Lichfield District Council



Local Plan Allocations Focused Changes Sustainability Appraisal – Non –technical Summary

January 2018



Introduction

Lichfield District Council has undertaken a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in support of the Lichfield District Local Plan Allocations, the document referred to as the LPA. The LPA will identify and allocate specific sites that are suitable for development, in order to meet the Local Plan Strategy (LPS) requirements and also review a number of saved policies from the Local Plan 1998.

Plan making is now at an advance stage. Consultation (Regulation 19) on the Publication version of the LPA took place in spring 2017.

Since preparing the Regulation 19 consultation (undertaken March – May 2017) there were two significant factors that altered the planning landscape for Lichfield District. The first was receipt of three appeals from the Secretary of State, one of these appeal decisions for 750 dwellings at Land at Watery Lane was approved despite not being in conformity with the Plan. The second factor relates to Governments consultation on the Housing White Paper which inter alia seeks to clarify the national policy position associated with Green Belt. In light of these factors along with significant public objection to release of Green Belt land a review of the housing supply was undertaken.

These amendments have led to further working being completed through the SA process to ensure that a complete picture in regard to effect of the LPA on sustainability has been obtain.

Lichfield District Council Local Plan Allocations

The Lichfield District Local Plan comprises two documents; the adopted Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy and the emerging Local Plan Allocations

To support the delivery of the LPS the LPS includes:

- Land Allocations associated with meeting the growth requirements set out in the Local Plan Strategy (2015) including:
 - Determining remaining housing land requirements to deliver the overall 10,030 homes to 2029 in line with the adopted spatial strategy, including allocations of sites with the Broad Development Location (BDL) to the north of Tamworth, for housing in rural areas and the 'Key Rural' Settlements (including Green Belt release);
 - Consideration of 'infill' boundaries for Green Belt villages (as set out in Core Policy 1);
 - Sites to meet the identified Gypsy and Traveller requirements;
 - Land allocations to meet the Employment Land requirements, including the identification of primary and secondary retail areas for Lichfield City Centre;
 - A review of any remaining Local Plan (1998) Saved policies;
 - Consider Green Belt boundaries including the integration of the developed area of the former St Matthews into Burntwood and development needs beyond the plan period;
 and
 - Consider any issues arising through 'Made' and emerging Neighbourhood Plans where communities have sought the support of Lichfield District Council to progress with matters outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.

What is the purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal?

The purpose of sustainability appraisal (SA) is to promote sustainable development though better integration of sustainable development Objectives within plan-making practice.

SA is a legally required process that must be undertaken alongside plan-making with a view to fully considering and communicating likely sustainability effects of the preferred approach and alternatives to this approach. Specifically, in this instance, SA has involved:

- 1. Appraising reasonable alternatives, with a view to informing the process of preparing the LPA
- 2. Appraising the preferred approach as set out in the LPA (publication version), with a view to informing plan finalisation.

This document is a Non-Technical Summary, further detail can be found in the full SA report and appendices published alongside the LPA (publication version).

What is the sustainability context and the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal?

An important first step in the SA process involves establishing the 'scope' i.e. those significant sustainability issues which should be the focus of the SA, and those which should not.

A review was undertaken of all relevant plans and programmes at national, regional and local level to identify relationships between these and the SA process and the identification of a baseline to provide the basis for predicting and monitoring the effects of the policies and site proposals in the LPA.

The SA Scoping Report (August 2016) provides and detailed review of the sustainability context a baseline of baseline conditions in Lichfield This information was amended slightly following consultation at scoping stage, Appendix C and D of the full SA report provides an updated review.

In addition while the LPA was accompanied by a SA it was concluded at this point that the LPA would not be assessed against the same criteria. The SA process would be started afresh to enable it to fully reflect the current considerations.

Key sustainability issues were identified through the Scoping Report – these include social, environmental and economic issues relevant to the LPA as follows

Social

- Affordable housing
- · Access to health care
- Further education
- Aging population

Environment

- Protecting the landscape character
- Biodiversity especially key species and habitats
- Historic Environment
- Townscape
- Reduction in waste
- Energy use
- Air, Water and Soil quality.

Economic

- City, Town and Village viability and vitality
- Skills and further education

Drawing on the findings of the context/baseline review a SA framework was developed. This had 16 key sustainability objectives for assessing the LPA against and supported by Site Specific Questions to provide a more detailed and measureable assessment of sites and polices in regard to effect. In additional assumptions were drawn up to ensure consistency during assessment. The SA Framework is set out in below in Table 1.

Plan Making and Sustainability Process

Lichfield District Council adopted its Local Plan Strategy on February 2015 and undertook consultation on the proposed scope and nature of the Local Plan Allocations (Regulation 18) from August 2016 to October 2016. Assessment of the responses through the consultation did not identify any issues which could be considered as 'showstoppers'. The scope of this consultation was directly informed by the Local Plan Strategy which had already been subject to SA. The SA was taken forward to support and influence the identification of preferred sites and replacement policies. Amendments and additions have been included within the LPA, these reflect consultation responses (Regulation 19) and a change in local housing supply and clarification on national planning policy.

Saved Policies

Lichfield District Council adopted its Local Plan Strategy on February 2015. In total there are currently 54 saved polices carried over from the 1998 Local Plan. Appendix J of the Local Plan Strategy identifies policies that have been replaced by the Local Plan Strategy and those that will be replaced by the LPA.

In terms of those relating to LPA an SA assessment was completed for the proposed replacement policy and the following reasonable alternatives were also considered.

- Policy absent
- Alternative if suggested
- Saved Policy

Following Regulation 19 consultation two proposed replacement policies received amendment, these too have now been assessed and are referred to as Amended Proposed Policy within the main body of the SA report and its accompanying appendices.

The SA assessment of effect, supporting commentary and recommendations if appropriate in relation to the Saved Policies are in Appendix H of the full report.

Housing Sites Gypsy and Traveller Sites Policy Context

Lichfield District Council adopted its Local Plan Strategy in February 2015. Within that Strategy, Core Policy 1 'The Spatial Strategy' and Core Policy 6 'Housing Delivery' provide the policy context for the selection of alternatives and preferred options. These policies are supported by a raft of localised policies.

In addition the process of Gypsy and Traveller site identification was completed using the criteria outlined within Local Plan Strategy Policy H3: Gypsies, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople.

Gypsy and Traveller Sites Methodology

A number of sites feature within the SHLAA others were identified solely as part of the implementation of policy H3. An SA assessment was completed for each of the identified reasonable alternatives (21 in total). Taken into consideration the effects identified within the SA, the policy context, and factors identified within the general methodology one Gypsy and Traveller Site was identified as a preferred option, (SA reference GT21). Appendix E of the full report contains the scoring and a summary of effects completed of the preferred option in full report Appendix F. Appendix G Table 7 summaries the selection of preferred options from alternatives options identified.

Housing site Methodology

Stage 1: All sites within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2016 which were located within or adjacent to settlements identified within the settlement hierarchy were identified and subject to the SA process along with any additional sites which were submitted/ promoted

through the Regulation 18 consultation. Such an approach was taken so that sites which could be considered to be potentially aligned to the adopted spatial strategy were considered. Any sites which were noted as being complete or under-construction (having had the benefit of planning permission), or sites assessed as capable of delivering less than 5 dwellings were removed from the schedule of sites prior to being assessed. This was because it was considered that these were already moving through the planning process and for sites of 5 or less dwellings were not taken through the SA process because the LPA was not allocating sites below this threshold.

Concurrently and in isolation an Urban Capacity Assessment was produced which assessed the deliverability of all sites identified within the SHLAA located within the existing built up areas of settlements. Where this assessment determined that an urban capacity site was deliverable, consideration was given to other evidence, including their assessment within the SA (SA outputs), to conclude on whether the site should be proposed for allocation.

Stage 2: The Urban Capacity Assessment assesses each settlement within the settlement hierarchy in terms of its delivery against the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy. Where the assessment indicated that insufficient sites had been found including those found through stage 1, consideration to sites beyond the settlement boundary was given. This consideration was based on a range of evidence including the SA outputs.

Stage 3: Following Regulation 19 consultation a further review of housing supply within the District was completed. This resulted in additional reasonable alternatives being identified and assessed for effect.

An SA assessment was completed for each of the identified as a reasonable alternatives and full results are contained within Appendix E of the full report. A summary of scores was undertaken (the summary sheets for allocated sites are contained within Appendix F of the full report. Appendix G Table 6 summaries the selection of preferred options from alternatives options identified.

Employment Sites Policy Context

Core Policy 7 Employment and Economic Development provide the policy context for the selection of alternatives and preferred options

Employment Sites Context

Potential employment sites that feature within the District Council Employment land Review (ELR), Employment Land Availability Assessment (ELAA) 2016 and Regulation 18 consultation were identified as reasonable alternatives on the basis that these sites may be in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy

Of those sites the following were removed, sites under construction and site that had been completed in previous years because it was considered that these were already moving through the Plan process

Taken into consideration the effects identified within the SA, the policy context, wider evidence base including Employment Land Capacity Assessment and factors identified within the general methodology the following employment sites where identified as preferred options to fulfil the remaining development quantum.

An SA assessment was completed for each of the identified reasonable alternatives full results are contained within Appendix E of the full report. Summary of scores undertaken (the summary sheets for allocated sites are contained within Appendix F of the full report. Appendix G Table 6 summaries the selection of preferred options from alternatives options identified.

What are the Appraisal Findings and Recommendations at the Current Stage?

The effects of the LPA sites and polices have been assessed against the SA objectives, and the results have been recorded in tables showing effect. The tables are presented in the following manner in the appendices of the SA Repot.

Table 2: Example SA Table

| SA Objective | Site Specific Question | Score | Comment |
|---|----------------------------|----------|--|
| To promote | Will it conserve | Double - | There are protected |
| biodiversity protection enhancement and | protected/priority species | | species present on site and on land adjacent |
| management of | - Special | | to the site 2016 survey |
| species and habitats | | | data |
| | | | |

The SA predicted the significant positive and negative effects of each of the policy and site options on the sustainability objectives using the following scoring method.

Table 3 Scoring System

| Symbol | Likely Effect on the SA Objective | |
|--------|---|--|
| ++ | Significant positive effect on sustainability objective | |
| + | Minor positive effect on sustainability objective | |
| N | Neutral effect on sustainability objective | |
| - | Minor negative effect on sustainability objective | |
| | Significant negative effect on sustainability objective | |
| ? | Uncertain | |

Assumptions for each of the SA Objectives were developed and supported the scoring process. The assumptions can be found within Appendix I of the full report.

The full results and score are available in Appendix E of the SA Report. Furthermore Appendix F includes charts illustrating and summarise effect for each of the sites which have been identified as allocated within the Publication Version of the LPA. A brief summary of the assessment results of sites and polices that have been assessed is provided below within Table 3 Summary of the predicated effects of the LPA sites and Table 4 Summary of the predicted effects polices. It should be noted that some indicators do not have sites slotted against them. This is due a neutral effect being record. In some instances this is due to the extent of the effect (if any) being clearly and consistently be identified at this point in the plan making decision taken process. Further explanation in relation to neutral impact can be found within Appendix H of the full report.

Cumulative, Synergistic and Indirect Effects

The LPA performs well in terms of cumulative, synergistic and indirect effects relating to:

- SA Indicator 5 use of previously developed land.
- SA Indicator 11 provision of affordable homes
- SA Indicator 14 economic prosperity

There are also a number of negative effects highlighted by the assessment. These include

- **SA Indicator 1** impact on Biodiversity
- SA Indicator 2 effect on landscape

• SA Indicator 9 loss of agricultural land.

Uncertainty remains regarding the extent of effect in relation to Climate Change SA indicator 7.

The assessment serves to highlight the need for those elements that are expected to result in negative effects to be addressed more overtly as part of the LPA process, supported by mitigation as appropriate, as well as enhancement of positive effects where possible.

Mitigation

Mitigation measures have been suggested throughout the SA process to help mitigate any predicated harmful impacts of polices and allocated sites.

In summary mitigation will be delivered through the following mechanisms

- Local Plan Strategy
- Supplementary Planning Documents
- Key Development Considerations
- Partner plans, policies and programmes

Monitoring

The predicated significant effects of the policies identified by the SA will be monitored to highlight specific performance issues and inform future decision making. Indicators for monitoring are identified within the SA framework above, and where possible those proposed as part of the LPS SA have been included to ensure continuity. The reporting of such monitoring will be through the Authority Monitoring Report.

Conclusions

The evolving, iterative nature of the SA has enabled the integration of the core principles of sustainable development into the LPA. Taken together with the policies in the LPS, SPD and national planning policy, it is considered that the policies in the policies and sites identified within the LPA should help create sustainable communities

The LPA is likely to deliver significant benefits for sustainable development, particularly in relation to economic prosperity and meeting housing needs. Mitigation of predicated negative effects, such as loss of agricultural land, biodiversity and landscape through the effective implementation of measures including within supporting documents, such as the LPS, SPD's.

Habitats Regulations Assessment

An assessment of the LPA under the Habitats Regulations has been prepared separately. Its findings have been considered and have informed the preparation of the LPA. Further information is available in the documents entitled Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment: Local Plan Allocations.

Appendix A Table 1 Sustainability Assessment

| Sustainability | Control Production | | A de la deservación de la deservación de la dela dela dela dela dela dela del |
|---|---|--|---|
| Biodiversity, Geodiversity, Flora and Fauna | 1 To promote biodiversity protection enhancement and management of species and habitats | Will it conserve protected/priority species? Will it conserve protected/priority habitats and local nature conservation sites? Will it protect statutory designated sites? Will it encourage ecological connectivity (including green corridors and water courses)? | Proportion of local sites where positive conservation management has been or is being implemented. Number, type of quality of internationally and nationally designated sites. Number of spices relevant to the district which have achieved SBAP targets Number of Local Nature Reserves within Lichfield District. |
| Flora and Fauna, Landscape, Cultural heritage | 2 To promote and enhance the rich diversity of the natural archaeological/geological assets and lands character of the district | Does it respect and protect existing landscape character? | The proportion of housing completions ion sites of 10 or more which have been supported, at the planning application stage by an appropriate and effective landscape character and visual assessment with appropriate landscape proposals. Number and area of RIGS within District. |

| Sustainability | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| Topic | Sustainability Objective | Site Specific Questions | Monitoring Indicator |
| | | Will it protect sites of geological importance? Does it offer the opportunity to improve and promote landscape connectivity sympathetic to the existing District Landscape character? Will it lead to the sterilisations of | Number if sites subject to development where archaeology is preserved in situ compared with those scientifically recorded. National Forest Coverage within the District. Proportion of Forest of Mercia or Central Initiatives promoted schemes implemented within the District. Loss of historic landscape features erosion of character and distinctiveness (HLC) Extent and use of detailed characterisation studies informing development proposals (HLC) |
| | | mineral resources? 5. Will it improve green infrastructure including National Forest, Forest of Mercia and the Central Rivers Initiative? | |
| | | 6. Will it result in the loss of historic landscape features? | |

| Sustainability Topic | Sustainability Objective | Site Specific Questions | Monitoring Indicator |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|
| · | | 7. Will it safeguard sites of archaeological importance (scheduled or unscheduled) and their setting? | |
| Cultural Heritage | 3 To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their setting | Will it preserve and enhance buildings and structures and their setting and contribute to the Districts heritage? Will it improve and broaden access to, and understanding of, local heritage, historic sites, areas and buildings? Will it preserve and enhance conservation areas including their setting? Will it offer opportunities to bring heritage assets back into active use? | Number and Proportion of major planning proposals which improved access to heritage features as part of the scheme. Number of listed buildings or structure in Lichfield District Heritage at risk and number of assets removed from Register. Proportion of Conservation Areas with an up to date character appraisal and management plan. |
| Cultural Heritage Population | 4 Create places, spaces and buildings that are well designed, integrated effectively with one another, respect significant views and vistas and enhance the distinctiveness of the local character | 1. Will it achieve high quality and sustainable design for buildings, spaces and the public realm sensitive to the locality? | Improvements in the quality of the townscapes, e.g. delivery of street/public realm audits, improvements works de-cluttering worth both in urban and rural areas. |

| Sustainability | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|---|
| Topic | Sustainability Objective | Site Specific Questions | Monitoring Indicator |
| | | | Development meeting design standards within Supplementary |
| | | | Planning Documents |
| | | | |
| | | 2. Does it value and protect diverse | |
| | | and locally distinctive settlement and townscape character? | |
| | | 3. Does it safeguard historic views and valuable skylines of settlements? | |
| | | 4. Is the site within a main settlement | |
| | | or a key rural settlement? 5. Is the site within close proximity to | |
| | | key services (e.g. schools, food | |
| | | shop, public transport, health centres etc.)? | |
| | | | Proportion of new development on |
| | | | Brownfield Land. No of redundant buildings bought back |
| | | | into use. |
| | | | Proportion of long term vacant dwellings in the District. |
| Soil Water and Air | 5 Maximise the use of previously developed | | Housing Mix of sites with planning |
| | land/buildings and the efficient use of land. | | permission. |
| | | Will it result in the loss of land that has not previously been developed? | Housing Density of sites with planning Permission |
| I | | 2. Is the site capable of supporting | |
| | | higher density development and/or a mix of uses? | |

| Sustainability | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|---|
| Topic | Sustainability Objective | Site Specific Questions | Monitoring Indicator |
| | | 3. Does the site allow for the re-use of existing buildings? | |
| | | 4. Will it reduce the amount of derelict degraded and underused land within the District? | |
| Climatic Factors | 6 Reduce the need to travel to jobs and services through sustainable integrated patterns of development, efficient use of existing sustainable modes of transport and increased opportunities for non-car travel. | Does the site location encourage the use of existing sustainable modes of travel? Will it reduce the overall impact on traffic sensitive areas? Will it help develop walking, cycling rail and bus networks to enable residents access to employment, services and facilities? | Traffic Levels (million vehicle kilometres) in the local road network. Access to bus services Increase opportunities for walking and cycling. |
| Climatic Factors | 7 To reduce, manage and adapt to the impacts of climate change | Will it reduce the causes of climate change? Will it encourage prudent use of energy? Will it provide opportunities for additional renewable energy generation capacity within the District? | Carbon dioxide emissions within the Authority Areas Renewable Energy Capacity within the District. |
| Soil Water and Air | 8 To minimise waste and increase the reuse and recycling of waste materials | Will it reduce household and commercial waste? | Residual Household water per household |

| Sustainability | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|---|
| Topic | Sustainability Objective | Site Specific Questions | Monitoring Indicator |
| | | | Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting Municipal waste landfilled. |
| | | Will it increase waste recovery and recycling? | |
| | | 3. Will it reduce the proportion of waste sent to landfill? | |
| | | Which Source Protection Zone does the development fall within? | Population living within Air Quality Management Areas Number of planning applications granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on water quality. |
| Soil Water and Air | 9 Seek and improve air, soil and water quality | Does the site fall within the River Mease SAC? | Proportion of homes built on Greenfield land. |
| | | Is the site within or directly connected to road to an AQMA? | |
| | | 4. Will it result in the loss of quality agricultural land? | |
| Soil Water and Air | 10 To reduce and manage flood risk | Is the site located outside an area of risk from flooding? | Number of Planning Permissions grated contrary to Environment Agency advice on fluvial flooding. Number of Planning Permissions granted contrary to Lead Local Flood Authority advice on surface water flooding. Number of existing properties within the Environment Agency's flood risk areas. |

| Sustainability Topic | Sustainability Objective | Site Specific Questions | Monitoring Indicator |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Τορις | Sustainability Objective | Will there be an opportunity for | Proportion of new development/dwellings incorporating Sustainable urban drainage techniques. |
| Population and Human Health | 11 To provide affordable homes that meet local need | Will it provide sufficient housing to meet existing and future housing need? Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups? Will it reduce the number of households waiting for accommodation or accepted as homeless? Will it meet the needs of the travelling community and show people? | Number of households on the household register Number of people accepted as homeless (annually) Net Additional Dwellings Net affordable housing completions Housing mix Net additional Pitches. |
| Human Health | 12 Improve services and access to services to produce good health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities. | 1. Will it improve accessibility to health care for existing residents (including older residents) and provide additional facilities for new residents? | Life expectancy at birth (male and female) Number of new or improved healthcare facilities delivered annually through development |

| Sustainability Topic | Sustainability Objective | Site Specific Questions | Monitoring Indicator |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | Number of new sports pitches or other leisure facilities delivered annually through development |
| | | Will it support a healthy life style including opportunities for recreational/physical activity? | |
| | | 3. Will it provide new accessible green space? | |
| Population and Human Health | 13 To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime | Will it reduce crime through design measures? Will it contribute to a safe built environment? | Reduction in overall British Crime Survey comparator recorded crime – Lichfield District. % of residents who say that they feel very or fairly safe when outside in Staffordshire during the day. and after dark. |
| Material Assets | 14 Improve opportunities for prosperity and economic growth | Will it encourage higher skilled economic sectors in the District? Will it encourage new employment that is consistent with local needs? | Employment Rate Number of VAT registrations per 1000 Business Births Unemployment by ward Proportion of the District Employed in key sectors. |
| | | Will it encourage growth of existing businesses? | |

| Sustainability | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Topic | Sustainability Objective | Site Specific Questions | Monitoring Indicator |
| | | Will it encourage small businesses to grow? | |
| Material Assets | 15 To enhance the vitality and viability of existing city, town and village centres with the District | Will it improve existing facilities within Lichfield City and Burntwood Town Centre? Will it protect and enhance the ability of our key rural settlements to meet the day to day needs arising with these settlements and from the wider rural areas they serve? Will it support and protect existing neighbourhood centres serving the local needs of our urban communities | Total amount of retail floor space (by type) in Lichfield City Centre and Burntwood Town Centre. New retail spaced developed within villages Loss of shops and other retail businesses to other uses Vacancy rates in Lichfield City Centre and Burntwood Town Centre. Loss of local community, leisure and shopping facilities to other uses. |
| Population and Human Health | 16 Increase participation and improve access to education, skills based training knowledge and information and lifelong learning | Will it increase educational attainment amongst young people? Will it reduce the number of working age residents who have no, or lower level qualifications? | Proportion of working age population with no, or lower level qualifications. Success rate for Work Based Learning 5 of Working Age Population with NVQ level 4 and above. Success rate for further education. |

| Sustainability | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Topic | Sustainability Objective | Site Specific Questions | Monitoring Indicator |
| | | | % of 18-59 year olds attending Higher Education Institutions. |
| | | | |

Appendix B Table 2 Sites Predicted Effect

Table 3

| SA | Sites with overall Positive Effects(recorded one or more | Sites with overall Negative Effects |
|-----------|--|---|
| Objective | ++ against site specific questions and /or recorded two or | (recorded one or more against site specific questions and /or recorded two |
| | more + against site specific questions) | or more - against site specific questions) |
| 1 | | A2,A3,A4,A5,AH,R1,FZ2,F1,NT1,HR1(255),HR2(135),OR1,OR3,OR5,S1,W2,F2,(EL |
| | | AA 97),B1,B2,B3,B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L2,L3,L4,L5(89-90), L5(1065), |
| | | L5(19),L6,L7,L8,L9,L10,L12,L13,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,L20,L21,L23,L25,L26,L27,L2 |
| | | 8,B20,B21,L31,HR2,OR7,OR8,L30,H1 |
| 2 | | L29,HR2,OR7,L30,H1,A2,AH1,FZ2,R1,NT1,NT2,HR1(255),OR1,OR3,OR4,OR5,S1, |
| | | L2,L5(89-90),L5(19),L6,L8,L10,L19,L22 |
| 3 | L29,FZ2,OR3,OR5 | L31,L29,OR4,A2,NT1,W2,W3,L1,L4,L6,L8,L13,L18,L26 |
| 4 | B20,B21,L31,L29,A2,A3,A4,A5,AH1,FZ2,FZ3,F1,NT2,S1,W2, | L29,OR7,OR8,R1,OR1,OR3,OR4,OR5,L1,L2,L6 |
| | W3,GT21,B1,B2,B3,B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L3,L4,L | |
| | 5(19),L5 (89- | |
| | 90),L5(1065),L6,L7,L8,L9,L10,L12,L13,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,L | |
| | 20,L21,L22,L23,L24,L25,L26,L27,L28 | |
| 5 | B20,B21,L31,L29,OR8,OR7,H1,A4,R1,FZ2,OR1,OR3,OR4,OR5 | A2,A3,A5,AH1,FZ3,NT1,NT2,W2,W3,HR1(255),HR1(135),S1,F2(ELAA97),F2(ELA |
| | ,W2,GT21,B1,B2,B3,B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B17,L1,L4,L5(106 | A 105),F2(ELAA113),B16,L2,L3,L5(19),L8,L9,L10,L20 |
| | 5),L6,L7,L8L12,L13,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,L21,L22,L23,L24,L25 | |
| _ | ,L26,L27,L28 | |
| 6 | B20,B21,L31,L29,OR7,OR8,L30,H1,A3,A4,AH1,R1,FZ2,FZ3,N | HR2,OR7,OR8,H1,NT1,NT2,OR1,OR3,EMP1(ELAA97),EMP1(ELAA113) |
| | T1,OR5,S1,W2,W3,F2(ELAA97),F2(ELAA105),F2(ELAA113),A | |
| | 6,B1,B2,B3,B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L4,L5(19), | |
| | L5(879-90),L5 | |
| | (1065),L6,L7,L8,L9,L10,L12,L13,L16,L18,L19,L20,L21,L22,L23 | |
| 7 | ,L24,L25,L26,L27,L28 | |
| 7 | D20 D24 L24 L20 OD0 L20 D4 F72 D4 D2 D4 D0 D40 D42 D46 | 12.005 |
| 8 | B20,B21,L31,L29,OR8,L30,R1,FZ2,B1,B3,B4,B8,B10,B13,B16, | L3,OR5 |
| | L1,L4,L5(1065),L6,L7,L12,L13,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,20,L21,L2 | |
| | 2,L23,L24,L25,L26,L27,L28,L29 | |

| 0 | | UD2 OD7 U1 |
|----|--|--|
| 9 | | HR2,OR7,H1, |
| | | A2,A3,A5,AH1,FZ3,F1,NT1,NT2,W2,W3,HR1(255),HR1(135),B2,B3,B4,B5,L2,L4,L |
| | | 5(19),L5(89-90),L8,L9,L10,L20,F2(ELAA 105),F2(ELAA 113) |
| 10 | | A2,S1 |
| 11 | B20,B21,L31,L29,HR2,OR7,OR8,H1,A2,A3,A4,A5,AH1,FZ2,FZ | GT21 |
| | 3,F1,NT1,NT2,HR1(255),HR1(135),OR1,OR3,OR4,OR5,S1,W2 | |
| | ,W3,GT21,B1,B2,B3,B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L2,L3, | |
| | L4,L5(19),L5(1065),L5(89- | |
| | 90),L6,L7,L8,L9,L10,L12,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,L20,L21,L22,L2 | |
| | 3,L24,L25,L26,L27,L28, | |
| 12 | B20,B21,L31,L29,HR2,OR7,OR8,L30,H1,A2,A3,A4,A5,AH1,R1 | |
| | ,FZ2,FZ3,F1,HR1(255)HR1(135),OR1,OR3,OR4,OR5,S1,W2,W | |
| | 3,F2(ELAA97),F2(ELAA105),F2(ELAA113)OR6,A6,B1,B2,B3,B | |
| | 4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L2,L3,L4,L5,L6,L7,L8,L9,L10, | |
| | L12,L13,L14,15,16,L17,L18,L19,L20,L21,L22,L23,L24,L25,L26 | |
| | ,L27,L28 | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | L30,F2(ELAA97)F2(ELAA105),F2(ELAA | L31,L29,OR7,S1,R1,FZ2,S1,R1,FZ2,B1,B2,B3,B4,B8,B13,B16,B17,L3,L14,L23,L24, |
| | 113),OR6,A6,L6,L17,L22,L27 | L27 |
| 15 | GT21,B20,B21,L31,L29,OR7,A2,A3,A4,A5,AH1,FZ2,FZ3,F1,W | |
| | 2,W3,R2(ELAA97),F2(ELAA105),F2(ELAA113),OR6,A6,B2,B3, | |
| | B4,B5,B7,B8,B10,B13,B16,B17,L1,L2,L3,L4,L5(19),L5(89- | |
| | 90),L5(1065)L6,L7,L8,L9,L10,L12,L14,L16,L17,L18,L19,L20,L2 | |
| | 1,L22,L23,L25,L26,L27,L28 | |
| | | |
| 16 | | |
| | T Company of the Comp | |

Appendix C Table 3 Polices Predicted Effect

Table 4

| SA | Proposed Policy Options with overall Positive Effects(recorded | Proposed Policy Options with overall Negative Effects |
|-----------|---|---|
| Objective | one or more ++ against site specific questions and /or recorded | (recorded one or more against site specific questions and /or |
| | two or more + against site specific questions) | recorded two or more - against site specific questions) |
| 1 | NR11 National Forest | |
| | NR 10 Cannock Chase AONB | |
| | IP2:Lichfield Canal | |
| 2 | NR11 National Forest | ST5: Road and Junction Improvements –Fradley |
| | NR 10 Cannock Chase AONB | ST3:Road Line Safeguarding |
| | ST3:Road Line Safeguarding | |
| | IP2:Lichfield Canal | |
| | BE2: Heritage Assets Policy Lichfield | |
| 3 | E3: Shop fronts and advertisements | E2 Service Access to our Centres |
| | ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City | |
| | IP2:Lichfield Canal | |
| 4 | IP2:Lichfield Canal | ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City |
| | NR11 National Forest | |
| | NR 10 Cannock Chase AONB | |
| | E3: Shop fronts and advertisements | |
| | E2 Service Access to our Centres | |
| | ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City | |
| | ST3:Road Line Safeguarding | |
| | BE2: Heritage Assets Policy Lichfield | |
| 5 | Burntwood 3 | ST5: Road and Junction Improvements – Fradley |
| | Lichfield 3 | IP2:Lichfield Canal |
| | ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City | |
| 6 | ST5: Road and Junction Improvements Fradley | |
| | ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City | |
| | ST3:Road Line Safeguarding | |
| | IP2:Lichfield Canal | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City | ST5 Road and Junction Improvements Fradley |

| | | ST3:Road Line Safeguarding |
|----|--|--|
| | | IP2:Lichfield Canal |
| 10 | IP2: Lichfield Canal | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | NR11 National Forest | |
| | IP2: Lichfield Canal | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | Burntwood 3Lichfield 4 | E3: Shop fronts and advertisements |
| | E2: Service Access to our Centre | ST5 Road and Junction Improvements Fradley |
| | EMP1: Employment Areas & Allocations | |
| | ST4: Road Junction Improvements – Lichfield City | |
| | ST3:Road Line Safeguarding | |
| 15 | IP2: Lichfield Canal | E3: Shop fronts and advertisements |
| 16 | | |