk Plan to idenfy how 200 homes culd be delivered on the site.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 326	Michelle Simpson-Gallego (Pegasus) on behalf of Bloor Homes	Local Plan Allocations Document	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Representations relate to land to the east of Coulter Lane, Burntwood which is within the control of Bloor Homes and submit promotional document in support of the allocation. The Plan provides a commitment to undertake a review of the Local Plan to address shortfall within the GBHMA. This commitment is supported but needs to provide further clarity and certainty relating to the date by which a MOU to deal with the distribution of growth and unmet need of GBHMA will be signed and the date for adopted of an updated Local Plan. The Council should submit a replacement or revised Local Plan for examination by January 2020 in line with the Birmingham Development Plan. Housing delivery has not been realised as originally intended in the Local Plan Strategy. The deficit has not been addressed through alternative sites coming forward to take up any shortfall. Whilst the Council has updated its housing trajectory, no site specific information has been published. Good progress has been made in the delivery of the Land East of Burntwood Bypass SDA, however there is shortfall of 30 units against the assumed yield set out in the LPS. Supportive of undertaking an Urban Capacity Assessment to illustrate the finite brownfield capacity that is present within the existing urban area. Argue that the total supply for Burntwood should be reduced from 1,035 to 1,009 dwellings. UCS contains inconsistencies and problems with the approach taken and the calculations within it, many of allocations are already under construction and should not be identified as new allocations, many of the allocations are not deliverable or developable, once those sites not deliverable or developable are removed there will be a deficit across the District against the housing target and on this basis additional sites should be allocated to maintain a buffer. Welcome the preparation of the Local Plan Allocations Supplementary Green Belt Report 2016. It provides an assessment of parcels at the Former St Matthews Hospital and justifies a revised Green Belt boundary to integrate St Matthews into the wider settlement of Burntwood. There is a requirement to consider the issue of safeguarded land now through the Local Plan Allocations document rather than push it to a future review.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								<p>Pegasus submitted supporting Landscape and Visual Constraints and Opportunities report which endorses many of the conclusions contained within the Council's evidence base and establishes the site does not perform an important role in respect of Green Belt purposes. Bloor Homes full spoort the allocation of Land East of Coulter Lane (Site B15) for 80 dwellings. The site is suitable, available and deliverable. Welcome the approach that the built up area of St Matthews is removed from the Green Belt. The removal of land to the East of Coulter Lane and its allocation for residential development is in accordance with the Green Belt Report and Supplementary Report. Submitted supporting technical assessments including an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey, Lanscape Strategy, Flood Risk Statement and Highway Access Technical Note. Provides comments in relation to the SA and SHLAA with regards to land to the east of Coulter Lane. Confirms the site is available and suitable for development.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 327	Michelle Simpson-Gallego (Pegasus) on behalf of Bloor Homes	Local Plan Allocations Document	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<p>Representations relate to land to the west of Coulter Lane, Burntwood which is within the control of Bloor Homes and submit promotional document and evidence in support of the safeguarding of this site which can deliver approx 400 dwellings. The Plan provides a commitment to undertake a review of the Local Plan to address shortfall within the GBHMA. This commitment is supported but needs to provide further clarity and certainty relating to the date by which a MOU to deal with the distribution of growth and unmet need of GBHMA will be signed and the date for adopted of an updated Local Plan. The Council should submit a replacement or revised Local Plan for examination by January 2020 in line with the Birmingham Development Plan. Housing delivery has not been realised as originally intended in the Local Plan Strategy. The deficit has not been addressed through alternative sites coming forward to take up any shortfall. Whilst the Council has updated its housing trajectory, no site specific information has been published. Good progress has been made in the delivery of the Land East of Burntwood Bypass SDA, however there is shortfall of 30 units against the assumed yield set out in the LPS. Bloor Homes considers further land should be identified for development within Burntwood to ensure the Local Plan is effective in ensuring that the housing requirement of 1,350 for the settlement can be delivered. The issue of safeguarded land was considered through the examination of the LPS. As the issue of safeguarded land was not dealt with through the LPS there is a requirement to consider this issue now through the Allocations documents rather than push this to a future review. Submit a Landscape and Visual Constraints and Opportunities report to complement to Councils Green Belt evidence base. Land to the west of Coulter Lane provides a sound option for assisting in delivering homes in the longer term and should be safeguarded to meet longer term housing requirements which are to be considered through the forthcoming Local Plan review. Provides summary on Burntwood Allocations and highlights issues with a number of the allocations, some of which are already advanced and have been completed and other are showing no certainty of being delivered. Comments on the Green Belt Review, SHLAA and SA relating to Coulter Lane. Confirms land west of Coulter Lane is a suitable and sustainable location for residential development and represents a deliverable proposition, being available now and providing every prospect that a significant number of dwellings can be delivered.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 328	Stacey Green (Barton Willmore) on behalf of the Church Commissioners for England	Local Plan Allocations Document						<p>Representation relates to land at the west of Ironside Road and west of Stables Way, Burntwood. The site is Green Belt, suitable for 375 dwellings and is situated between existing built edge of Burntwood and the boundary with Cannock Chase District and the Chasewater SSSI. The site has not been included in the Green Belt Review, Supplementary Report 2013 or the LPA Supplementary Green Belt Report 2016. Unreasonable for LDC to propose allocations at Burntwood in the Green Belt without due consideration for sites adjacent to the urban area. Lichfield District are aware of the need to assist Birmingham City Council in meeting their unmet housing needs, it is considered that some additional non-strategic sites should be identified now to ensure that the housing need of the wider HMA is met. Barton Willmore have undertaken a Green Belt assessment which is submitted as part of a supporting document. The southern part of the site has been assessed by Barton Willmore as providing a "limited contribution" to the purposes of the Green Belt and the northern part a "some to a limited contribution". Parcel B14 is assessed as contributing "some to a limited contribution" and Parcel B15 contributes "some to a little" to the purposes of the Green Belt. Concerns regarding how the cumulative supply of 11,191 in Table 4.1 has been calculated. Consider a 10% demolition / non-implementation buffer should be applied to committed supply, non-strategic allocations and windfall allowance, and it should also be applied to strategic allocations. The windfall allowance should not be included for the next three years to avoid double counting. Paragraph 47 of NPPF requires LPAS to significantly boost the supply of housing. It is not considered the Allocations Document does this and additional land should be allocated such as land west of Ironstone Road and west of Stables Way to ensure flexibility. Over reliance on brownfield sites which is considered to be slow to deliver and can have many barriers to redevelopment. LDC is encouraged to safeguard land adjacent to the urban area of Burntwood to help promote sustainable patterns of growth.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 329	Gemma Johnson (Barton Willmore) on behalf of Sarah Milward (IM Land)	Local Plan Allocations Document			No	Yes	Yes	<p>Promoting land to the north of Lichfield for residential development of approximately 200 dwellings. Lichfield District are aware of the need to assist Birmingham City Council in meeting their unmet housing needs, it is considered that some additional non-strategic sites should be identified now to ensure that the housing need of the wider HMA is met. Concerns regarding how the cumulative supply of 11,191 in Table 4.1 has been calculated. Consider a 10% demolition / non-implementation buffer should be applied to committed supply, non-strategic allocations and windfall allowance, and it should also be applied to strategic allocations. The windfall allowance should not be included for the next three years to avoid double counting. Paragraph 47 of NPPF requires LPAS to significantly boost the supply of housing. It is not considered the Allocations Document does this and additional land should be allocated such as land at North Lichfield to ensure sufficient flexibility within the Plan. Local Plan Allocations proposes to review the Green Belt to accommodate additional residential allocations. It is not considered that the Council have examined fully reasonable options for meeting their housing requirements outside of the Green Belt. Land to the north of Lichfield is outside of Green Belt and is capable of accommodating approximately 200 dwellings. Considered all reasonable alternatives to Green Belt release should be considered prior to the release of Green Belt land. Additional allocations should be made to boost the supply of housing and provide flexibility. Promotes land at North Lichfield, confirms there are no constraints and the site is in a sustainable location for development. Submits supporting promotional document, transport and flood risk note and landscape capacity assessment.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 330	Dennis Pollard representative of residents of St Matthews Estate	Policy B1& Paragraph 14					Yes	120 signed copies of letter received from residents of St Matthews Estate objecting to the proposal to remove the estate from the Green Belt. Request to participate at EIP to explain how many residents have only just become aware of the proposal and see it as a threat to the surrounding green belt, movement of traffic in the area, availability of school places and ability to access medical facilities. Object to remove St Matthews from the Green Belt as out in Policy Burntwood 1: Burntwood Environment and accommodate residential allocations (Site B15) to assist in meeting the housing requirement for Burntwood. Consider Paragraph 14 'integration of this area with the town would be beneficial in allowing the St Matthews Estate to function as part of the larger urban area' as meaningless nonsense as St Matthews estate has functioned well for the past 18 years and being in the Green Belt has never been a barrier to changes to properties. This is a ploy to justify the removal of adjacent land from the Green Belt
LPA 331	Generic Green Belt Petition	Section 9: Burntwood						I/we the undersigned call on Lichfield District Council to protect the Green Belt and ensure that housing development primarily takes place on Brownfield sites across the District. Signed by 37 people.
LPA 332	Burntwood & Hammerwich Labour Party Petition	Section 9: Burntwood						Please find enclosed a petition of 94 signatures and survey responses from 60 residents opposing the loss of Green Belt to housing development.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 333	Stephen Fairweather	12.14 - 12.16	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building
LPA 334	Stephen Fairweather	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 337	Mrs Pauline Boss	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 338	Mr Roy Parkes	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 339	Mr Ian Tucker	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 340	Mrs Louise Hearne	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 341	J Hancox	Policy B1, Site B14 & Site B15						<p>Objects to building on the Green Belt land surrounding Burntwood. Burntwood will on the one side sprawl further to becoming a suburb of Lichfield and on the other as far as Brownhills at the A5.</p> <p>NPPF contains presumption in favour of sustainable development, sites in Green Belt on the periphery of Burntwood are not sustainable. Further expansion of the Burntwood boundary will exacerbate the situation regarding local of services and insufficient infrastructure.</p> <p>Ask Council to consider carefully the real requirements of people struggling to buy a home and whether those needs could be better met by affordable development on brownfield sites.</p>
LPA 342	JC and D Howells	Other Rural Longdon						<p>Suggest some areas for development should be identified within villages in order to maintain their viability and prevent them becoming old peoples' homes, losing schools, shops and post offices and transport services. Particularly concerned for the village of Longdon. Consider Longdon suitable for development as it has local services and facilities, good transport links, not blighted by HS2 and serves approximately 1750 residents. Longdon is viable as it has amenities which would be preserved and enhanced if further affordable housing was provided. Compares Longdon to Kings Bromley where since houses have been under construction a new shopping complex has been constructed and public house opened.</p>
LPA 343	Cllr Susan Woodward on behalf of LDC Labour Group	Site B14 (Burntwood) Site B15 (Burntwood)						<p>Opposes development within Green Belt, in particular sites B14 and B15.</p> <p>Do not believe there is any justification for sites at Coulter Lane and Highfields Road to be considered as 'exceptional circumstances.'</p> <p>Burntwood suffers from lack of infrastructure investment. Services have not followed development. Burntwood community is overwhelmingly opposed to any reduction of its valued Green Belt.</p> <p>Do not believe all brownfield sites within the District have been considered or that evidence showing brownfield sites to be 'unsustainable' has not been provided or tested. Urge all brownfield sites to be thoroughly investigated before allocations are made on Green Belt.</p> <p>Labour Group believe what is exception about these two sites is the controversy and opposition, including cross-Party opposition, that they have received.</p> <p>Argue the impact of the proposals in Burntwood is disproportionate and totally unacceptable. There is no guarantee that any planning gain monies would address the current problems, let alone possible future problems.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								Believe sites B14 and B15 would probably become commuter areas, adding little to the community life in the town while adding to the pressures on its services.
LPA 344	Stephen Cowley	Local Plan Allocations Document	No	No	No	Yes	No	Local authorities need to work with the public. Documents need to be easily accessible and easy to understand.
LPA 345	John Turnbull	Burntwood						Quotes an article about Burntwoods infrastructure and services from 1977 and states Burntwood is still waiting for its provision of community facilities in 2017. LDC without justification has decided Burntwood is a strategic direction for housing presuming it is sustainable. Questions where is the evidence to supports LDCs presumption.
LPA 346	A Leech	Site B14						Land south of Highfield Road is green belt land which is meant to be provide open space and green fields for the health and well being of local residents. This is an environmental issue invading the rights of the existing population to space and greenery. Objects to the development of another estate.
LPA 347	Aurthur Grant	Burntwood	No		No (justified and effective)		No	The response form is a hinderance to members of the public. To answer some of the questions requires specalist knowledge. Signs BAG petition. Site B14 is last remaining 'buffer' between West Midlands conurbation and Burntwood and should be preserved. B14 is observed as area of green preservation when walking at Chasewater. To allow site B14 to become a housing development would blight the views from Chasewater and degrade its abiltiy to refresh those who seek to enjoy the open spaces which are left.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								The infrastructure of Burntwood is inadqueate now, without further increasing population.
LPA 348	J Davies	Burntwood						The proposed development south of Highfields Road would effectively give a continuous housing development to either side fo the toll road. Promises made at the time of the toll road construction regarding maintaining the Green belt have faded into insignificance. Coulter Lane is a pleasent area to walk in. Building to the east of the lane is going to remove the rural character and seems to be a prelude to 'developing' the fields between Coulter Lane and Rugeley Road. There is still brownfield land in Burntwood which could be built on why is there a need to build on Green Belt land.
LPA 349	Alison Parr	Site B14: Land south of Highfields Road			No (effective)			The plans to build on the farmland off Highfields Road (250 homes) is totally inappropriate as local facilities cannot accommodate this development. The roads cannot support extra traffic. Continual expansion on the green belt areas is destroying the local countryside for good. The Council should look to more brownfield sites. It could be more appropraite to build a few complexes for elderly residents and free up some of the existing large dwellings for families.
LPA 350	Anne Barter	Burntwood			No (justified)			Opposes any building on green belt land in the Burntwood area. These is brown land which could be used and resources should be employed to identify and utilise these areas before any green belt area is considered for housing.
LPA 351	Alan Bliss	Site B15: Land east of Coulter Lane						Supports Burntwood Action Group in their stance against proposals to construct houses on green belt land in and around Burntwood. Strongly opposes the allocation of land to the east of Coulter Lane and the impact this will have on services and infrastructure. Bloor Homes plan proposes a further 400 homes west of Coulter Lane and 80 homes to the east will set a precedent for further development.
LPA 352	Wendy Taylor	Site B14: Land south of Highfields Road						Object strongly to the proposed housing off Highfields Road. The section of green belt is very narrow and much has already been lost with the construction of the M6 Toll. The remaining land is precious and should be protected from development. There is insufficient infrastructure for any more housing developments of this site.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 353	Brian Budley	Site B14: Land south of Highfields Road						Object to the proposed housing allocation at highfields Road within the Green Belt which is contrary to the NPPF. The District Councils Green Belt Review determined the area is narrow and too important to build on. Development will cause Burntwood to join up with the West Midlands. Councils can only release Green Belt in exceptional circumstances after all other options have been considered including brownfield sites. Infrastructure such as roads, schools and health facilities are overcrowded. Desecration of green belt is contrary to Conservative manifesto 2015.
LPA 354	Frances McCallum	Policy B1: Burntwood Housing Allocations						Object to proposed development of Green Belt land around Burntwood. NPPF states that Green belt should only be developed under very special circumstances and does not believe that the circumstances are very special. Proposed site at Highfields Road will mean there is no definition between Brownhills and Burntwood. Once development has happened there is no going back. This is against public opinion.
LPA 355	Jason Beeston	Site B14: Land south of Highfields Road						Objects to development on land South of Highfields Road. Concerned about the impact the development will have on traffic levels, air quality and local infrastructure. Notes that there is a stream which flows through the proposed site, which if developed, may heighten the risk of flooding.
LPA 356	Maureen Tonks	Local Plan Allocations						Consultation has been carried out without proper notification and further examination should be postponed until proper consultation is carried out. Access for proposed sites adjacent to Robert Peel hospital is not clear. Concerns over increased congestion in area. Level of social housing needs to be decreased and replaced with provision for elderly persons.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 357	Sue Nelson - Parish Clerk - Shenstone Parish Council	Policy S1: Shenstone Housing Land Allocations, Page 83, Paragraph 12.14 to 12.16, Site 3: Land iff Millbrook Drive.						Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 and S3 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. Policy Shen4 of Lichfield Local Strategy identifies a range of between 50 - 150 dwellings to be delivered in Shenstone over the plan period and this should not be achieved by allocating unsustainable sites. Site allocations S2 and S3 do not represent sustainable development sites when compared with others across the district. It is unclear why the Local Plan Allocations Document proposes to allocate Site S1 when its already allocated by the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan (Policy HA1). The plan is not justified because it has not been considered against reasonable alternatives and it is not effective as it has not been justified that it is deliverable over the plan period. Outlines site specific issues and raises a concerns relating to lack of evidence regarding viability for Sites S2 and S3. The strategic issue of delivering housing in Shenstone could have been effectively dealt with through cross- boundary working between the Parish Council and Lichfield District Council. Important information that would have assisted the neighbourhood plan process has not been forthcoming from LDC. LDC has failed to discharge the duty to cooperate as (a) has not followed the test it set itself of ensuring that evidence collected to support the Plan and SA is locally derived; and (b) it has not identified or considered in the Sustainability Appraisal that an approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan has also considered the sustainability impact of sites S2 and S3; and (c) has not made any attempt to specifically consult with or reach agreement with the Parish Council or the directly relevant residents groups that assembled and approved the Neighbourhood Plan. The validated and approved framework neighbourhood plan framework policy processes resulted in sites S2 & S3 being rejected for building of new homes. LDC subsequently approved these April 2016 conclusions.
LPA 358	A V Vayro	Site B14: Land south of Highfields Road						Object to proposals to remove land from the Green Belt in Chasetown and Burntwood when facilities and infrastructure cannot support the existing residents. Loss of Green Belt at Chasetown would go against long term policy of Lichfield District Council. Area of Green Belt is important to prevent coalescence of Burntwood and the West Midlands conurbation. Facilities and infrastructure are insufficient - particularly health, employment, public transport, roads, shopping, leisure and library. The area is becoming saturated with high density housing. When housing allocations were considered 5 years ago the District Council reconsidered in the face of public opposition. There are further brownfield sites which should be considered such as Mount Road, Chase Terrace abattoir.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 359	Brian & Judy Duffy	Site B14: Land south of Highfields Road						Object to the building of houses on Green Belt land at Highfields Road. It is the only Green Belt between Staffordshire and the West Midlands. There are alternative sites that are not Green Belt or would not cause the conurbation and Burntwood to link. The Government have pledged to protect the Green Belt and there are not exceptional circumstances to change the Green Belt. Access and egress for new residents would be difficult and cause further traffic issues. There are flooding issues in the area known locally as 'The Triangle'. Currently facilities and infrastructure are inadequate.
LPA 360	Ian & Jean Hopkins	Policy B1: Burntwood Housing Allocations						Priority for location of new housing should be brownfield sites to preserve the Green Belt and bring back into use derelict sites. For example the blue hoarding site. There should be an increase in the number of 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings. It is suggested that careful consideration be given to Burntwood Action Groups suggestions for development of the town and town centre. The District Council should consider the impact of development on schools and roads and should liaise with the County Council and Burntwood Town Council. Bus services have deteriorated and would need improving following further development. The plan lacks community focus and there is a need for community facilities.
LPA 361	Jane Smith	Burntwood						<p>Concerned developing in the Green Belt will change the character of Burntwood. Not against building new homes providing it is in the right places and will not result in the destruction of green open spaces. There is not just a problem with the amount of housing but an issue with the affordability and availability of social housing for people to rent at realistic prices. There has been a reduction in services and lack of investment in services and roads whilst the population has increased. It makes Burntwood and Hammerwick an increasingly unsustainable place to live.</p> <p>There is discrepancy between the proposals and NPPF as the proposals are not sustainable without significant investment in Burntwood and Hammerwick.</p> <p>Remain unconvinced that all other reasonable options have been examined and is under the impression there is reluctance to consider fully the possibility of alternative locations as the local plan as been written.</p> <p>Bloor Homes proposals focus on executive style housing rather than affordable housing.</p> <p>Supports the plan outlined by Burntwood Action Group to see brownfield sites being used to meet housing requirements and the regeneration of Burntwood Town Centre and Health Centre facilities.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 362	Emily Smith	Burntwood						<p>Concerned developing in the Green Belt will change the character of Burntwood. Not against building new homes providing it is in the right places and will not result in the destruction of green open spaces. There is not just a problem with the amount of housing but an issue with the affordability and availability of social housing for people to rent at realistic prices. There has been a reduction in services and lack of investment in services and roads whilst the population has increased. It makes Burntwood and Hammerwick an increasingly unsustainable place to live. There is discrepancy between the proposals and NPPF as the proposals are not sustainable without significant investment in Burntwood and Hammerwick. Remain unconvinced that all other reasonable options have been examined and is under the impression there is reluctance to consider fully the possibility of alternative locations as the local plan as been written. Bloor Homes proposals focus on executive style housing rather than affordable housing. Supports the plan outlined by Burntwood Action Group to see bronwfield sites being used to meet housing requirements and the regeneration of Burntwood Town Centre and Health Centre facilities.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA363	John Cannon on behalf of Whittington & Fisherwick Parish Council	Whittington, Site W1, Site W2, Site W3 and Site W4						<p>Consideres four sites identified for potential development and two other sites put forward in the Developers' Day forum held in Whittington which have been discounted. Site W1: Land at Huddlesford Lane - concerned Huddlesford Lane is narrow making access hazardous and impractical. Site boundaries defined by existing hedgerows is not obviously contiguous with existing village edge and development would impact on views. Indicative proposals from Richborough Estates show number of units have risen to 70 representating a net density of 38 dph. Site W2: Former Whittington Youth Centre - proposals developed by SCC retain exisiting school building. Proposals fit well with draft Neighbourhood Plan. However further consideration needs to given to the proposed mitigation measures at the site access. Site W3: Land at Chapel Lane & Blacksmith Lane - Parish Council has considerable doubts at this juncture over the sites deliverability. There has been no indication that the current owner is prepared to sell the land. Site access is likely to be problematical. Site W4: Land west of Common Lane - although the site is favourably received, concerns expressed about likely impact on traffic outside Primary School during peak hours. Parish Council considered possibility of establishing self contained off road parking facilities for school and community uses. This could be backed by a suitably structured planning condition. Welcome the opportunity to discuss the aspect further with LDC officers. Site W5: Land east of Common Lane - not included within allocation proposals. Site W6: the presented scheme at Developers Day. As presented this scheme was arguably the best resolved amongst the 5 proposals, being well scaled and detailed appropraite to location, demonstrating more obvious continuity with adjacent existing development. Further clarification on the reasoning behind its omission at this stage would be helpful and desirable.</p>
LPA364	Button Family	Burntwood						<p>Oppose allocation of two pieces of GreenBelt land in Burntwood.</p> <p>Concerns over air pollution in town and cities which can only get worse and populations and vehicle usage icnrease. Green belt is there to clean our air and provide a breathing space between settlements, please focus on brownfield sites rather than increasing the size of settlements and destroying our towns lungs. People move to Burntwood because previous locations have been chocked with traffic congestion, noise and pollution. By building on brownfield sites new traffic will have access to better road networks and bypass routes.</p> <p>Once Green Belt is lost it will break the continuous chain utilised by animals, insects and birds to move around town.</p> <p>We should pay more attention to the network of footpath and bridal paths and make geo-orientation trails, cycle routes and nature works.</p> <p>Greenbelt is favoured by developers for executive homes, whereas housing on brownfield sites tend to be smaller more affordable homes, which are those badly needed by our young people.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA365	Troy Farrington	Burntwood						Opposes development in the Green Belt south of Highfields Road. It would be devastating to see it being turned into urban landscape. The Green Belt should be kept because it provides land for animals to graze on and crops to be grown on. People enjoy and like having Green Belt surrounding them. Need to think about schools and doctors because lots of schools are full and you have to wait weeks for a doctor's appointments.
LPA366	Robert Birch	Burntwood Housing Allocations						Accepts the need for housebuilding in the area but feels that there is a problem with the amount of housing along with the affordability of it and availability of social housing also that it should not result in the destruction of our open green spaces. Businesses, schools, banks, post offices and doctors surgeries have all reduced whilst the population has increased as well as the roads seeing a reduction in investment as the same time as an increase in traffic. It seems as if this is a direct attack on the people of Burntwood and Hammerwich by the Conservative Council. Remains unconvinced that 'all other reasonable options' have been examined. Regarding the proposals from Bloor Homes it seems there is limited options for social housing and affordable family homes, the main emphasis seems to be on executive style housing. The increase in local population should be matched with an increase of investment in the area. Wants Burntwood to be a better place to live not bigger.
LPA367	John Butler	Burntwood						Objects to proposal to build houses on green belt land, specifically Policy B1 Site B14 land south of Highfields Road. The local infrastructure is not capable of taking on additional people, increase in traffic, there are more viable brownfield sites, Burntwood is not big enough to cater for additional homes, the dam at Chasewater poses a flood risk to the proposed new development. The water from housing development built in the 70/80s flows in Crane Brook combined with water from the new development can lead to a greater flood risk in the area.
LPA368	John Butler	Site B14	No	No	No (justified)			The land is in the green belt. The local infrastructure cannot take more housing
LPA369	Peter Gostling	Burntwood						Objects to proposed developments that will take Green Belt land from the areas surrounding Burntwood. To lose more green belt when brownfield areas are available cannot be allowed. Infrastructure can barely cope existing numbers within the area. To deliberately destroy green areas that form the foundation of so much pleasure and leisure cannot be allowed. Developers always seem to target building larger properties. Lichfield and its surrounding area have a large 'aged' population. Before any additional needs are mindlessly built a study of the existing population structure and properties linked to them would help analyse exactly what the area needs.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								Ensure systems exist that not only retain but improve the quality of life in the area. Consideration of employment provision is also vital if the commuter overload is not to be added to or is that what they intend doing with the brown-fill options that are being ignored as home development areas.
LPA370	John Turnbull	Site B14						Considers the increase in housing numbers in Burntwood, is fabricated to bring pressure to bear on the Green Belt and set a precedent for future removal. LDC approach is to come up with an argument that the piece of Green Belt under immediate threat is of low Green Belt value. Considers the reason relating to the M6 Toll flimsy because the presence of the road in the Green Belt is of no consideration under the NPPF. The LDCs first Green Belt appraisal pronounced this section of GB as important for three reasons set out in the NPPF, this importance is clearly seen when standing in the narrow gap between Burntwood and Brownhills. See no evidence that LDC has complied with NPPF requirement that they plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt. Would like to know what alternative uses have been considered including renewable alternatives which preserve the openness of the Green Belt. What beneficial uses have been looked and reasons why they have not been adopted or promoted. LDC is ignoring the Green Belt second appraisal which sets out principles for Green Belt removal is not considered parcel E1, land west of Coulter Lane. The reason is vague but suggests the land is too big and they discount safeguarding land. This doesn't make sense and the conclusions to use Highfields Road will in the end use more Green Belt.
LPA371	Angela Turnbull	Burntwood						Building on the green belt is inexplicable. Using the land for recreational purposes would be more beneficial to the community. Building houses on Highfields Road without putting any infrastructure into place makes no sense. The primary schools are almost at capacity, doctors surgeries are full. LDC is planning on using Mouth Road for housing development which means even less employment land in the area to attract new businesses. Its time to consider bringing the Hammerwich railway link back. Land off Coulter Lane could be built on without any detrimental effect on 'openness' of the Green Belt as it is a natural infill between two developments. Why allow developers to keep building small development which means the local community does not get enough money from the development to do anything substantial to improve their local area. LDC IDP is just an exercise to justify building 250 houses on Green Belt.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								A reduction in rates for people having their views taken away would be a nice 'sweetener' and making sure any 106/CIL money is used to enhance the communities that are affected. Liaise with SCC to maintain road, better street lighting and provide adequate services.
LPA 372	Mr David Morris	12.14 to 12.16. S2 - Pumping Station	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 questioned by LDC. This in turn questions the objective preparation by LDC adopting the proposal in February 2017 that the site is now suitable for new house building. There is justification for loss of Green Belt. There is no evidence that the use of Birchbrook Industrial Estate and Shenstone Business Park for housing has been considered and their re-use would rid the village of HGV's 'killing 2 birds with 1 stone' The Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Appraisal excluded S2 as it would have an adverse environmental impact.
LPA 373	Mr Peter Ruscoe	12.14 to 12.16. S2 - Pumping Station	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 questioned by LDC. The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan that a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The three major problems facing the village which will not be addressed by this proposal are; the number of heavy goods vehicles using Pinfold Hill; inadequate car parking at the station and the preservation of the Green Belt. rather than attempting to solve these problems on an individual basis a more creative solution would be to regard them as one problem which could be solved by exploiting fully the potential of the Shenstone Business Park

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 374	Mr Peter Ruscoe	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan. The three major problems facing the village which will not be addressed by this proposal are; the number of heavy goods vehicles using Pinfold Hill; inadequate car parking at the station and the preservation of the Green Belt. rather than attempting to solve these problems on an individual basis a more creative solution would be to regard them as one problem which could be solved by exploiting fully the potential of the Shenstone Business Park. The proposal will increase traffic on Pinfold Hill and increase increase the danger at the junction with Millbrook Drive. The proposal will increase the risk of flooding.
LPA 375	Mrs Susan Whittock	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan.
LPA 376	Mrs Susan Whittock	12.14 to 12.16. S2 - Pumping Station	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the DtC as it has not attempted to specifically consult or reach agreement with Shenstone Parish Council as the accountable body for the Shenstone NP. At no time during the three year process of assembling the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan ending December 2016 was the objectivity of excluding Sites S2 questioned by LDC. The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan that a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building. Further investigation of use of the business park for housing should be made.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 377	Mrs Charlotte Walk	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was “made” at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building. In addition the application for planning permission applied for by CT Planning the South Staffordshire Waterworks in Planning document CET/3511 on 6th October 2016LA was not considered in the local plan.
LPA 378	Gurdev Singh Sagoo	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 379	Gurdev Singh Sagoo	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 380	Joginder Kaur Sagoo	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 381	Andrew Bews	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 382	Stephen Palmer	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 383	Barbara Palmer	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 384	Sandra Miller	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 385	Gary Jones	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 386	Kay Lindley	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 387	Emily Lindley	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 388	Christine Webb	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 389	Colin Whittock	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 390	Louise Hearne	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 391	Pauline Taylor	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 392	Peggy Meek	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 393	David Morris	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 394	Kirsty Lindley	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 395	Joyce Ruscoe	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 396	Georgina Jones	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 397	Thelma Brookes	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 398	Edward Lindley	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 399	Jill Shaw	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 400	Pamela White	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 401	Elizabeth Stockton	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 402	Martin Stockton	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 403	Margaret Harding	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan
LPA 404	Kirsty Lindley	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 405	Kay Lindley	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 406	Emily Lindley	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 407	Christine Webb	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 408	Colin Whittock	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 409	John Lumb	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 410	Roy Brookes	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 411	Peggy Meek	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 412	Joyce Ruscoe	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 413	Barbara Palmer	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 414	Stephen Palmer	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 415	Sandra Miller	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 416	Andrew Bews	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 417	Joginder Kaur Sagoo	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 418	Margaret Harding	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 419	Elizabeth Stockton	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 420	Jill Shaw	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 421	Edward Lindley	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 422	Gary Jones	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 423	Thelma Brookes	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 424	Georgina Jones	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 425	Julia Hicks	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 426	Pauline Boss	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The council's objective assessment of site S2 is undermined by the council previously accepting the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan because professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that proposed site S2 was not suitable for new house building. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed/approved 2.1 hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park. 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the Neighbourhood Plan Submission of Evidence were supportive of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014.
LPA 427	Justin Dawson	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building. In addition the application for planning permission applied for by CT Planning the South Staffordshire Waterworks in Planning document CET/3511 on 6th October 2016LA was not considered in the local plan.
LPA 428	Robert Olliffe	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The LDC objective assessment of site S2 has been significantly undermined by LDC having previously accepted that (i) as part of the 2015 draft Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan that a professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that the site S2 was not suitable for new house building (ii) an independent Planning Inspectors report in April 2016 did not challenge the sustainability assessment conclusion that site S2 was not suitable for new house building and (iii) the Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan was "made" at a Cabinet meeting in December 2016 on the basis that site S2 was not suitable for new house building. In addition the application for planning permission applied for by CT Planning the South Staffordshire Waterworks in Planning document CET/3511 on 6th October 2016LA was not considered in the local plan.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA429	David McCallum	Burntwood						<p>Objects to the identification of large swathes of greenbelt and green field sites for housing development. Opposes land off Highfields Road. Highfields Road is close to M6 Toll, Brownhills and West Midlands Conurbation. There is little greenland separating Staffordshire and West Midlands due to the construction of the M6 Toll and the argument the M6 Toll creates a natural barrier is wrong. Why has no consideration been given to areas to the north and east of Burntwood where development would not put so much stress on the thin band of Greenbelt. The farmland has significant use by migrating wildlife which uses nearby Chasewater. Development would remove the natural habitat and there is a significant risk of losing 'green corridors'. Highfields Road and surrounding roads are in a poor state of repair and would not be capable of sustaining the extra traffic. Has any consideration been given to the potential disaster that could occur if anything happens to the dam. The presence of new houses would put pressure on public services in the area. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Burntwood, Chasetown and Chase Terrace that could be used to build new housing. LDC appear to have drawn up plans without consultation with local communities and without visiting sites. There is a need to explore all options before committing Burntwoods green fields to housing and destroying it for future generations.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 430	Burntwood Action Group	9 Burntwood				Yes	Yes	<p>The representation contains both objection and a vision statement which includes a number of proposals:ObjectionBAG opposes allocation of Green Belt land around Burntwood, in particular site B14 and asserts that LDC has not sufficiently explored alternatives re. Brownfield land. Considers that Planners have made minimum effort to bring forward BF sites for housing development and have taken the easy option of removing B15 from the Green even though it is more than half a mile from the nearest main road and bus route, off a narrow country lane and two miles from Burntwood Town Centre at Sankeys Corner. It is far from a sustainable site.The Green Belt on both sides of Coulter Lane is of great importance in retaining the character and identity of the old historic Burntwood village. The Green Belt supplementary report is regarded as a "travesty" as it was devised and written in such a manner as to class previously chosen parcels of land as not being important to the Green Belt.Site B4 of the allocations document is a relatively small part of the dilapidated Mount Road Industrial estate. Burntwood Action Group believes that, if Planners pursue the release of this land with more vigour, most of it could become available for housing before the end of the Plan period.Birmingham's aim to get neighbouring authorities to accept some of its housing requirement should be resisted vigorously. Birmingham has much previously used land and should be encouraged to prepare it for housing development. The loss of integrity of parts of the Green Belt can be attributed to "bending the rules" and developers finding ever more ingenious ways to argue that their developments are "appropriate," or under "special circumstances."BAG disagrees with the Burntwood Neighbourhood Plan HRA/ SEA Screening report Jan 2017 as it only looks at "Natura 2000 Wildlife" sites, and "European Sites" i.e. Cannock Chase. It doesn't take into account any other wildlife in the local Burntwood area. So implies, the destruction and displacement of any other wildlife habitat is acceptable. This fails to consider the ecological importance of Site B15. LDC's current Local Plan offers no concrete solutions to Burntwood's lack of infrastructure. Instead, its proposed housing allocation appears to be nothing more than a list to make up numbers rather than a strategy to provide housing of the right type in the right place to reflect the needs of the population.Burntwood lacks a coherent town centre and the approach taken by the Local Plan Allocations will not help remedy this. The approved town centre scheme and some of the planned housing on the former Olaf Johnson/ adjoining site will only form a barrier with the existing town centre and looks away from Sankeys Corner. The blue hoarding site has remained undeveloped for years and had LDC has not provided any concrete proposals for it and landowners have not been able to find a developer for it. Inadequate medical services. The Salters Meadow practice adj to Sankeys corner is overburdened and unable to take new patients. Vision/ proposalsThe Olaf Johnson site, with planning permission for retail units and housing, to be developed as soon as possible to attract tenants before the Lichfield Friarsgate and Cannock Mill Green Designer Outlet Village are open.The Blue hoardings site south west of Morrisons Store to be reassigned as soon as possible and released for the construction of new homes and Health</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								<p>Centre. <u>Mount Rd</u>LDC Planning Officers (helped by BAG if necessary) begin work to release adjacent land, containing vacant or underused industrial units for circa 80 additional affordable dwellings. (timescale circa 5 years).Existing businesses could be relocated to available units in Burntwood Business Park (see current listings in presentation). BAG has been informed that additional land could be made available on the Business Park when existing units have been filled.<u>Prospect Road / New Road and remaining Mount Road Industrial Estate</u>In the latter stages of the Plan period, when a significant proportion of the Mount Road Estate has been redeveloped, businesses in this area should have been convinced by financial incentives or compulsory purchase orders (funding from developers?) to re-locate to more suitable premises on Burntwood Business Park. The site could then provide space for a further 250 homes.<u>Health</u>Any plan for the re-development of Burntwood should make provision for a new health centre at or close to Sankeys Corner.<u>Sankeys Corner</u>whole area to be re-developed to provide modern retail units and a range of housing types. Landscaped town square with additional pedestrian links. Landscaped walkway to Steam railway and Chasewater. This will be a vital pedestrian / cycle route to link the new Town Centre with leisure facilities at Chasewater, possibly involving another footbridge over the Bypass <u>Salter's Meadow</u>Once the new Health Centre is completed the existing site can be redeveloped possibly to complement Jervis Court on the junction of Rugeley Road and Bridge Cross Road</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								<p>The approved town centre scheme and some of the planned housing on the former Olaf Johnson/ adjoining site will only form a barrier with the existing town centre and looks away from Sankeys Corner. The blue hoarding site has remained undeveloped for years and had LDC has not provided any concrete proposals for it and landowners have not been able to find a developer for it. Inadequate medical services. The Salters Meadow practice adj to Sankeys corner is overburdened and unable to take new patients. Vision/ proposalsThe Olaf Johnson site, with planning permission for retail units and housing, to be developed as soon as possible to attract tenants before the Lichfield Friarsgate and Cannock Mill Green Designer Outlet Village are open.The Blue hoardings site south west of Morrisons Store to be reassigned as soon as possible and released for the construction of new homes and Health Centre. Mount RdLDC Planning Officers (helped by BAG if necessary) begin work to release adjacent land, containing vacant or underused industrial units for circa 80 additional affordable dwellings. (timescale circa 5 years).Existing businesses could be relocated to available units in Burntwood Business Park (see current listings in presentation). BAG has been informed that additional land could be made available on the Business Park when existing units have been filled.Prospect Road / New Road and remaining Mount Road Industrial EstateIn the latter stages of the Plan period, when a significant proportion of the Mount Road Estate has been redeveloped, businesses in this area should have been convinced by financial incentives or compulsory purchase orders (funding from developers?) to re-locate to more suitable premises on Burntwood Business Park. The site could then provide space for a further 250 homes.</p>

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								HealthAny plan for the re-development of Burntwood should make provision for a new health centre at or close to Sankeys Corner.Sankeys Cornerwhole area to be re-developed to provide modern retail units and a range of housing types. Landscaped town square with additional pedestrian links. Landscaped walkway to Steam railway and Chasewater. This will be a vital pedestrian / cycle route to link the new Town Centre with leisure facilities at Chasewater, possibly involving another footbridge over the Bypass Salters MeadowOnce the new Health Centre is completed the existing site can be redeveloped possibly to complement Jervis Court on the junction of Rugeley Road and Bridge Cross Road
LPA 431	Frances Stockton	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Just fewer than 80% of the residents of Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing in 2014. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan. Is concerned about the impact of flooding and encloses a photograph of the area under water after a period of torrential rain.
LPA 432	Stephen Judd	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The proposals ignore the impact on the environment and wildlife. The area is on a flood plain, alas access would create huge environmental issues. The Brownfield site in Birchbrook Industrial estate would have a neutral effect on the above. The proposal is ill conceived, underhand and not prepared by Council officials fit to discharge their civic responsibilities.
LPA 433	Ann Williams	para 12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the Duty to Co-operate and listen to local people. It has not considered the approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan, made no attempt to consult the Parish Council, groups who approved the Plan which had passed a vote by local residents.Since a Neighbourhood Plan in 2015 (draft) demonstrated that the S2 site was not suitable for new house building and this was endorsed by the latest Plan it would appear that LDC has done no preparation.The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing, resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved i.e 2.1 Hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park.

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of positively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 434	Roddy Williams	para 12.14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Lichfield District Council has failed to discharge the Duty to Co-operate and listen to local people. It has not considered the approved Shenstone Neighbourhood Plan, made no attempt to consult the Parish Council, groups who approved the Plan which had passed a vote by local residents. Since a Neighbourhood Plan in 2015 (draft) demonstrated that the S2 site was not suitable for new house building and this was endorsed by the latest Plan it would appear that LDC has done no preparation. The Local Allocations Plan document has not considered releasing more land for new housing adjacent to the existing, resident endorsed and Neighbourhood Plan agreed and approved i.e 2.1 Hectares of land at Shenstone Business Park.
LPA 435	Stephen Judd	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	A professional sustainability evaluation demonstrated that this site is not suitable for new house building. The proposals ignore the impact on the environment and wildlife. This area is a flood plain and access would create huge environmental issues. Suggests releasing 2.1 ha of land from Shenstone Business Park instead. Building on this land would have a neutral effect on the environment
LPA436	Mr John Lumb	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Objects to the development at site S3 due to LDC previously accepting that the site was not suitable for new house building as part of Shenstone's Neighbourhood Plan. Shenstone in the NP Submission of Evidence approved of the use of the Business Park for new housing. LDC have failed in DtC duties as the have not ensured evidence is locally derived and failed to consider an approved Neighbourhood Plan. The three major problems facing the village which will not be addressed by this proposal are; the number of heavy vehicles using Pinfold Hill; inadequate car parking at the station and the preservation of the green belt The volume of traffic currently using Pinfold Hill is increasing and any increase in the number of vehicles entering and leaving Millbrook Drive can only increase the danger at the junction. The land in question is in flood plain
LPA 437	Elaine Whitney	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The site S3 needs to be excluded as a site for new house building on the basis that the Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Appraisal (Pages 30,31 and 32) concluded that low access to village amenities, the increase in car movements in the village centre, adverse environmental impact, loss of agricultural land, impact on public open space, adverse biodiversity and adverse landscape impact all pointed to its exclusion and remain valid. LDC has failed to consider releasing more land at Shenstone Business Park and/or Birchbrook Industrial Estate. These two sites were the preferred sites by the vast majority of the people of Shenstone and could provide further housing including starter homes for young couples wanting to remain in the village, apartments for the increasing number of single households and bungalows for the increasingly elderly population and disabled persons. It would also greatly reduce heavy traffic with the attendant pollution, noise wear and tear and safety concerns with Lorries known to have mounted the kerbs. The Green Belt should be preserved as the whole village enjoy using Lammas Land

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 438	Ian Tucker	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	In the Pinfold Hill Planning Brief (Southern District Plan) dated March 1985 the land in question was described as 'Flood Plain and Washland of the Bourne Brook' and floods regularly and onto the land contained within Site S3. Building on the flood plain will only increase the risk to existing, adjacent properties. Access to and from S3 will be via a single narrow access onto Millbrook Drive and also via a single access to the already heavily congested Pinfold Hill. Any increase in the number of vehicles entering and leaving Millbrook Drive can only increase the danger at its junction with Pinfold Hill. The land contained within Site S3 entered private ownership as a result of an agreement with Shenstone Parish Council in 1998. Part of this agreement stated that the land in question would remain within the Green Belt (Shenstone Parish Council letter 20/05/98)
LPA 439	Carol Tucker	Site S3 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	In the Pinfold Hill Planning Brief (Southern District Plan) dated March 1985 the land in question was described as 'Flood Plain and Washland of the Bourne Brook' and floods regularly and onto the land contained within Site S3. Building on the flood plain will only increase the risk to existing, adjacent properties. Access to and from S3 will be via a single narrow access onto Millbrook Drive and also via a single access to the already heavily congested Pinfold Hill. Any increase in the number of vehicles entering and leaving Millbrook Drive can only increase the danger at its junction with Pinfold Hill. The land contained within Site S3 entered private ownership as a result of an agreement with Shenstone Parish Council in 1998. Part of this agreement stated that the land in question would remain within the Green Belt (Shenstone Parish Council letter 20/05/98)
LPA 440	Carol Tucker	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Appraisal concluded that the adverse environmental impact, loss of agricultural land, adverse ecological impact and adverse landscape impact all pointed to the exclusion of S2 as a site for new house building. The removal of S2 would allow further investigation of the potential of the Shenstone Business Park sites opposite for additional mixed-use housing and commercial development and allow for more creative solutions to be examined in order to deal with the whole village issue regarding the number of HGVs using Pinfold Hill to access the Industrial Park.
LPA 441	Ian Tucker	Site S2 (Shenstone)	No	No	No	Yes	No	The Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Appraisal concluded that the adverse environmental impact, loss of agricultural land, adverse ecological impact and adverse landscape impact all pointed to the exclusion of S2 as a site for new house building. The removal of S2 would allow further investigation of the potential of the Shenstone Business Park sites opposite for additional mixed-use housing and

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
								commercial development and allow for more creative solutions to be examined in order to deal with the whole village issue regarding the number of HGVs using Pinfold Hill to access the Industrial Park.
LPA 442	Burntwood Action Group	Burntwood Policy B1, Site B14 & Site B15			No (sound)			2383 signed copies of a letter opposing the plans to remove land surrounding Burntwood from the Green Belt. For the past 60 years Burntwood has been allowed to sprawl across valuable green land. It is now time to call a halt and value all the Green Belt which surrounds it. Planners might look at a map and see likely infill spaces but I see land which helps to breathe life into the community. The Plan Strategy aims to focus future housing on the District's "key sustainable settlements". Sites such as these, in Green Belt on the periphery of Burntwood, are not sustainable. Planned improvements to Burntwoods infrastructure will not make up for the lack of investment over many decades and do not justify further outward expansion. Few residents of Burntwood are employed locally and outward commuting makes all routes out of the are highly congested at peak times. Further expansion of Burntwood boundary will exacerbate the situation. The questioning of Lichfield District Planners has revealed that insufficient effort has been put into bringing forward old and dilapidated industrial sites for housing development. They must now stop looking for the easy option and work with the local community and their representatives for the release of brownfield sites for housig and thereby rejuvenate existing eyesores

Representation Ref.	Consultee/Agent	Section	Duty to Cooperate	Legally and procedurally Compliant?	Sound? (inclusive of postively prepared, justified, effective and compliance with NPPF)	Does the respondent suggest changes	Does the respondent wish to appear at EIP	Comment Summary
LPA 443	Hammerwich Action Group	Burntwood						<p>2007 signed copies of a letter opposing the development of 250 houses to the south of Burntwood. The development is proposed within the Green Belt, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework Section 9 'Protecting Greenbelt Land'. Lichfield District Council's own Green Belt reviews determined the area of Green belt proposed for development is narrow and too important to build on. Burntwood does not have a high enough level of facilities and services to match existing housing, let alone for more housing. The road infrastructure in and beyond Burntwood is inadequate and under further stress from increased traffic from development in surrounding towns, leading to longer queues, increased pollution and greater risk of accidents. A town from where most people commute by car for work and shopping, and does not have a railway, is not sustainable. The Green Belt is not only enjoyed by those privileged to live on its edge but by everyone that uses it for recreation, dog walking etc. The proposal does not protect the quality and character of the country side and existing communities. LDC has unilaterally without consulting with the local people on such a contentious issue proceeded to promote this site. This is contrary to the Conservative manifesto 2015 that states they 'will ensure local people have more control over planning and protect the Green Belt.' LDC have ignored the needs and broader interests held by the community, who have previously objected to this proposals in their thousands.</p>