

CABINET

11 June 2009

Report of the Portfolio Holder Economic Development and Enterprise

Core Strategy : Option Consultation : Responses

Purpose

For Members to consider the responses to the consultation on the Core Strategy Option Document carried out in February and March 2009 and the next stage in the process to deliver a sound Core Strategy.

The report is not a key decision.

Executive Summary

In February and March this year a consultation was undertaken in respect of an Option Document which sought broad consensus to the direction of the future development of Tamworth. 39 respondents made representations and these comprised a mixture of developers, government agencies and individual members of the public. It is clear from the responses that a broad consensus on the future development of Tamworth was not achieved.

Further evidence gathering will be required before the production of the Preferred Option in September 2009. A key part of the Local Development Framework and Core Strategy will be an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to show how policies and proposals can be implemented. To be found sound, the Core Strategy must identify the infrastructure requirements for its area, who will provide them and when. This is not something the Borough Council can do alone and it will need to work closely with its partners to prepare the infrastructure delivery plan.

Policy, Capital & Revenue Budget Background

There are no policy, capital or revenue budget issues arising from this report.

Recommendations

- 1. That Members note the responses to the Core Strategy Option Document and approve the suggested Borough Council responses outlined in Appendix A of this report.**
- 2. That Members approve the preparation of a Core Strategy Preferred Option document to be submitted to Cabinet for approval prior to consultation.**

If Members would like further information or clarification prior to the meeting please contact Matthew Bowers Ext. 279 or Ray Vanstone Ext. 276.

<i>Background Papers</i>	<i>Report to Cabinet 15 October 2008, minute number 310</i>
	<i>Report to Cabinet 11 February 2009, minute number 518</i>

Core Strategy : Option Consultation : Responses

Background

The Local Development Framework (LDF) is a collection of Development Plan Documents (DPD's) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) which collectively delivers the spatial strategy for an area. The Core Strategy is the key document within the LDF and will contain a vision and strategic objectives for the Borough as well as Core Policies that will set the basis for directing change in the Borough for the next 15 to 20 years. It is a requirement of the process that we should have continuous engagement with all those who have an interest in the future of Tamworth.

In February and March this year a consultation was undertaken in respect of an Option Document which sought broad consensus to the direction of the future development of Tamworth. The consultation document was approved by Cabinet on 11 February 2009. The document sets out an amended vision for the how the Borough will develop, Spatial Objectives to address the key issues identified and a spatial option for how growth could be managed and draft Core Policies that would support the delivery of the Strategy. It also included generic development management policies which are the broad principles of development against which planning applications can be assessed.

39 respondents made representations and these comprised a mixture of developers, government agencies and individual members of the public. Further work will be needed to raise the profile of the LDF and Core Strategy in the Borough and to try and generate a higher level of response at the next consultation. It is clear from the responses that a broad consensus on the future development of Tamworth was not achieved.

Overview of the responses received.

Appendix A contains a summary of the responses received and a suggested Borough Council response. The following provides an overview of the responses received in relation to key questions:

The Vision: The majority of respondents supported the vision, those that suggested changes were often minor changes to reflect their organisations remit or to strengthen references to particular issues.

Spatial Objectives: Generally there was support for the objectives, and where amendments were suggested these were often wording suggestions to strengthen references to particular issues.

Delivery of Development: There was a mixed response to the sequential approach identified, with those suggesting changes to ensure that Greenbelt, greenfield and sites outside of the Borough boundary were considered at the same time based on sustainability.

Core Policies & Development Management Policies: There was a mixed response to individual policies. It was suggested that these should be subdivided and they should be locally distinctive and based on evidence.

Evidence Base

The consultation has highlighted where further evidence is required before producing a preferred option. Ongoing work for the LDF includes the process of assembling a range of technical documents and assessments to inform the preparation of the Local Development Framework policies and proposals. The evidence base needs to be completed prior to the Council determining the content of the Core Strategy Preferred Option. Appendix B summarises progress on the ongoing studies that have recently been completed or are in progress.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan

A key part of the Core Strategy will be an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to show how policies and proposals can be implemented. It is recognised that to create sustainable communities providing housing and employment opportunities alone is not sufficient. There is a need to provide the necessary supporting 'infrastructure' including utility services, transport, schools, open space, community, health and leisure services. These services are provided by a range of organisations and the preparation of an integrated infrastructure delivery plan is essential for Local Authorities and their partners to fulfil their place shaping role. To be found sound, the Core Strategy must identify the infrastructure requirements for its area, who will provide them and when. This is not something the Borough Council can do alone and it will need to work closely with its partners to prepare the infrastructure delivery plan.

It is envisaged that the LSP is utilised as an existing partnership of organisations to identify those that need to be involved and to start to establish a baseline.

As part of this process the Borough Council will need to undertake a review of its own land and buildings, and identify if any land can be released to deliver public services.

Next steps

It is intended that work continues on producing the evidence base and preparing a Core Strategy Preferred Option for consideration by Cabinet in September. All of the comments received will be taken into consideration in developing the Preferred Option. Further consultation and discussion with key groups and individuals will also continue. Work will also commence on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and it is envisaged that an event to gather all partners together to discuss the way forward will be held in early summer.

It is intended to consult on the Core Strategy Preferred Option document in September / October 2009. The document will then be finalised and prepared for Cabinet consideration in January 2010. Subject to approval a final Draft Core Strategy will be published (Regulation 27) in order for representations (relating to issues of soundness) to be made. The document will then be submitted (Regulation 30 and 31) to the Secretary of State for examination in the late summer of 2010.

Appendix A – comment on responses

Respondent	Agent	Main issues raised	Council's Response
Taylor Wimpey	Boyer Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2900 houses will not provide all of Tamworth's housing need, at least 3489 houses will be required taking into account Regional Housing Land Potential Study and projected household increases of 5000. • There is evidence that Tamworth will not be able to meet its locally generated housing requirement within the Borough boundary. • There will be a shortfall if either the Anker Valley is not deliverable or a flexibility allowance is included. • New locations for housing should be related as closely as possible to the existing urban area because of accessibility to facilities. • Structure Plan EIP considered Green Belt – unlikely to have the capacity to accommodate requirement. Even less likely to meet requirement of the current plan period. • EIP panel considered land to north of Tamworth to have merit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not in the Green Belt ○ Less constrained in landscape terms 	<p>The Council is awaiting the outcome of the RSS Phase Two examination to see if the Borough's housing requirements are revised.</p> <p>The Council is undertaking a joint development and infrastructure study in conjunction with Lichfield District Council and North Warwickshire Borough Council. This will provide detailed evidence of the Borough's capacity to accommodate growth within its own boundary.</p> <p>The Anker Valley would be a strategic housing allocation, which would be essential to the delivery of the strategy. It is therefore essential that it can be delivered within the Core Strategy period. It will be necessary to undertake further assessment of the site to justify its inclusion in the Strategy.</p> <p>Comments regarding land put forward for consideration have been noted. All sites will be assessed against sustainability and deliverability criteria.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Walking and cycling distance of town centre and railway station ○ Able to integrate with Anker Valley development ● Sequential approach under CP1 is inappropriate; land outside the Borough should be considered before the Green Belt in the sequential approach. ● Green Belt should not be considered at all or be last in hierarchy. ● Co-ordinate the spatial strategy for 2900 within the Borough with the remainder of the town's requirements outside the Borough. 	<p>The sequential approach will be refined for the preferred option version of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Structure Plan policy has fallen.</p> <p>It is understood that when considering land to the north, it was assumed that Anker Valley would be brought forward first and any development to the north would require new infrastructure and road link to Anker Valley. Any development to the north would also need to demonstrate its viability regarding the provision of infrastructure.</p>
Sport England		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SO11 is an improvement on previous version. However, whilst it addresses accessibility, it also needs to address quantity and quality of open space. ● Any option will need to appropriately protect and provide open space or sports facilities. ● Policy CP1 should include reference to 'Active Design' as it will help deliver SO11 and CP6. It might be more appropriate for DM1. ● Town centre may have a role in providing new sports facilities e.g. new sports hall or swimming pool. Town centre is a key location for strategic sports provision to maximise accessibility. PPG17 work will help to 	<p>The Core Strategy and/or SPD will take forward standards for all types of open space and sports/recreation facilities.</p> <p>The PPG17 work on sports/recreation facilities will highlight the need for a new sports facility and help to identify a suitable location.</p> <p>The Council does not intend to discourage the provision of small private gyms in employment areas where there is no loss of essential employment land (to be determined by further research). There are a number already that provide for particular needs. The Council is undertaking an employment land review to assess the</p>

		<p>determine if a new facility is needed and if the town centre is the preferred location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP4 and CP6 seem to discourage built sports facilities like private gyms in employment areas. Advise liaising with leisure department to identify whether there is a need for more formal facilities to encourage an active workplace. New employment buildings should incorporate showers and bike stores. • Lack of reference to BSF, which is a great opportunity for schools to provide community benefits through new/refurbished/extended access to facilities such as sports, library or theatre. • Standards should be set for all open space, sport and recreation in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility. • DM2 should also refer to cycle routes. 	<p>existing situation, whether new site need to be identified, the continued suitability of existing sites and to establish a vision for the future.</p> <p>Core policy area CP6 includes provision for informal recreation space in employment areas. Reference could also be made to the provision of bike stands and shower facilities in this policy, CP1 or DM2.</p> <p>BSF is an opportunity to secure community use of school facilities (not just sports facilities). The Council is trying to influence the outcome of this through meetings with the County Council.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p> <p>The Council would welcome Sport England input into this discussion.</p>
M Carroll		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous planners have destroyed Tamworth's heritage, there isn't much left to interest tourists. • Need more for teenagers. • Tamworth has lost much of its engineering and manufacturing. Office blocks and shops are boarded up. • Does not agree with ban on disabled people parking on George Street and Church Street. • Does not like the new Snowdome hotel. 	<p>Many parts of the Borough contain historic buildings and street layouts, particularly around the town centre. This is recognised in the designation of conservation areas.</p> <p>Parking and refuse collection are not planning policy issues. Illegal parking is now dealt with under the Civil Parking Enforcement scheme (also called 'Clear Streets').</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town centre needs to be accessible to disabled people, e.g. cobbles not easy to drive over. • Bulky rubbish is not removed quickly enough and the Council needs to advertise this service. • Council needs more powers to control itinerants and rubbish dumping. 	Other comments noted.
Alan Wiseman		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not agree with the proposal to allocate Anker Valley for development because it is within an area liable to flooding. All brownfield land should be investigated before greenfield areas are used. Brownfield land is not mentioned in any depth in the report. 	<p>The Anker Valley site is within Flood Zone 1, which is low risk. The Council is undertaking a review of its strategic housing land availability assessment (SHLAA) to assess the capacity of the urban area to accommodate additional development.</p> <p>Effective use should be made of land, which includes reusing previously developed sites and this still remains a national priority. However, in order to deliver the required levels of growth, the Council acknowledges that it is necessary to develop this in tandem with appropriate sustainable greenfield sites.</p>
Advantage West Midlands		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome CP3 re making the most of the town centre's cultural and historic assets for tourism. • Welcome DM3 re reduction in use of finite resources and impact on the environment. Reference to WM sustainability checklist. • Approach to delivery of development is unclear and 'scenarios for distribution of 	<p>The Council will undertake additional work on the deliverability and viability of directions of growth and individual sites to justify their inclusion.</p> <p>The core policy contents included in the Option document were an indication of the issues that would be covered. The Council appreciates that they will need to be re-</p>

		<p>development' do not correspond with text.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the bullet points in the outline policies should be combined to fully explain the Council's intentions. • Lack of reference to affordable housing to meet needs and aspirations of local people in line with level of predicted housing growth. 	<p>drafted as workable policies for the Preferred option version of the core strategy.</p> <p>Points about affordable housing noted.</p>
West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium	Tetlow King Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable and specialist housing should be prioritised throughout the CS as meeting local housing needs is a pressing concern. • Affordable and specialist housing should be included in the spatial objectives, possibly under SO10. • Future CS drafts should reflect changes to RSS figures. • Support 20% flexibility allowance. • Review of green field and Green Belt land will be necessary and should be instigated as soon as possible. • Affordable housing should be a core policy on its own. It should also feature in CP1. Policy should include thresholds and credible district wide and sub district wide targets. • Recommend a separate core policy on housing to meet the needs of the elderly/specialist housing, again with thresholds and targets. • Should make reference to Code for 	<p>The Council is undertaking a joint development and infrastructure study in conjunction with Lichfield District Council and North Warwickshire Borough Council. This will provide detailed evidence of the Borough's capacity to accommodate growth within its own boundary.</p> <p>Points about affordable housing, specialist/elderly housing, setting targets and thresholds noted. The Council is undertaking further work on defining affordability at a local level.</p> <p>The Council is awaiting the outcome of the RSS Phase Two examination to see if the Borough's housing requirements are revised.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that site viability to accommodate renewables, affordable housing and other planning obligations is an important issue that will need further</p>

		<p>Sustainable Homes and Lifetime Homes in CP1 and DM3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site size thresholds for affordable housing should be properly derived from local housing and land markets. Consider the circumstances across the district which justify proposed site size thresholds. • Set a local definition of affordable housing for intermediate and social rented housing, taking into consideration the local relationship between incomes and housing prices. • Proper targeting of individual sites for affordable housing, including sites for 100%. • Flexibility re design and development control standards, densities etc. to achieve affordable housing. • Flexible approach to S106 agreements when working with RSL's. 	<p>investigation. It is likely that the outcome of the RSS Phase 2 examination will not be known prior to the publication of a Preferred option version of the core strategy. The core strategy therefore needs to build in flexibility to account for any changes.</p> <p>Further evidence gathering to inform affordable housing policy will be undertaken.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
Royal London Asset Management	DPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support focus of development on existing urban fabric. • Broadly supportive of sequential approach, however, with regard to retailing, this should not preclude consideration of edge or out of centre sites, if there are no suitable or viable town centre sites. • With regard to protection of existing employment sites, monitoring should allow critical review of them and their 	<p>The Council is undertaking additional work to assess the need for additional convenience and comparison retail. The town centre is still the preferred location for new retail development in line with national policy.</p> <p>The Council monitors employment land availability and employment areas and is reviewing their continuing suitability for this use. It intends to undertake market testing</p>

		continued suitability.	with commercial agents. Other comments noted.
Maurice Arnold		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm the Green Belt and greenfield areas and promote biodiversity in these locations. Appoint specialist biodiversity officer for the Borough. 	<p>The joint growth and infrastructure study will provide recommendations on the most sustainable directions for growth, which may include the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council does not have a specialist biodiversity officer but can draw on the expertise of Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and the Wild about Tamworth project officer.</p>
J Plimmer		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reconstruct old buildings lost over the years using old photos as references. Place them in the precinct and use for retail. Car parking should be affordable. 	<p>The regeneration of the town centre will be taken forward by the emerging Town Centre Partnership.</p> <p>It is considered that Tamworth's car parking prices are comparable with other local town centres. Again, the Town Centre Partnership will address this issue.</p>
London Midland		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be better linkages between the railway station and town centre. Mention railway links to the south east in addition to the WM conurbation. 	<p>It is acknowledged that the linkages are currently poor and need to be improved as part of the overall regeneration of the town centre. The Council welcomes working closely with partners to improve these linkages, particularly as the majority of land is outside the Council's ownership.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
National Grid		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This organisation needs to be involved in preparation, alteration and review of DPDs which may affect their assets: 	<p>The Council will liaise with the respondent regarding infrastructure requirements.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies relating to overhead lines, cables or pipelines ○ site allocations that are crossed by overhead or underground lines, cables or pipelines; ○ policies or development adjacent to high voltage substations or above ground installations ○ policies relating to infrastructure or utility provision ○ policies diverting or under grounding overhead lines ○ development in the countryside ○ landscape policies ○ waste and minerals ● ensure consultation on planning applications that affect assets. 	<p>Other comments noted.</p>
GOWM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Publication draft will need some certainty including the deliverability/viability of part or all of the Anker Valley site. ● In identifying sites outside the built up area, greenfield sites will need to be assessed alongside Green Belt. The latter could be more sustainable. ● Core Strategy can include strategic allocations. Consider whether the greenfield and/or Green Belt housing and employment provision are strategic sites (allocations) or broad locations for development. ● If strategy of development outside the 	<p>The Anker Valley would be a strategic housing allocation, which would be essential to the delivery of the strategy. It is therefore essential that it can be delivered within the Core Strategy period. It will be necessary to undertake further assessment of the site to justify its inclusion in the Strategy.</p> <p>The joint growth and infrastructure study should provide recommendations on the most sustainable directions for growth, which may include the Green Belt. The Council is already engaged in joint working with Lichfield and North Warwickshire</p>

		<p>Borough is taken forward, need to show support and commitment to delivery from neighbouring authorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office development outside the town centre is contrary to national and regional policy and needs to be strongly justified. • Explore potential for mixed use town centre to include retail and office and other uses like housing and leisure. • Should be more ambitious in Vision and state that neighbourhood deprivation will be eradicated. • Map on page 8 could form the basis of a key diagram. Add reference points e.g. areas of deprivation, other neighbourhoods, flood plain, main retail parks, canals and Snowdome. Add features outside borough but relating to it, e.g. Drayton Manor, M42 MSA, Sir Robert Peel Hospital. • Is the Council going to consult on some of the issues, e.g. affordable housing thresholds before publication draft? • Core and development management policies should be locally distinctive and not repeat national policy. • Policies may need to be subdivided because of the wide range of issues proposed to be covered. • Deprived neighbourhoods should have economic support in addition to social 	<p>Councils.</p> <p>The Council is not convinced that the RSS requirement for offices is appropriate or that it can be accommodated within the town centre. It will undertake a review of potential sites and test the market. The Town Centre Masterplan includes recommendations for potential uses, which will be used to direct the strategy for the town centre.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the Vision should be ambitious, the Council considers that it should also be achievable.</p> <p>The Council intends to produce a Preferred Option version of the core strategy in September 2009, which will contain more refined policies. It will consult on emerging evidence such as the joint growth and infrastructure study, playing pitch and sports facility study, employment area review, affordable housing issues, retail review etc.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that the infrastructure delivery plan will form a critical part of the Core Strategy and local development framework.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>infrastructure improvements in CP2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of the issues in CP2 would form the basis of an implementation/ delivery plan and it may be appropriate to include them there rather than a core policy. • The town centre policy CP3 should include a development strategy. • Expand CP4 and CP5 to include issues like facilitating the diversification of the local economy and up-skilling workforce. • Include in publication draft how all the components of the strategy can be delivered, by which organisation and when. Indicate how the infrastructure will be delivered. • CS must undertake an assessment to comply with EU Directive on habitats even though there are no European biodiversity sites. Check with English Nature. • Publication CS should include a housing trajectory (possibly as an appendix) and also identify saved local plan policies that would be superseded by the CS. • Draws attention to the PAS soundness self assessment toolkit. 	
Bloor Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not agree with sequential approach. It should be amended to urban – greenfield – land outside Borough – 	The joint growth and infrastructure study will make recommendations on the most sustainable directions for growth, which

		<p>Green Belt. Sites in first three categories should be selected on basis of sustainability and deliverability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt should be retained in line with RSS. Locations outside the Green Belt should be tested and discounted before the Green Belt is considered as a last resort. • Notion that all possibilities within the Borough must be exhausted before considering land outside is not credible. • Welcome 20% flexibility allowance. • Core policies should be locally distinctive and based on robust and credible evidence. • CP1 reference to windfall allowance in housing trajectory should only be included where local circumstances justify it. Refers to SHLAA which says that such circumstances do not exist and no allowance is made for windfalls. 	<p>together with information from infrastructure providers, will refine the sequential approach. The Council is considering Green Belt alongside greenfield sites within the Borough and land outside the Borough. Sustainability and deliverability are important factors that will guide the selected direction of growth.</p> <p>Effective use should be made of land, which includes re-using previously developed sites and this still remains a national priority. However, in order to deliver the required levels of growth, the Council acknowledges that it is necessary to develop this in tandem with appropriate and sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>Windfalls will not form an integral part of the supply in the Core Strategy but they will be regarded as an additional source of supply.</p>
Helen Gill		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure should meet the needs of vulnerable and disabled people. Involve disability groups. • Older people and people with disabilities should be able to access appropriate town centre housing under Living and Working. • Take into account needs of vulnerable groups under Healthy and Active Communities. 	<p>It is acknowledged that infrastructure also includes 'social' infrastructure or services.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
WM Morrison	Peacock & Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core strategy to contain a realistic 	The Council will undertake further work to

Supermarkets PLC		<p>summary of the need for convenience and comparison retail development in the Borough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a positive strategic policy framework for retail uses and town centres which fosters a competitive and innovative retail sector. • Very concerned about requirement for on-site renewable energy generation. This should only apply to developments where installation is viable. • Do not place an undue burden on developers, should not specify that all energy is to be renewable. 	<p>identify the need and capacity for convenience and comparison retail floorspace.</p> <p>The Council is aware of viability concerns regarding renewables and other development requirements. It will undertake further viability work through an update on the SHLAA.</p> <p>Work is also being undertaken on climate change and the opportunity that exists to meet the requirements of PPS1 and its supplement.</p>
Lichfield DC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear about reference in the Vision to town functions no longer being constrained by an administrative boundary, how will this work in practice? Does it mean that the strategy needs evidence to show how the current administrative boundary constrains the function of the town and how the strategy or proposals will change this? • Surprised that the strategy contains scenarios for the distribution of growth because the deliverability of Anker Valley is uncertain. • Supports general approach of the sequence identified, but refers to RSS revision policy CF3 which does not make provision for part of Tamworth's 	<p>The reference in the Vision refers to the fact that the settlement of Fazeley/Mile Oak is contiguous with the Tamworth urban area. The presence of administrative boundaries does not restrict residents' use of services in either settlement. The administrative boundary does not necessarily constrain the function of Tamworth but could make it difficult to accommodate all the necessary growth in a sustainable way within its boundary. Joint working with Lichfield and North Warwickshire aims to identify the most sustainable locations for development, irrespective of boundaries. The joint growth and infrastructure study should provide recommendations on the most sustainable directions for growth, which may include the Green Belt.</p>

		<p>2900 to be found outside the Borough. It says that part of Lichfield's 8000 should relate to Tamworth, depending on further studies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant areas surrounding Tamworth in LDC and NWBC are also in Green Belt. Whether 'exceptional circumstances' exist for release of GB in any district will be revealed by joint study. • Support spatial objectives. 	<p>The Anker Valley would be a strategic housing allocation, which would be essential to the delivery of the strategy. It is therefore essential that it can be delivered within the Core Strategy period. It will be necessary to undertake further assessment of the site to justify its inclusion in the Strategy.</p>
Theatre Trust		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine SO2 and SO7 as they both deal with the town centre. • Combine SO6 and SO11 as they overlap and refer to cultural activities. • CP3 does not cover all elements of PPS6. Should include reference to venues for cultural activities to ensure the vitality of the town centre in the evening. • Disappointed at lack of a needs assessment for leisure and culture within evidence base. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Council is in the process of reviewing its Tourism Strategy, which includes the arts/entertainment industry.</p> <p>The Town Centre Masterplan was produced to generate a vision and ideas for regenerating the town centre. The Council is in the process of setting up a town centre partnership, which will consist of a range of public and private sector interests. This group will be responsible for drawing up an action plan and implementing proposals, which will be subject to public consultation.</p>
Natural England		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision should include reference to a high quality environment, sustainable living, enhanced green infrastructure, protection and enhancement of valuable natural and built resources. 	<p>The Council acknowledges the importance of linked up green infrastructure.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whatever option is chosen should deliver a strong green infrastructure made up of linked sites and green spaces. • Make explicit reference to sustainable design and construction methods, rather than 'high standards of design'. • Stronger emphasis on importance of the natural environment in delivery of sustainable construction activities. • CP1 - New development to be high quality, well designed, locally distinctive, sustainable. Include green infrastructure, be sensitive and enhance the landscape, local character and natural ecosystem. Sustainable design and construction to make efficient use of resources and minimise green house gas emissions. • CP2 – make specific reference to green infrastructure. • CP6 – include reference to existing open spaces and linking features. Use Natural England's accessible natural greenspace standards and refer to them as 'standards' rather than 'targets'. • CP7 – refer also to geodiversity. 	
Ken Forest		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests minor amendments to strategic objectives and three new objectives. • The Borough does not have a rolling 10 year supply of housing. 	<p>PPS3 outlines the requirement for a 5 year supply of deliverable sites, which the Council can prove is achievable.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the respondent has</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies a shortfall of 500 dwellings for period 2020 to 2026 taking account of completions, under construction, site identified in SHLAA/with planning permission and other sites identified from a revisit of the SHLAA. • Anker Valley could take substantially more than 800 dwellings. • Green Belt could take 240+ dwellings (planning application site plus others) • Identify greenfield and Green Belt sites in CS as broad locations for growth. • Strong objections to incorporation of a flexibility allowance as it is contrary to PPS3, it would enable developers to increase numbers on greenfield sites, it would encourage outward migration from the MUA and would reduce the Council's ability to respond to change through plan-monitor-review. • Should not limit tackling of deprivation to just Amington, Glascote and Belgrave. • Town centre section should cover sustainable transport. • Set housing density targets for all areas taking account of their character. • 'learning communities' covers education as well as training. Should refer to partners such as SCC, South Staffs College and education and training providers. 	<p>included the Anker Valley in his calculations.</p> <p>The Anker Valley would be a strategic housing allocation, which would be essential to the delivery of the strategy. It is therefore essential that it can be delivered within the Core Strategy period. It will be necessary to undertake further assessment of the site to justify its inclusion in the Strategy. Additional housing on this site or a wider site could help with development viability.</p> <p>The joint growth and infrastructure study will provide recommendations on the most sustainable directions for growth, which may include the Green Belt.</p> <p>The flexibility allowance has been included in order to enable higher household projections to be accommodated if necessary over the Plan period and in the event of a higher housing requirement coming through the RSS examination. PPG3 states that the Council must plan for a flexible responsive supply of land and in doing so, should identify broad locations and specific sites that ensure a continuous 15 years of housing delivery.</p> <p>The Core Strategy must be locally</p>
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to BSF in more detail re provision of community facilities. • Widen references to environmental projects (not just Wild about Tamworth) • Current guidance on private amenity areas has been adopted without going through due process. Need to re-state standards as guidance taking into account location and local circumstances. • Sizes and types of dwellings should satisfy local need. • DM3 should discourage impermeable surfaces to reduce flood risk. 	<p>distinctive. It would be appropriate to target specific areas to tackle known areas of deprivation rather than making a general statement about tackling deprivation throughout the Borough. This approach is supported by the evidence base, which in turn has informed the issues and spatial objectives.</p> <p>BSF is an opportunity to secure community use of school facilities (not just sports facilities). The Council is trying to influence the outcome of this through meetings with the County Council.</p> <p>Supplementary planning document (SPD) 'Open space for new residential development' related to adopted Local Plan policy. It was subject to full and open public consultation in line with the Statement of Community Involvement. The intention is to adopt standards for open space and sports facility provision through the Core Strategy and further SPD.</p> <p>'Wild about Tamworth' is the main biodiversity project based in Tamworth. It delivers practical benefits through habitat creation and restoration and educational benefits by working with communities to improve their local areas.</p>
--	--	---	--

			Other comments noted.
Tamworth Football Club	Signet Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to confirm commitment in Local Plan to supporting principle of a new football stadium for Tamworth FC either within or adjacent to the Borough. • New spatial objective to facilitate a new community stadium within or adjacent to the Borough, possibly using a sequential approach. • Apply sequential approach to employment and leisure development. Emphasis on potential of land adjacent to M42 junction 10. • CP1 – include reference to new community stadium for Tamworth FC. • CP4 – encourage joint working with adjoining authorities to find the most appropriate and sustainable location for development, including a new stadium to meet Tamworth’s needs. • CP5 – stadium can contribute towards a local learning community • CP6 – new stadium and ancillary facilities would have a role in meeting this policy. 	<p>The Council is undertaking a joint development and infrastructure study in conjunction with Lichfield District Council and North Warwickshire Borough Council. This will provide detailed evidence of the Borough’s capacity to accommodate growth within its own boundary.</p> <p>Comments about a new football stadium noted.</p>
Stuart Ashton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites in the urban area that are available, suitable and achievable should be identified as first priority (ref PPS3). If there are enough sites within this category to meet the total housing requirement then they should be 	<p>Effective use should be made of land, which includes reusing previously developed sites and this still remains a national priority. However, in order to deliver the required levels of growth, the Council acknowledges that it is necessary</p>

		<p>prioritised as brown before green. However the key consideration is not brown at any cost, they should meet the PPS3 tests first.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re the SHLAA, core strategy to confirm that both brownfield and greenfield infill sites are included within the definition of 'urban containment'. • Pennine Way is identified in the SHLAA as a suitable site within the 10 year supply. Although greenfield it should be considered before any development on unsustainable brownfield sites and urban extensions sites. It is available, suitable and achievable. • CP6 and CP7 – disagree with these policies. There should be a green Space review and only those sites that fulfil an open space function should be included. Open Space Position Statement identifies Pennine Way site as green space to be protected whereas the SHLAA identifies it as a suitable site for development within the 10 year supply. • Would like to be consulted on the Indoor and Outdoor Sports Strategy which is currently being prepared. 	<p>to develop this in tandem with appropriate and sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>The SHLAA contains both greenfield and brownfield sites within the urban area.</p> <p>Comments regarding land put forward for consideration have been noted. It is currently shown on the adopted proposals map as part of the greenspace/open space network. All sites will be assessed against sustainability and deliverability criteria.</p> <p>The Council will consult on emerging evidence such as the joint growth and infrastructure study, playing pitch and spots facility study, employment area review, affordable housing issues, retail review etc.</p>
--	--	--	---

Coal Authority		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS to include a reference to the need for sustainable and safe development, with reference to Tamworth's coal mining legacy. The Borough contains unstable land and other environmental risks which need to be addressed through the development process. e.g. centre of Borough contains coal resources and the southern end along the A51 corridor has been subject to coal mining. • Most past mining is generally benign, but potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. • CP7 to refer to safe natural green space. • DM1 to refer to ground and site investigations to ensure public safety and protect amenity. • DM3 to refer to removal of mineral resource from site prior to development to avoid sterilisation. 	Comments noted.
Newton Regis, Seckington & No Man's Heath Parish Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building more houses in the Anker Valley will have a detrimental impact on the outlying villages and potentially increase traffic using B5493. • Encroaching on Green Belt land is 	The Anker Valley site was allocated in the Local Plan which was adopted in 2006. It would be a strategic housing allocation, which would be essential to the delivery of the strategy. It is therefore essential that it

		<p>unnecessary and will result in Tamworth joining up with the villages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building more houses north of Tamworth will result in more traffic noise in the villages. 	<p>can be delivered within the Core Strategy period. It will be necessary to undertake further assessment of the site to justify its inclusion in the Strategy.</p> <p>The Council is undertaking a joint development and infrastructure study in conjunction with Lichfield District Council and North Warwickshire Borough Council. This will provide detailed evidence of the Borough's capacity to accommodate growth within its own boundary. One of the fundamental principles is that growth should be directed to the most sustainable locations, which may include the Green Belt or land outside the Borough.</p>
William Davis		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the use of the sequential approach when selecting locations for housing development, it is contrary to national guidance. Delete first bullet point of CP1. • Does not agree with using previously developed land first, although accept that it is a national priority. • Brownfield and greenfield land should be developed in tandem. • CP1 covers too many issues, it should be broken down into separate policies. Climate change/renewable technologies should be dealt with separately to ensure that it is properly tested and 	<p>Effective use should be made of land, which includes reusing previously developed sites and this still remains a national priority. However, in order to deliver the required levels of growth, the Council acknowledges that it is necessary to develop this in tandem with appropriate sustainable greenfield sites.</p> <p>The joint growth and infrastructure study will make recommendations on the most sustainable directions for growth, which together with information from infrastructure providers, will refine the sequential approach. The Council is considering Green Belt alongside greenfield sites within</p>

		<p>does not limit viability of housing developments. Design bullet point would also have a significant influence on future residential development design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP4 is too long and should be split into separate policies. Affordable housing and density should not be dealt with in the same policy. • DM3 – all the provisions of this policy have cost implications which could adversely affect the viability of development. They should be split into separate policies to ensure that they are adequately tested. 	<p>the Borough and land outside the Borough. Sustainability and deliverability are important factors that will guide the selected direction of growth.</p> <p>The Council intends to produce a Preferred Option version of the core strategy in September 2009, which will contain more refined policies.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that site viability to accommodate renewables, affordable housing and other planning obligations is an important issue that will need further investigation.</p>
English Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-name 'built environment' section 'historic environment'. • Check SCC's historic environment record for further information on the archaeological resource. • Recognise potential for unrecorded archaeological remains and setting of designated assets. • Refer to SCC's historic landscape characterisation. • Refer to historic environment character assessment for Lichfield DC as it covers areas bordering Tamworth and will be useful in informing decisions on growth outside the Borough. 	<p>The policy heading is 'Looking after our environment'. It currently encompasses both heritage and biodiversity matters. The Council intends to produce a Preferred option version of the core strategy in September 2009, which will contain more refined policies.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
Gilman	Howkins & Harrison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP5 covers issues outside the LDF that are not related to planning policy. 	<p>The Core Strategy is meant to be a 'spatial plan'. This means that it goes beyond</p>

			<p>traditional land use planning by bringing together a range of factors such as health, education and employment (which are the responsibility of other partner organisations) in order to create sustainable communities.</p>
Clarke	Howkins & Harrison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider Green Belt release as Anker Valley cannot accommodate all Borough's housing requirement, particularly if it is also to provide employment. 	<p>The Anker Valley site was allocated in the Local Plan which was adopted in 2006. It would be a strategic housing allocation, which would be essential to the delivery of the strategy. It is therefore essential that it can be delivered within the Core Strategy period. It will be necessary to undertake further assessment of the site to justify its inclusion in the Strategy.</p> <p>The Anker Valley is not an area that is being considered for employment use. It was considered as part of the Local Plan process but the allocation was removed at pre-inquiry stage.</p> <p>The Council is undertaking a joint development and infrastructure study in conjunction with Lichfield District Council and North Warwickshire Borough Council. This will provide detailed evidence of the Borough's capacity to accommodate growth within its own boundary. One of the fundamental principles is that growth should be directed to the most sustainable locations, which may include the Green Belt or land outside the Borough.</p>

Surinder Singh		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP4 - not clear where 'other community facilities' referred to in the evidence base are addressed in this policy. 	<p>Social facilities are currently dealt with under CP6, Healthy and Active Communities.</p>
Centro		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality public transport can help with regeneration, reducing emissions and providing an alternative to the car. • Spatial objective SO6 could be strengthened by replicating T10 policy of the Regional Transport Strategy to reduce the number and length of journeys. Provide key services closer to people so that they can use sustainable modes rather than the car. • Spatial objective SO6 should be widened to provide people with the opportunity and choice to travel by more sustainable transport modes for all journeys. • Ensure appropriate infrastructure is in place to support new or existing developments, particularly those on the periphery. High quality public transport infrastructure should be provided to serve new developments at the outset. • No reference to how the trips associated with growth will be catered for. 2900+ new houses plus associated employment growth and essential facilities could create huge new numbers of trips. • CP1 - infrastructure improvements are likely to be critical to the success of 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Core Strategy must be locally distinctive and not repeat national or regional policy. It would not therefore be appropriate to repeat a policy from the Regional Transport Strategy. Reference will be made to it if it is considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that an infrastructure delivery plan will be a crucial requirement to ensure delivery of the Core Strategy. The Council will engage with infrastructure providers to discuss delivery of the overall strategy and specific sites.</p> <p>The Council intends to produce a Preferred option version of the core strategy in September 2009, which will contain more refined policies.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that pedestrian linkages between the railway station and town centre are currently poor and need to be improved as part of the overall regeneration of the town centre.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>

		<p>policies and proposals in the core strategy and the promotion of accessible developments and sustainable regeneration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP2 - make specific reference to public transport's role in helping to reduce emissions, social inclusion and offering sustainable transport choices. • CP3 - include provision of pedestrian links through the town centre, to and from the surrounding public transport network to encourage the use of public transport. Rail services should be considered. • CP4 - Joint working should include liaison with Centro, with particular reference to public transport/rail links to the wider region. • Would welcome working with TBC re improving rail infrastructure and services along the Tamworth-Birmingham corridor. • Make reference to the contribution of public transport to sustainable development. • New development should be encouraged in areas where there are already good public transport facilities and services. • DM2 - expand bullet points to clarify what can be expected particularly in relation to role of rail facilities/services, 	
--	--	---	--

		bus, walking and cycling. Give consideration to demand management and parking provision/charges particularly in the town centre.	
John Mitchell		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deprivation exists in all neighbourhoods, not just those mentioned. • Don't highlight any specific areas in the strategic objectives, all statements should apply to all areas. Treat people the same. • Deficiency in open space has been identified so increasing amount should be an objective. • Extension of the Anker Valley site will require a major reconsideration of highway systems. • Not sure whether the RSS requirement for employment is really needed. • Lack of consultation on town centre masterplan. Town centre improvements must be in consultation with businesses and residents. • 20% increase in housing is irresponsible as land is already limited. • Make more of the two rivers. 	<p>The Core Strategy must be locally distinctive. It would be appropriate to target specific areas to tackle known areas of deprivation rather than making a general statement about tackling deprivation throughout the Borough. This approach is supported by the evidence base, which in turn has informed the issues and spatial objectives.</p> <p>The Open Space Position Statement has identified an overall deficiency of open space but a shortage of land within the urban area to make up the shortfalls. The Council's approach will be to make improvements to existing open spaces and also to re-designate some spaces for other purposes where there is a local surplus of another type.</p> <p>The Anker Valley site was allocated in the Local Plan which was adopted in 2006. It would be a strategic housing allocation, which would be essential to the delivery of the strategy. It is therefore essential that it can be delivered within the Core Strategy period. It will be necessary to undertake further assessment of the site to justify its</p>

			<p>inclusion in the Strategy.</p> <p>Staffordshire County Council undertook an employment land review for Tamworth in 2008. This concluded that future land requirements should be interpreted cautiously, as the outcome will depend on the approach used (continuation of past trends, labour supply or labour demand). It will be necessary to undertake further work to investigate the suitability and availability of the existing stock.</p> <p>The Town Centre Masterplan was produced as an exercise to generate a vision and ideas for regenerating the town centre. It was not intended to be a public document at this stage. The Council is in the process of setting up a town centre partnership, which will consist of a range of public and private sector interests. This group will be responsible for drawing up an action plan and implementing proposals, which will be subject to public consultation.</p> <p>The flexibility allowance has been included in order to enable higher household projections to be accommodated if necessary over the Plan period and in the event of a higher housing requirement coming through the RSS examination. PPS3 states that the Council must plan for</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>a flexible responsive supply of land and in doing so, should identify broad locations and specific sites that ensure a continuous 15 years of housing delivery.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
Reverend Michael Harris		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More emphasis on public/private sector partnerships and involvement of the voluntary sector. • Make more use of vacant shops and facilities given the current economic climate. • Cycle lanes on wider roads where cycle paths are not possible. • More resources for domestic recycling. 	<p>The Council monitors vacancies in the town centre and has noted that there are a number of long term vacancies.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
RE Matthews	CT Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to 4 ha from deleted Local Plan policy EMP4 forming part of the 33 hectares to be found in the urban area. These sites should be subject to proper and transparent review. • Questionable whether the Stonydelph site will come forward. It is greenfield and should be assessed against other greenfield sites. • RE Matthews site is sustainable, ideally located close to road infrastructure, high quality existing employment areas and the town centre. 	<p>Staffordshire County Council undertook an employment land review for Tamworth in 2008. This concluded that future land requirements should be interpreted cautiously, as the outcome will depend on the approach used (continuation of past trends, labour supply or labour demand). It will be necessary to undertake further work to investigate the suitability and availability of the existing stock.</p> <p>Comments regarding land put forward for consideration have been noted. All sites will be assessed against sustainability and deliverability criteria.</p>
Bellway, Redrow &	Barton Willmore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial objective SO10 should refer to 	<p>The Anker Valley site was allocated in the</p>

Bloor		<p>the need to avoid town cramming. Do not focus on the elderly, young and less able, should be 'including' not 'particularly'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sequential approach is contrary to PPS3 and RSS revision. • Anker Valley should be allocated as a strategic site. It could deliver 950+ dwellings. • Spatial strategy should be identified capacity within the urban area and Anker Valley as a strategic site. • Anker Valley should come before Green Belt releases. It is more sustainable and outside the Green Belt. • CP1 should reflect views on sequential approach. Treat windfalls in accordance with PPS3. • Sustainable technologies are covered by separate legislation and building regulations. Take into account feasibility and viability. • Is the joint development and infrastructure study going to be subject to public consultation? Any infrastructure sought must meet tests of planning obligations circular. • As the Council can allocate strategic sites there is no need for the sequential approach. • CP4 - no need for development briefs for strategic sites as core policies will 	<p>Local Plan which was adopted in 2006. It would be a strategic housing allocation, which would be essential to the delivery of the strategy. It is therefore essential that it can be delivered within the Core Strategy period. It will be necessary to undertake further assessment of the site to justify its inclusion in the Strategy.</p> <p>The joint development and infrastructure study will provide detailed evidence of the Borough's capacity to accommodate growth within its own boundary. Green Belt is being considered alongside greenfield sites within the Borough and land outside the Borough. Sustainability and deliverability are important factors that will guide the selected direction of growth. The final study will be subject to public consultation.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that site viability to accommodate renewables, affordable housing and other planning obligations is an important issue that will need further investigation.</p> <p>The Core Strategy will probably allocate strategic sites, but there will be a need to apply a sequential approach to the phased release of sites and any windfalls that come forward.</p>
-------	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP6 – open space standards needs to take account of existing provision. They should not be applied rigidly. Maintain concerns regarding the open space assessment and proposed standards. • CP7 – clarify phrase ‘improvements to conservation areas’. • DM3 – take account of feasibility and viability of sustainable technologies. 	Other comments noted.
North Warwickshire Borough Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision/lack of provision of major infrastructure could constrain the sequential approach resulting in easier to develop sites being developed before or instead of the Anker Valley. Anker Valley must come before the other options. Funding access to this site must be a priority as it would take pressure off the Green Belt and land outside the Borough. • Green Belt should not be seen as an absolute constraint if it is more sustainable than development outside the Borough. • CP2 must be written strongly to ensure that Anker Valley infrastructure is achieved and delivered. It could be a regional show stopper, if it isn't provided, Tamworth's housing target may not be delivered. 	<p>The Anker Valley site was allocated in the Local Plan which was adopted in 2006. It would be a strategic housing allocation, which would be essential to the delivery of the strategy. It is therefore essential that it can be delivered within the Core Strategy period. It will be necessary to undertake further assessment of the site to justify its inclusion in the Strategy.</p> <p>The joint development and infrastructure study will provide detailed evidence of the Borough's capacity to accommodate growth within its own boundary. Green Belt is being considered alongside greenfield sites within the Borough and land outside the Borough. Sustainability and deliverability are important factors that will guide the selected direction of growth.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that an</p>

			infrastructure delivery plan will be a crucial requirement to ensure delivery of the Core Strategy. The Council will engage with infrastructure providers to discuss delivery of the overall strategy and specific sites.
Highways Agency	GVA Grimley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development must be brought forward strictly in accordance with the sequential approach to ensure that infrastructure is delivered in a constructive and timely manner. • Need for an infrastructure delivery plan and include relevant infrastructure agencies in discussions. • CP3 should seek to strengthen public transport links to and from the town centre. • Support travel plans for strategic residential sites, but only where relevant. • CP7 – include sustainable methods of transport and reducing need to travel. 	<p>The Council acknowledges that an infrastructure delivery plan will be a crucial requirement to ensure delivery of the Core Strategy. The Council will engage with infrastructure providers to discuss delivery of the overall strategy and specific sites.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
Staffordshire County Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision should encourage sustainable travel. • Would support an infrastructure study to address additional trip generation issues. • 950 dwellings in Anker Valley are unlikely to support the Anker Valley link road. • Where would the remaining 600 dwellings (flexibility allowance) be 	<p>The Council acknowledges that an infrastructure delivery plan will be a crucial requirement to ensure delivery of the Core Strategy. The Council will engage with infrastructure providers to discuss delivery of the overall strategy and specific sites.</p> <p>The Anker Valley site was allocated in the Local Plan which was adopted in 2006. It would be a strategic housing allocation,</p>

		<p>located?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant highway mitigation measures would be required to increase sustainability and mitigate impact of traffic. • Development should maintain or enhance the local distinctiveness of conservation areas. • Vision should include aspiration that Tamworth will develop in a way that will reduce its impact on climate change and will be resilient to the unavoidable effects of climate change. • Vision should safeguard and enhance biodiversity. • Sequential approach to maintain and enhance current network of habitats to retain connectivity. New open space to be provided in housing developments to improve network. • CP1 – take into account opportunities for sustainable waste management. Do not sterilise remaining clay resources near Wilnecote Quarry and safeguard employment areas and areas with potential for waste management facilities. • DM1 – site waste management plans to be used to encourage recycling of building materials on brownfield sites. • Many schools already full or nearing capacity even without additional 	<p>which would be essential to the delivery of the strategy. It is therefore essential that it can be delivered within the Core Strategy period. It will be necessary to undertake further assessment of the site to justify its inclusion in the Strategy.</p> <p>The joint development and infrastructure study will provide detailed evidence of the Borough's capacity to accommodate growth within its own boundary. Green Belt is being considered alongside greenfield sites within the Borough and land outside the Borough. Sustainability and deliverability are important factors that will guide the selected direction of growth.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>housing. Not possible to quantify or identify locations for enlarging provision or providing new facilities until sites are identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Children & Lifelong Learning Directorate does not have sufficient funds to build facilities and infrastructure and will continue to rely on education contributions from planning obligations. Include in SPD.• Development of c. 1000 houses would necessitate a new primary school.• Services like libraries, recreation, leisure and community facilities could be co-located on school sites.	
--	--	--	--

Appendix B – The Evidence Base

Topic	Description	Status
Strategic Housing Market Assessment	Birmingham City, Lichfield District, Solihull Borough and Tamworth Borough Councils fall into a strategic housing market area defined at regional level for the consideration of housing needs. The authorities commissioned consultants to provide a detailed sub-regional market analysis of housing demand and housing need in the area. In particular the study analyses housing affordability issues and considers the level of affordable housing requirement within the area.	Complete
Conservation Area Appraisals	An assessment of the character of the conservation areas and recommendations for enhancement.	All CA's appraised 07/08.
Playing Pitch Strategy and Indoor Sports & Facilities Assessment	An assessment of current quality, accessibility and quantity, and looks at current and future needs.	Currently being produced, expected completion July 2009
Open Space Assessment	An assessment of current quality, accessibility and quantity, and looks at current and future needs.	Complete
Employment	An employment land review will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) assess the existing employment land situation b) An examination of how much employment land may be required for the future c) The identification of a portfolio of sites for the future 	Stage b has been completed by SCC. The remaining stages are currently being undertaken.
Retail	Work is required to assess the comparison and convenience retail provision for Tamworth.	The town centre masterplan provides some context on this. Further work may be required
5 Year Housing Supply Paper	An annual estimate of the 5 year housing land supply.	2009-2014 complete and demonstrates TBC does have a 5

		year supply.
Renewable Energy Study	Potential for all renewable and low carbon energy sources and technologies across Staffordshire.	A joint study between all Staffordshire Authorities is in the process of being commissioned.
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	In August 2007 a group comprising the District and Borough Councils of Tamworth, Lichfield, Stafford and Staffordshire Moorlands commissioned Halcrow to produce a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS). The SFRA is a strategic document which illustrates information on the probability of flooding.	Complete
Landscape and Biodiversity Assessment	Consideration is needed to identify what is critical in landscape and biodiversity terms to the character of the Borough, which important characteristics need protection from development and whether this has implications for potential strategic growth locations within the Borough.	A Habitats Study is complete. The County Council have undertaken some landscape appraisal work, however, further work may be required .
Southern Staffordshire and Northern Warwickshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment	Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAA's) are designed to provide the evidence needed to inform Local Authority strategies to respond to the accommodation needs of the Gypsy and Traveller communities as part of wider housing strategies. A GTAA was commissioned in May 2007 by a number of local authorities across the Southern Staffordshire and Northern Warwickshire area.	Complete
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment	Identifies potential housing sites in the Borough, assesses their housing potential and when they are likely to be developed.	Completed 2008. Needs to be reviewed and updated.
Future Development and Infrastructure Study	Examine how the scale of growth identified by the RSS Phase 2 Revision for Tamworth can be most effectively accommodated. This includes consideration of land in Lichfield District and North Warwickshire	Draft report received. Final report expected end of May.