

Lichfield District Rural Planning Project

Rural Planning Project

Conclusions

Including

Implications for the Local Development Framework



Lichfield District Council

November 2011

Introduction

1. The Rural Planning Project Report covers general issues affecting all of the six villages included within the study, together with more detailed reports on each village. The village reports each include discussions on future housing potential, a draft vision statement for the village and a set of guiding principles relating to the environment, traffic management, housing and social well-being. In relation to housing there are specific suggestions for a preferred level of housing growth and preferred housing sites.
2. One of the conclusions drawn in each village report was the need to carry out more public consultation. This would be aimed at seeking to confirm that the range of issues identified for each village was acknowledged locally as adequately covering the matters that villagers felt to be important. It would also seek to gauge if there was a level of consensus on the housing conclusions, the draft visions and the guiding principles. In addition it would seek to identify any new issues or matters of detail that should be addressed.
3. This concluding Section of the Rural Planning Project Report has been drafted following a series of exhibitions held during September and October

2011. This was based on the draft village reports and was directed towards achieving the aims identified above. As a result, the conclusions to the Rural Planning Project Report are divided into three sections. The first section deals with the results of the consultation on the draft village reports, dealing specifically with issues for each village. The second section covers more general conclusions that are able to be drawn, in particular issues that were found to be common amongst villages and villagers. The third section deals with the implications of the study for the preparation of the Local Development Framework, in particular for a policy framework to support the villages' efforts to thrive and recommendations in relation to future housing growth.

Section 1: Consultations on the Draft Village Reports:

4. In order to test the level of consensus on the content of the draft village reports, consultation and discussion took the form of a one-off event for Parish and District Councillors and secondly a series of public events. The Parish and District Councillor event included a presentation and group discussions for each village involving relevant Parish and District Council Members. The Councillors event was held on 1st September 2011 and

included an exhibition for each village containing a summary analysis of village issues, the CABE report, the Vision and Guiding Principles set out in full, and the conclusions on housing development scale and location. A facilitator for each group recorded the views on each report.

5. A series of 6 exhibitions were subsequently held between the 28th September and the 14th October 2011, in the villages of Alrewas, Armitage with Handsacre, Fazeley Mile Oak and Bonehill, Little Aston, Shenstone and Whittington. This followed the publication of a draft report for each village during September, together with an introductory report that covered issues applicable to every village, in particular future housing need and affordable housing.
6. Each exhibition explained the process so far and showed for each village a Composite Plan summarising ideas from the February workshops the full conclusions of the report prepared by the February 2011 Workshop facilitator sponsored by CABE, a summary of the main issues raised in the specific Village Report, a proposed Draft Vision and Draft Guiding Principles for the future. In addition a plan was displayed showing the housing sites for the village and where identified, additional housing sites that had potential for housing subject to further evidence of need for₂

their release being available within the Local Development Framework process. These additional potential sites would represent extensions to existing villages, some lying within the Green Belt. The need for the release of any site would be subject to issues of the overall scale of future housing development to be met within the Local Development Framework and a spatial strategy to meet the identified need. Both of these matters were the subject of ongoing separate work at the time of the public consultation.

7. The consultation summaries for each village are set out below. They are based upon the content of responses received at the exhibition, which included written comments sheets and annotated plans, on the facilitators' notes from the Members event and upon individual letters that were received following the public events. The full text of the comments sheets and of subsequent responses received are included in Appendix 1 to this Conclusions section. Appendix 2 shows the suggested (and potential, subject to need) housing sites which were consulted on as part of the feedback events in September and October 2011.

Alrewas

8. The consultation at Alrewas was held on 28th September 2011. The event

was attended by some 42 people, of whom 17 people indicated that they had not attended the February 2011 workshops.

Village Infrastructure and Environment Issues:

9. In terms of the analysis of the issues that villagers felt to be important for Alrewas, the consultation did not reveal any specific new issues, and mostly villagers commented on where they felt their particular priorities or support for action lay.
10. The majority of comments on issues affecting the existing village reinforced the view that traffic and traffic management, including parking on Main Street, were a high priority for villagers. However the views expressed mainly supported the idea of reducing speeds through the village for example with a 20 mph zone, rather than any particular physical works to the streets or providing additional parking. A second main point, variously expressed, was that traffic issues and speeds affect roads other than Main Street. Fox Lane, Furlong Lane and Somerville Road were mentioned in this context. Taking the views expressed overall throughout the rural masterplanning project, there is clear support for tackling traffic issues within Alrewas village and for slowing speeds. There is limited consensus on the

nature of any scheme and therefore options for implementing further traffic management and the extent to which they might be integrated with environmental and Conservation Area improvements would need to be tested further.

11. The other topics that people mentioned in the consultation included support (mostly) for a footbridge over the A38, occasional mention of support for a rail station and the need for a new doctor's surgery. All of these however seemed to be of less priority than traffic management, or than opposition to major housing development.



Alrewas Village Hall September 2011

Housing Development:

12. The exhibition included a map (appendix 2) illustrating the conclusions on preferred housing development for the village and showing the following sites:

Site Location	No. Dwellings	Comments
Suggested Housing Sites:		
Land E. of A513 and south of canal	16	Within existing village boundary, but protected open space
Land off Coton Close	2	Infill
27 Main Street	1	Infill
Storage/garage site, Main Street	10 - 20	Redevelopment
Essington House Farm	6	Conversion, Redevelopment and infill
Land E. of A513 and north of canal, Bagnall Lock	10 - 15	Greenfield, outside existing village boundary
Potential Greenfield Option subject to Need		
Land north of Dark Lane	Up to 150	outside existing village

		boundary
--	--	----------

13. One of the clearest outcomes from the Alrewas consultation was the opposition expressed to any housing development on the open land to the north of the village. This is referred to as land north of Dark Lane in the Table above, although many people responding at the exhibition referred to the site as Essington House or Essington Park. Although this major development was not one of the suggested housing sites, the report acknowledged that its potential should be considered if a need for additional village sites was demonstrated. It is clear that there would be substantial local opposition should the site be taken forward through the planning process.

14. In general other comments received seemed to acknowledge that infill and redevelopment for housing would be acceptable within the village, although there were one or two concerns over issues that could be addressed at a more detailed stage, including density and parking.

15. Alrewas is one of the few villages where the suggested housing sites include development on land outside the existing village boundary, including part of Essington House Farm site and

land north of the canal near the A513. There were not many views expressed about these sites, but those made included both support and opposition to Essington House Farm and opposition to both of the sites alongside the canal near Bagnall Lock, although references to the canal sites were only made in two responses.

16. As a general conclusion on housing for Alrewas it would seem reasonable to say that there seems to be a reasonable level of acceptance of infill development within the village and that this should be the general approach taken to future growth, in terms of scale and location. This is combined with strong opposition to any major expansion of the village. The relatively small scale Greenfield developments to the west of the village would be expected to have less consensus if taken forward through the Local Development Framework, although there was no major upsurge of opposition voiced through the consultation.

Guiding Principles and Vision:

17. There was little by way of direct comment upon either the Guiding Principles or the Vision statement for Alrewas. The comment that was made was mostly supportive and expressed in general terms. Two issues were

raised however that merit some consideration.

18. These were raised at the Parish/District Councillors consultation event and related firstly to the lack of mention of the relation of Alrewas to adjoining areas, including Fradley. The second was that there was no mention of the role of Alrewas as a service centre. The first of these points was intended to be covered within the Vision statement through the mention of Alrewas as freestanding, but the two points are linked in terms of the role of the village. It is suggested that these points could both be covered through minor modifications to the first sentence of the Vision for Alrewas, such that it would be:

“Alrewas should develop its role as a separate, freestanding and stable community offering a high quality local living environment and functioning as a local service centre offering a range of services and facilities.”

19. One comment showed confusion by the part of the Vision statement that says: “Community Hall, open space and play facilities should be renewed to be of a physical form, distribution and quality to meet current needs.” However many villagers were concerned at the poor quality of the facilities available in the village,

particularly the village hall. Additionally the reference to open space picks up on the District Council’s Open Space and Recreation assessments. These indicate that the quality of existing equipped play facilities could be improved and that there is a deficiency in the amount of equipped play easily accessible to residents of the northern part of the village, although at present there is no identified means of overcoming this deficiency. Taking this into account it is considered that the apparent confusion does not require any change to the Vision statement, however people need to remain aware of these unresolved issues.

Armitage with Handsacre

20. The consultation at Armitage with Handsacre was held on 5th October 2011. The event was attended by some 29 people, of whom 19 people indicated that they had not attended the February 2011 workshops.

Village Infrastructure and Environment Issues:

21. The consultation did not elicit a substantial amount of written response to the exhibition, compared to that of some of the other villages. In terms of the analysis of the issues that villagers felt to be important however, the consultation responses were generally supportive of both the main topics

identified as issues and of the approach taken to the Guiding Principles, the Vision and to housing growth.

22. More traffic management was frequently supported, especially in terms of crossings of the main route through the village. Better enforcement of the existing village weight restriction was mentioned.
23. Other support was given to the need to enhance facilities for young people. This included both youth facilities and equipped play. One suggestion was made for more equipped play within the open space adjacent to the village hall on Shropshire Brook Road.
24. Although only mentioned once in a response from the exhibition, the issue of flooding in several locations, particularly on highways, was picked up several times within the Parish/District Members discussion, which suggests that this is an ongoing issue that needs further investigation within the village, as indicated in the Village report.
25. Overall the responses from the consultation suggest that the village report had identified the major issues and principal views of the community and no new issues were raised.

Housing Development:

26. The exhibition included a map (appendix 2) illustrating the conclusions on preferred housing development for the village and showing the sites included in the Table below:

Site Location	No. Dwellings	Comments
Suggested Housing Sites:		
Land rear of 87 New Road	14	Within existing village boundary
Land rear of 19 – 27 Uttoxeter Rd.	4	Infill
Land adjacent 8 The Glebe	1	Infill
94 – 96 Old Road	1	Infill
Part of Ideal standard (Armitage Shanks) works, Old Rd.	40	Redevelopment of part of factory site on east side of Old Rd.
Potential Greenfield Option subject to Need		
Land forming part of Brick Kiln Farm, Hood Lane	100	In Green Belt, outside existing village boundary

27. There was some comment arising from both the Parish/District Members discussion and the exhibition that thought there was a need for various types of housing within the village. In particular this included social housing, affordable housing, starter homes and low cost ‘smaller’ housing, and housing suitable for the elderly, including bungalows.

28. The comments made were mostly supportive of the approach suggested to future development, that of limited growth that largely concentrated on infill and redevelopment proposals. Some concern was expressed at the quality and in particular the width of some of the roads that would provide access to potential housing sites and these are matters where suitability or access requirements need to be confirmed through consultation, before any land allocations made. These include the Ideal Standard redevelopment land proposed as a suggested site and the site off Hood Lane at Brick Kiln Farm, if a need is established for Greenfield development within the Green Belt.

29. Armitage with Handsacre was one of the few villages where new housing development locations were put forward through the consultation process. These appear to be made on the basis that the February Workshops event had not considered all of the potential locations available on the periphery of

the village. Two large (and overlapping) areas to the south and west of the village were put forward. Both of these encompass land lying entirely within the green belt and each would have a capacity of several hundred dwellings if developed in their entirety, although it is likely that this is not the intention of either new submission.

30. Part of the argument made in favour of both of the new locations is that of support for the general approach suggested by the Village Report of concentrating development near to the existing ‘centre’ of the village, rather than spreading new development either to the east or to the west, promoting elongation and potentially coalescence.

31. One of the submissions covers a large area to the south of the village that has already been assessed by the strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, while the other area, concentrated around Rectory Lane and Westfields Road is not currently within the SHLAA. It is considered that neither of the new submissions affect the main conclusions in relation to housing, that growth should first concentrate on infill and redevelopment opportunities and that there is currently no proven case for needing to develop within the Green Belt within the larger villages of Lichfield District. However, should such a case be proven, it is considered that the limits of the new development,

suggested in the Village Report, that is in the Brick Kiln Farm area, would need more detailed consideration, such that they could potentially include parts of the land within the two submissions received.

Guiding Principles and Vision:

- 32. There was little direct comment made on the suggested Guiding Principles or on the Vision statement, either through the Parish/District Members consultation or through the exhibition responses. Two written responses were made that supported the Guiding Principles and there were no comments made that either opposed or criticised any part of them.
- 33. The extent that the comments made generally supported the approach to new housing development and the need for better traffic management and improved facilities within the village can be taken as generally supportive of the Vision statement. It is concluded therefore that no changes to the Guiding Principles or the Vision need to be suggested as a result of the consultation.

Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill

- 34. The consultation for Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill was held on 30th

September 2011. The event was attended by some 17 people, of whom only 1 person indicated that they had not attended the February 2011 workshops. The attendance was somewhat disappointing, in particular that the event failed to attract people who had not been previously involved in the project.

Village Infrastructure and Environment Issues:

- 35. In terms of the analysis of the issues that people responded on, these, not surprisingly given the nature of the attendance, picked up on issues that had been identified at previous events. The consultation responses were generally supportive of many of the ideas suggested in the report and included within the Guiding Principles and Vision statements. In particular the ideas of greater traffic management, improved local accessibility within the settlement and environmental improvement were supported. There were various ideas on priorities for traffic management. In particular mention was made of traffic control on the A453, (where traffic lights at junctions were suggested as an alternative to a series of roundabouts), to filter lanes at the Mile Oak junction, and improving visibility on the exit from Price avenue to the B5404 (a new suggestion). Suggestions for traffic management were mostly related to the

Mile Oak part of the settlement, but it is likely that the majority of visitors to the exhibition were Mile Oak residents.

- 36. The idea of a 'mile of oaks', promoted in the CABE report as one means of environmental enhancement, had some support both amongst Parish and District Members and the general public. Some, however, saw the difficulties of implementing it in practice. In the light of the public support it is recommended that the idea should be given further thought and consideration. Whilst it is unlikely that the idea could be implemented in a 'rigid' way, some flexibility in the nature of the idea and opportunism in the manner of its implementation, could bring about some beneficial environmental improvement in the longer term.



- 37. There was also some public support for the idea of an 'events' area, which although mentioned infrequently in

responses, had been 'sounded out' by local Members. One of the main issues for the Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill areas is the access to and the distribution of open space and play facilities, but there are no easy or obvious solutions to the issue. As well as the idea for a central 'events' area, the land to the rear of Victory Terrace was mentioned in responses, since there is open space that is acknowledged locally as having access and visibility issues. These are areas that need further investigation. The issue of provision of an 'events area' was picked up through a response on housing issues on behalf of a land owner. This is referred to under the heading 'Housing Development' below.

38. Concern remains at the quality and frequency of local bus services, in particular the lack of a direct Lichfield service, some of the routes of local services, for example to the hospital and that Drayton Bassett is only served once a week. Such issues can only be addressed through achieving a dialogue with the transportation authority and operators.

Housing Development:

39. The exhibition included a map (appendix 2) illustrating the conclusions on preferred housing development for the village and showing the following sites:

Site Location	No. Dwellings	Comments
Suggested Housing Sites:		
Sites with planning permission or under construction	205	Includes 77 at Laurel House, 14 at The Boathouse and 100 at Tolson's Mill
Land rear of The Green, Bonehill	7	Within existing village boundary
Fazeley saw mill and timber yard	25	Redevelopment
Petrol station, Fazeley	10	Redevelopment
Part of Ideal standard (Armitage Shanks) works, Old Rd.	40	Redevelopment of part of factory site on east side of Old Rd.
Potential Options subject to site investigation		
Sites along Lichfield Street and Tamworth Rd.	?	Potential brownfield redevelopment requires investigation

40. The strongest outcome from the September consultation was the desire from residents to protect the green belt and not encroach into open countryside. This was therefore supportive of the suggested approach taken by the Village Report, that of no expansion but concentrating on redevelopment opportunities.

41. One of the responses, made on behalf of a landowner, suggested that a more flexible approach to housing site development should be followed, allowing both Brownfield and Greenfield development. This is outlined within the Appendix 1 section on Fazeley. It is suggested that the release of some Greenfield land could provide a mix of housing tenure and type to satisfy local needs. This idea is linked to the idea of a central 'events' area, suggesting that the release of Greenfield land for housing could also contain an appropriately located park, for example on land between Bonehill and Mile Oak.

42. It is considered that the new submission made on behalf of a developer does not affect the main conclusions in relation to housing for Fazeley, that growth should concentrate on infill and redevelopment opportunities. There is currently no proven case for needing to develop within the Green Belt within the larger villages of Lichfield District. However, should such a case be proven, then

the potential location put forward would require further investigation amongst a range of options.

Guiding Principles and Vision:

43. There was little specific comment made on the details of the suggested Guiding Principles or on the Vision statement, either through the Parish/District Members consultation or through the exhibition responses. Amongst the public, three written responses were made that supported the Guiding Principles and there were no comments made that either opposed or criticised any part of them.

44. An observation was made through the Parish/District Members event that the Guiding Principles could have more emphasis on the need for central play facilities and football pitches and also on a need for sheltered housing.

45. In terms of play and football pitch provision the Guiding Principles already make reference to improving facilities. It is suggested however that the suggested statement could be amended to meet the point concerning additional emphasis, to say the following (suggested amendments in bold type):

“Improve existing open spaces, particularly to provide better quality play facilities, and seek opportunities to

provide a greater quantity of open space well located to meet the needs of local children, with an emphasis on availability for football, other junior sports and equipped play.”

The above suggestion is made on the basis that the Guiding Principles should not be phrased to be so specific as to rule out potential options for meeting need.

46. It is concluded that no changes to the Vision need to be suggested as a result of the consultation.

Little Aston

47. The consultation at Little Aston was held on 3rd October 2011. The event was attended by some 37 people, of whom 13 people indicated that they had not attended the February 2011 workshops (although 9 people attending did not respond to this question).

Village Infrastructure and Environment Issues:

48. In terms of the comments made by residents, most related to matters that had been previously raised, in particular suggestions identified on the Composite Plan of Workshop Ideas. The consultation did not reveal any specific new issues, and mostly villagers commented on where they felt

their particular priorities or support for action lay.

49. The majority of comments on issues affecting the village reinforced the view that traffic speeds, traffic management and better pedestrian movement were considered important. A number of mentions were made of the idea of a new golf course on the land south of Aldridge Rd. adjacent to the hospital, nearly all of these doubting the need or demand for an additional golf course in the area. Mention was also made of the need for better community facilities, including the village hall, although the latter was not a prominent issue.

50. In terms of traffic speeds, reference was made specifically to Aldridge Road in particular and the need to extend consideration of any lower speed limit or management measures along its entire length. In addition traffic speeds on Rosemary Hill Road and Little Aston Lane and Walsall Road were all identified as concerns. Where suggestions were made these tended to favour reducing speed limits rather than physical measures such as speed humps. Taking the views expressed overall throughout the rural masterplanning project, there is clear support for tackling speeding traffic on several of the roads within Little Aston.

51. As identified in the Little Aston Village Report, this was a settlement where,

the previous consultations showed no particular consensus on several issues. There were too few responses from the October consultation to help assess whether there was any greater consensus over the issues of developing a more concentrated 'heart' to the village or the need for a new village hall. On the latter issue there does seem to be a common view expressed that improved facilities are needed, however no conclusions can be drawn about whether most people would prefer an entirely new location or further refurbishment of the existing hall. Such a matter needs to be addressed through specific local consultation and involvement of more members of the community.

Housing Development:

52. In terms of future housing development the conclusions drawn in the Little Aston Village Report were that new housing development should be confined to infill and redevelopment opportunities within the existing village boundary, with no expansion of the settlement into the green belt. It was also suggested that as part of this strategy and taking account of the need to retain the high environmental quality of the area, the existing planning policy of limiting housing densities to half acre plots within part of Little Aston, should be continued.

53. The responses received from the October exhibition were generally supportive of maintaining the existing Green Belt boundary for Little Aston and for avoiding Greenfield development. There were no responses from the exhibition that supported Greenfield development. However the Parish/District Members event were concerned to provide an opportunity for affordable housing and suggested that the release of some Green Belt land in the vicinity of Roundabout Wood might be an appropriate location.

54. Greater concern amongst residents appeared to be a desire to control the densities of infill development, with concern expressed at the recent grant of planning permissions. One suggestion was made that a low-density policy area should be extended to cover larger parts of Little Aston.

55. There is currently no proven case for needing to develop within the Green Belt within the larger villages of Lichfield District. This is particularly relevant to Little Aston, where the Village Report argues that any release of Green Belt would represent an outward expansion of the West Midlands conurbation. It is recognised that work on the level of housing need is ongoing. However, even if a case could be made for releasing Green Belt land within Lichfield District any decisions on appropriate locations

would need to be made in the context of a District strategy for sustainable development.

Guiding Principles and Vision:

56. Only two comments were made through the public consultation that were directly relevant to the Guiding Principles and the Vision. Both comments were supportive and therefore it is considered that no amendments to either need to be considered.

Shenstone

57. The consultation at Shenstone was held on 7th October 2011. The event was attended by some 55 people, of whom 31 people indicated that they had not attended the February 2011 workshops.

Village Infrastructure and Environment Issues:

58. In terms of specific issues raised in comments from exhibition visitors, traffic management, parking and housing development options were the most frequently mentioned.

59. Traffic speeds, levels through the village, particularly heavy goods vehicles, have been an issue in Shenstone for many years, in part related to goods vehicles from the

industrial estate. Resolving these issues was one of the main themes picked up through the proposed guiding principles included in the Shenstone Village Report, including both the heavy goods vehicle issue and traffic management on Birmingham Rd. The responses from the October consultation expressed mixed views on implementing traffic calming on Birmingham Rd. Whilst reducing speeds was frequently supported, some responses were opposed to traffic calming measures, although it may be that some linked this directly to the installation of speed humps, to which many people appear opposed. Within the Parish/District Member discussion the issue was raised of the 'knock on' effect of traffic management measures elsewhere having a potentially direct impact upon Shenstone, in particular traffic diverting through the village (Lynn Lane/Pinfold Hill) to avoid measures or congestion on more strategic highway routes.

60. There is nothing raised through the consultation that suggests that people do not want to see measures implemented to reduce the impact of traffic through Shenstone. However the responses suggest that further research would be needed to establish an appropriate package of measures and to consider impact on the wider area and that perhaps this could be

addressed in association with housing proposals if these proceed.

61. Parking within the village caused some comment both from the public and the Parish/District Members. In particular the spread of parking into residential areas close to the station and village shops is a matter of concern, and a residents parking scheme was one suggestion. One resident was concerned that there were no specific proposals made to deal with the issue. These responses tend to confirm the appropriateness of including the need to resolve parking issues within the Guiding Principles for Shenstone, but also that resources need to be found to address the matter. Since the area concerned is in the heart of the Conservation Area and this is in one respect an environmental issue, parking issues and Conservation Area improvements may need to be considered together.

62. A third issue raised through the consultation by both public and Parish/District Councillors was that of the need for more diverse recreation facilities for younger and older people. This again is not a new issue but the consultation tends to confirm its relevance. Suggestions made include basketball, bowls, an astro-turf pitch and a training 'circuit' round the park. There is already a general reference to the range of facilities included within the

Guiding Principles, which should be retained and specific matters picked up at a local level.

Housing Development:

63. The exhibition included a map (appendix 2) illustrating the conclusions on preferred housing development for the village and showing the following sites. The Village Report also made reference to the committed and smaller sites shown in the table:

Site Location	No. Dwellings	Comments
Suggested Housing Sites:		
Plough and Harrow, Pinfold Hill	4	Redevelopment within existing village boundary
Part of Shenstone Industrial Estate, Lynn Lane.	100	Redevelopment of eastern part of the industrial estate from railway to Birch Brook Lane
Other village sites		
Oakdale, Lynn Lane	13	Under construction

Land adjacent 31 St. John's Hill	1	Infill
Other small sites with planning permission	18	Various small infill and redevelopment sites

64. Some of the consultation responses consider there is a need for particular types of housing within Shenstone. Reference was made to a potential need for affordable and first time buyer housing, housing for the elderly and 'smaller' housing.

65. The principal issue in relation to housing growth for Shenstone was that the Village Report recommended a partial redevelopment of the Shenstone Industrial Estate, which lies within the existing village boundary. The reasons for this are set out within the Village Report. Few people attending the exhibition were opposed to this idea, although some indicated the issues arising from its location on the other side of the rail line from the residential part of the village, in particular views that it was somewhat detached, that the railway bridge would be unsatisfactory for pedestrians and that it was distant from the primary school. Such issues caused some suggestions of relocating the primary school to the industrial

estate and building housing on the school site.

66. Other views expressed through the consultation were that the outer (western) part of the industrial site was more appropriate for redevelopment and that all of the industrial estate should be redeveloped. The latter was a suggestion arising from the Parish/District Councillors event. Albeit that the outer part of the estate contains the industrial buildings that are most in need of renewal and generates relatively more heavy goods vehicles, it is considered that redeveloping the outer part of the estate for housing would be an unsatisfactory solution for the residents of the new development since it would be clearly isolated from the heart of the village.

67. In terms of redevelopment of the whole estate, the Village Report argues that this runs the risk of reducing the potential of Shenstone as a sustainable community, particularly if in the long term some of the remaining employment sites could be redeveloped to provide a range of employment opportunities for village residents. The only argument for moving away from this view appears to be a heavy goods traffic argument and it is considered that this does not outweigh the balanced community argument, since the issue may be capable of resolution

in the longer term by redeveloping for employment uses.

68. The Composite Plan of Workshop Ideas shown at the exhibition included a longer term option discussed in February by a group of residents, of extending the village to the east, including the diversion of Birmingham Rd. The Village Report concluded that there was no need to consider this option further. However several people commented on this option, with the dominant view being that as an incursion into open countryside this was not a good option.

69. Several Greenfield sites had previously been put forward around Shenstone for consideration within the Local Development Framework process. All of these lay within the Green Belt. During the course of the consultation a further site was put forward, land between Court Drive and the railway line seen on the southern approach to the village by train. This site also lies within the Green Belt. Similar arguments apply to this site as the other Green Belt sites around the village. The proposed strategy of partial redevelopment of employment land does not require Green Belt and would result in a significant scale of development of around 80 to 100 dwellings. It is not considered that there is at present any justification for housing growth of a larger scale for_{1 2}

the village, nor any proven need for any Green Belt housing sites for the larger villages within Lichfield District. Even if a case could be made for releasing Green Belt land within Lichfield District any decisions on appropriate locations would need to be made in the context of a District strategy for sustainable development. For these reasons it is considered that the strategy as suggested in the Village Report should not be amended.

Guiding Principles and Vision:

70. There were very few direct comments on the Guiding Principles and the Vision. Many comments referred to the issues and approach for the village that was included within the Guiding Principles and the Vision and these were generally supportive. Consequently it is considered that no amendments need to be considered.

Whittington

71. The consultation at Whittington was held on 14th October 2011. The event was attended by some 32 people, of whom 14 people indicated that they had not attended the February 2011 workshops.

Village Infrastructure and Environment Issues:

72. There were a number of references to the importance of the local community spirit in the responses made by visitors to the exhibition. These echoed views made in previous consultations and were related to the size of the community and its range of social opportunities. This in turn reflects a view that there is no ambition for significant expansion of Whittington, although it must also be noted that several comments were made in favour of some housing growth to help maintain the vibrancy of the community. This element is considered further within the 'Housing Development' section below.

73. There appears to be some agreement on the need to achieve further traffic management within the village. In this context comments were made about reducing speeds and speed limits. A particular point arising from the consultation however, was the potential impact of any speed limit or works on Church Street or Main Street, on Back Lane, which could be used as an alternative route to parts of the village. Suggestions were made of restrictions on Back Lane or a one-way system within the village. Such ideas need to be given more detailed consideration, to examine the implications, for example, of a 20 mph zone across the village.

74. A number of people noted that the Composite Plan of Workshop Ideas showed an incorrect village boundary to the south of the church and there should be no alteration of the village boundary. The Composite Plan was prepared as a record of the February Workshops and recorded the views and ideas of residents set down on plans at that time. The October exhibition also showed a plan of Housing Suggestions contained within the Village Report that showed the intention to retain the existing village boundary.

Housing Development:

75. The exhibition included a map (appendix 2) illustrating the conclusions on preferred housing development for the village and showing the following sites. The Village Report also made reference to the committed and smaller sites shown in the Table below:

Site Location	No. Dwellings	Comments
Suggested Housing Sites:		
The Swan Inn	8	Redevelopment within existing village boundary
Cloisters Walk	8	Infill

Whittington Youth centre	10	Redevelopment of buildings and land
Chapel Lane and Blacksmith Lane	5 - 10	New potential infill site, capacity subject to detailed appraisal
Potential Greenfield Option subject to Need (green belt)		
Land at Huddlesford Lane	60	
Two sites fronting Back Lane	5 - 10	Capacity subject to further assessment

76. There appeared to be general acceptance of the opportunities for infill development within the village both from the exhibition and Parish/District Councillors event, provided a high design quality was achieved. The design and type of housing was sometimes mentioned and there were a number of references to a local need for particular types of housing. These included starter homes and cheaper housing, housing for the elderly, bungalows, and small apartments for single people. Parish/District Councillors considered there was a

need to be more specific about local needs.

77. There was no significant enthusiasm for larger scale housing growth and some people expressed opposition to development in the Green Belt. There were however several responses that felt that there was a need for some growth to help maintain the village services and facilities and to provide for local housing needs. As a result there were more responses that felt that some expansion of the village was desirable than there were opposed to village expansion. A number of people felt that development at Huddlesford Lane would be acceptable, whilst others specifically opposed this idea, the quality of access being one of the reasons mentioned for opposition to development.

78. The Whittington Village Report refers to the possible argument for the growth of Whittington, in its conclusions on housing development potential. In particular the small level of potential housing development available within the existing village would lead to a static, or declining population. The potential effect of this on the ability to maintain services and facilities is clearly a matter that concerns some residents.

79. There is currently no proven case for needing to develop within the Green Belt within the larger villages of

Lichfield District. It is recognised that work on the level of housing need is ongoing. However, even if a case could be made for releasing green belt land within Lichfield District any decisions on appropriate locations would need to be made in the context of a District strategy for sustainable development.

Guiding Principles and Vision:

80. There were few people who directly commented on the Guiding Principles or Vision, but several comments were supportive of their general content. One issue was raised however that needs separate consideration. Whittington is one of the villages where there is a particular drive amongst some for the village to address matters of sustainability and to direct its future towards becoming a 'low carbon' community. It is considered that there is merit in adjusting the Guiding Principles to include low carbon references within the Environment and Housing sections. Similarly, a minor adjustment to the Vision could better encompass this ambition.

81. As a result the following suggestions are made, with new/amended text in bold type:

Guiding Principles:

(Environmental)

“Consider opportunities to establish a **low carbon village community** and to use renewable energy resources to serve the village,

(Housing)

“Ensure any housing development is of a high quality of design, form and layout, **meeting zero carbon standards and** reflecting the character of the Conservation Area

Vision:

“Whittington should **be** a compact, stable, safe and progressive community with a high quality environment **working towards a low carbon future.....**”

82. It is understood that Whittington is progressing its own Parish Plan and that the local community may give consideration to the Guiding Principles and Vision in the course of this process. The suggestions made at this stage might potentially be affected by outcomes from this process.

Section 2: General Conclusions

The Rural Planning Project

83. The Rural Planning Project process set out to provide more locally based

evidence to help the preparation of the Lichfield District Local Development Framework. It has seen engagement with local communities, including individuals, Parish Councils, District Councillors and stakeholders with specific interests within the 6 settlements included in the project. Alongside this, more detailed and focussed engagement has taken place within the Fradley community where a slightly different situation exists, since a significant development and Broad Strategic Location is proposed at Fradley as part of the emerging Local Development Framework.

84. The Rural Planning Project has provided a good level of knowledge about the issues that concern people living within the communities involved, whether or not they are matters that can be directly ‘tackled’ through the Development Plan. Nevertheless there needs to be a note of caution since despite the efforts made and events held, those who have taken part by expressing their views still represent a relatively small proportion of each of the communities.

The September and October 2011 Consultation on the Draft Reports

85. The consultation and exhibitions on the draft village reports sought to disseminate information to the local communities on the outcome of

previous public involvement and on the conclusions being reached that would impact upon the future of each village, including its potential for growth. They also sought to reach a wider public and people who had not previously been involved in the village planning process. The extent to which this aim was successful varied between villages. It can be said for all the villages, however, that these exhibitions added to the significant number of opportunities and efforts made to engage the local communities and also that the people who attended were appreciative of the opportunity offered. The views expressed tended to be both generally supportive of the approaches recommended within the village reports and to confirm that the range of issues identified were the relevant ones for each village.



Parish and Neighbourhood Plans

86. The views expressed through public involvement in the Rural Planning Project represent a significant body of new information that can be used by local groups or bodies, as well as by the District Council. In addition to the Local Development Framework, it can potentially inform the preparation of Parish Plans or Neighbourhood Plans where individual communities decide to progress them. In some cases it could be used to support other information collected by communities.

87. Each village report contains a section on other evidence relevant to planning for the future of the village. The sections included under that main heading represent summaries of relevant parts of other published information. Local communities will be able to draw upon the full reports should they wish. These are principally available on the Lichfield District Council website, particularly as evidence base for the Local Development Framework, at <http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/newldf>

88. Staffordshire County Council (www.staffordshire.gov.uk) is also a significant source of valuable local information that may be relevant to communities developing plans or projects, particularly social and economic data and transportation information. Some documents referred to within the Village Reports are

available from other bodies, for example the West Midlands Rail Utilisation Strategy, published by Network Rail.

89. Each village report contains a draft of a Vision statement for the community and of Guiding Principles aimed at steering future actions that would contribute towards achieving the Vision. Both the Vision and Guiding Principles have been initially tested through the September/October 2011 consultation and for Alrewas, Fazeley Mile Oak and Bonehill, and Whittington some amendments to those statements are suggested earlier in this Conclusions section (see paragraphs 18 (Alrewas), 45 (Fazeley) and 81 (Whittington)). It is recommended that the Guiding Principles and Vision statements should be acknowledged within the Local Development Framework and used to guide its policies. However, they both potentially could be 'taken on' and developed further by the communities themselves. Other communities not directly involved in this Rural Planning Project could potentially use this type of 'model' to develop ideas for their own communities.

Common themes emerging from the Rural Masterplanning Project:

90. Within each community the Rural Planning Project has shown that there is a diverse range of views held by

individuals. However for many villages there is a broad consensus on the nature of the issues of most concern. Considering the local concerns that tend to be expressed most frequently, it is clear that there are also common threads between communities, so that the villages have similar issues affecting their quality of life and their local priorities for change and improvement. The September/October 2011 exhibitions identified no major new issues and for the most part confirmed the themes previously expressed.

91. Several themes emerged from the Rural Planning Project where most villages identified a common issue that they would like to see addressed, tailored to the particular circumstances of their village. They mostly related to aspects of daily life within the settlement. The main common themes emerging were:

- Most villages feel the need for some form of additional traffic management over and above what they currently have. This is normally to give greater control over speed of traffic, reduce impact of HGV's, or improve facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Within this theme there seemed in places to be some ambition for village 20mph 'zones', a frequent dislike of 'speed humps' and a potential relationship between traffic measures

and environmental improvements.

- People often had a desire for improved facilities within their village of various types, but in particular they saw a need for better facilities for children and teenagers, either for play facilities or for more activities, or places to go.
- Most villages had some desire and scope for environmental improvement. In many villages this was also related to the significance of maintaining the quality and character of a Conservation Area, where there is an obligation to consider such measures. The need for improvement was most keenly felt within Fazeley.
- Most communities accepted that there would be change within their settlement but all had limited enthusiasm for any significant housing growth.
- Where people thought there was a need for housing in their village, it was usually seen as a need to provide for specific types of housing or groups of people, such as starter homes, specialist housing for the elderly, or smaller homes to allow 'downsizing'.
- There was a call for high speed broadband to reach their village to allow them to be on a par with urban areas, seen as both a social and an economic need.

92. The emerging 'common threads' identified above, having been further tested following the draft report, should be taken into account in further village planning. In part they can be used within the policy development, for example within the continuing Local Development Framework process. However they could also be used to stimulate action through more direct initiatives potentially involving the public private and voluntary sectors.

93. For each village a range of individual priorities for action have been identified in the Village Reports and these encompass many aspects of village life. The common themes are potentially a way of drawing together action across a number of villages, which is one approach. Another approach for some villages might be to try to co-ordinate action across a number of these themes.

94. It is recognised that the present context for recommending action to implement village improvements is one of most severe financial restriction within the public sector. It is also recognised that other villages or urban areas may have common issues. Nevertheless it is recommended that as a result of the Rural Masterplanning Project the District Council should consider measures that might be taken to address some of the issues raised through the Project. There may

potentially be a relationship between village projects and new funding derived from the development process for example through Section 106 agreements or potentially the Community Infrastructure Levy.

95. It is suggested that options that might be considered could include:

- Consider the common themes identified and whether they might be addressed by establishing theme-based projects that might encompass expertise and resources from other public sector organisations. For example this might relate to traffic management for villages or rural areas, or to a wider theme of rural transport to include public transport.
- Consider how the issue of environmental improvement within villages could be taken forward.
- Consider if there are any cases where village based projects might be an approach that could be followed. If so, their scope and composition would need to be considered. This approach might be worth considering where there are significant multiple issues that potentially need addressing. In this context Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill seems to be a candidate, in the light of the identified₁₇

environmental issues, traffic management options, the need for open space improvements and possible redevelopment opportunities.

Section 3: Implications for the Local Development Framework

How the rural planning process fits into the LDF process as a whole:

96. Policies and proposals included within Local Development Frameworks or Local Plans need to be based upon evidence that supports the need for them and guides their direction. Local views are a legitimate and proper source of evidence. However they also need to be considered alongside all the other relevant evidence, which is the approach used in preparing the recommendations contained within the individual Village Reports.
97. In the wider context of a District-wide planning strategy the views of six of the larger villages, (for example in relation to development), form only part of the views of the Lichfield District community as a whole, albeit important views. For example the six wards included in the project represent approximately 25% of the total households present within Lichfield District. Ultimately, in preparing the LDF, it is the role and duty of the District Council to judge the weight to be given to any of the

evidence available to it, in the knowledge also that the judgements made will be independently tested by Public Examination as part of the LDF/local planning process.

98. The Rural Planning Project has provided a wide evidence base on the 6 villages concerned and the reports reveal the priorities and aspirations of some of the key rural communities within Lichfield District, including their attitudes to housing growth and views on local housing needs. It can be most useful as the start of a 'bottom up' approach to preparing the Development Plan. For this to be achieved the views expressed at the local level need to be reflected in the policy areas where they are relevant.
99. The development plan should therefore be shaped to take account of those views, including their reflection in overall spatial strategy, but also including policies that give a broad direction to future actions to address the main issues identified within the villages, such as traffic and transport, facilities for younger people, including better provision and quality of recreation facilities, and meeting local housing needs. Enabling policies could provide 'hooks' on which to base future initiatives and appropriate mechanisms to implement improvements, potentially involving a range of agencies working within the communities themselves.

100. This report is being prepared at a time when Lichfield District Council is well under way in preparing a Core Strategy for the Local Development Framework, having consulted on an informal Draft Core Strategy. It is also however a time when the Government is seeking the simplification of the Planning System, one aspect of which is to make the Local Development Framework more flexible in its approach, for example in enabling Core Strategies to include land allocations, rather than requiring them to be within a separate Development Plan Document. The conclusions of this report therefore do not assume that the Local Development Framework will be prepared in any particular format.

101. The LDF will in some form, contain an overall Spatial Strategy to act as a broad framework for the future development and activity within the District as a whole. It will include for broad and strategic policies and more detailed policies for development management and potentially the allocation of land.

Spatial Strategy

102. The spatial strategy developed during the LDF process so far and previously published for consultation is based upon consolidating the roles of the two main urban areas of Lichfield and Burntwood as the most₁₈

sustainable settlements within the District. These are supported by the six settlements included within the rural masterplanning process, as local service centres. In these the range of services and facilities they have enables them to fulfil a service centre role for their village and wider rural area. Each would also be a focus for limited housing growth that would help to meet District-wide needs whilst the growth would itself help to support the services.

103. One of the key conclusions of the project overall is that Little Aston should no longer be included as one of the settlements having this wider function and contributing to meeting housing needs. Whilst it is important that Little Aston should not be 'forgotten' in the overall policy framework – for example in the need for transportation measures and social/recreation improvements, it is recommended that the function as 'rural service centres' or 'key rural settlements' in the spatial strategy are restricted to Alrewas, Armitage with Handsacre, Fazeley, Shenstone and Whittington. The key reasons for the conclusions in relation to Little Aston are included in village report, but can be summarised as:

- Little Aston is geographically a very large settlement. Whilst Little Aston has a range of facilities, they are more limited than most larger settlements

and are spread over a very large area, so that there is no focal point to the settlement

- There is very limited scope for further infill development because of past redevelopment and particularly because the low density character, which is a key element of the Conservation Area, restricts further development potential within its existing limits.
- Little Aston is located on the inner edge of the West Midlands Green Belt and all growth options would require land currently within the Green Belt. Any sites would effectively result in an outward extension of the West Midlands conurbation, contrary to the fundamental purpose of designating the Green Belt.
- Because it is not freestanding and abuts a large urban area, the shops and services available within Little Aston do not solely rely on the population of the settlement alone to sustain them. Additional housing growth would make a very limited contribution to their long-term viability.

'Quality of Life' Issues

104. Most of the issues raised by residents through the Rural Planning Project have been about those things that detract from, or limit, the quality of

life being experienced now. Residents have been asked to consider future housing growth for their village, but it is not an issue that would often have been one of their major concerns. Whilst some residents have raised issues of particular local housing needs, issues about the current quality of life have been more pressing concerns.

105. The range of these issues are identified in the separate Village Reports and drawn together in earlier paragraphs of this Conclusions section where common themes have emerged. The Local Development Framework can provide a policy framework that sets a direction for village improvements and identifies their broad scope. It is important that they are framed in such a way so as not to be so prescriptive that they would constrain either the District Council or other bodies in developing future actions.

Housing Potential and Needs of the Villages

106. At the time of preparing these Conclusions on the major villages within the Lichfield District rural area, it is unclear what level of future housing growth is needed. A study is underway to assess the needs and options for future housing delivery in terms of the overall level and the type of requirement. It is difficult to conclude therefore what contributions need to

be met by villages to meet a level of need or pressure for new housing. Rather the Conclusions can identify the options that have emerged from the detailed work within the villages, suggesting a recommended preferred housing contribution towards a district-wide strategy that would potentially achieve some local consensus. In addition it can suggest where further potential could be found if a requirement for further housing growth is determined.

107. One of the conclusions that can be drawn from the complete 'exercise' however, is that the essential character of most of the villages has emerged from a long period of growth, mostly of individual developments of a relatively small scale until the latter part of the twentieth century. To retain the remaining essential character of villages suggests that future growth should be limited and not rapid, suggesting that developments of a relatively small size individually should be preferred to very large sites. The physical and social structure of villages, the way they have grown historically, and the scale of site that might be appropriate to the particular village context are all relevant considerations.
108. This could be described as seeking an 'organic' approach to the future development of villages, where the levels of growth can be more easily

assimilated over time into village social structures. This would be in preference to past modern developments such as the scale of over 400 dwellings that occurred at Armitage with Handsacre.

109. None of the six settlements included in the Rural Planning Project have been identified through the Local Development Framework so far, as being appropriate for the identification of Strategic Development Locations. This is principally because of their lesser degree of accessibility to services, facilities and jobs compared to the urban areas. Their role therefore in terms of housing growth is seen as one of supporting a district-wide strategy, by continuing to thrive and develop as important local service centres with a range of facilities that can support a lesser degree of housing to contribute towards the overall need, which in turn could contribute to long term viability and vibrancy of the villages.
110. In addition some limited housing growth can enable particular local needs to be met where identified, for example for affordable housing, or to meet the needs of particular groups of people. It has to be acknowledged however that the scale of such local needs has not been able to be more precisely assessed through the Rural Planning Project. The more broader based evidence, aspects of which are the subject of further assessment within

a Study of overall need, will therefore need to be relied upon to frame policies to enable local needs to be met.

Housing Options

111. Population and household forecasts prepared so far suggest that without some housing growth, most villages are facing a decline in population, which may raise some concerns over their ability to retain existing services and facilities in the longer term. For most villages the suggested recommendations for growth contained in the Village Reports will go some way to avoiding population decline.
112. The individual recommendations from each Village Report are drawn together in the Table below. It shows the recommended levels of growth for each village with no Green Belt or large-scale open countryside development. In addition it shows the suggested further potential should a sufficient level of housing requirement to justify larger scale village growth be identified. These include greenfield and Green Belt locations, although in the event of additional levels of village growth being needed, further capacity within existing villages in terms of redevelopment opportunities should first be further examined before Greenfield releases made.

Housing Summary Table

Village	Potential Capacity from 2010	Comments
Alrewas	73 – 88	28 dwellings within this capacity have planning permission.
Armitage with Handsacre	106	46 dwellings within this capacity have planning permission.
Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill	247	205 dwellings within this capacity have planning permission. (including Laurel House and Tolson's Mill)
Little Aston	37	34 dwellings within this capacity have planning permission.
Shenstone	136	31 dwellings within this capacity have planning

		permission.
Whittington	33 - 38	2 dwellings within this capacity have planning permission.
Total Suggested Housing Growth	632 - 652	Note: excludes completions 2006 – 2010 of 183 dwellings*
Range of other potential subject to need and further investigation		
Alrewas	150	North of Alrewas village.
Armitage with Handsacre	100	Green Belt sites only. Land at Brick Kiln Farm preferred.
Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill	Capacity to be assessed	Investigate long term redevelopment potential
Shenstone	Potential additional employment land capacity. To be assessed if required.	Any additional options would require Green Belt land.

Whittington	15 - 75	Green belt sites: Back Lane (15) and Huddlesford Lane (60)
Little Aston	Some sites likely as windfalls.	There could remain some limited infill capacity
Total	265 - 325	

113. A particular issue related to future housing potential common to all villages concerned except for Alrewas, is that of the statutory West Midlands Green Belt. Five of the villages have settlement boundaries that are common with a Green Belt boundary. Armitage with Handsacre lies at the outer edge of the West Midlands Green Belt, so that only the open countryside to its north does not lie within the Green Belt. This land, however, does not provide any development opportunities for a number of reasons, principally flooding issues. Shenstone and Whittington are entirely surrounded by Green Belt, whilst for Little Aston and Fazeley, Mile Oak and Bonehill all open countryside lies within the Green Belt and their other boundaries abut neighbouring local authority urban areas.

114. The presence of Green Belt has not prevented the consideration of

locations within it as potential directions for development in this Project. However, in terms of the Local Development Framework, current national policy provides that the District Council would have to show that there are exceptional circumstances that justify a change to the current Green Belt boundaries if it wished to promote development within it. Justification would have to be based upon a need to accommodate a particular level of growth and that a sustainable spatial strategy needs to rely on some rural growth in Green Belt in order to meet the requirements. However until further work is concluded on the level of housing need, final conclusions on whether there is a level of need within the 'key' settlements that adds up to 'exceptional circumstances', cannot be drawn. This is why conclusions on housing potential for individual villages have been made that effectively address potential at two or more levels, dependent upon the established need (see maps in conclusions appendix 2).

115. If additional sites are shown to be required within the rural areas beyond that achieved by the suggested sites (shown in the Table above as 632 – 652 dwellings from 2010), then it is considered that for the villages within the Rural Planning Project, the most appropriate would be:

- To first consider if there are additional potential Brownfield sites that are available, or will become available, during the plan period. Amongst these, consideration should include further investigation of potential sites within Fazeley – the potential of employment land and the haulage depot on Lichfield Street and the option of redevelopment of the Victory Terrace area. They should also include further consideration of the extent to which the Shenstone Industrial Estate might be redeveloped and the settlement sustainability consideration this might entail. Until more detailed investigations are undertaken, the level of additional potential arising from this option cannot be determined.
- Of the Greenfield sites identified the release of non- Green Belt land should first be considered. This effectively only includes Greenfield sites at Alrewas and would release potentially up to a further 150 dwellings. The detailed consideration of the implications for Alrewas referred to within the Alrewas village report would need to be satisfied in order to release this site.
- If following consideration of the above options there remains a need

to consider the release of Green Belt sites, it is considered that the sites at Armitage with Handsacre and Whittington identified within the Village Reports should next be considered. The release of these Green Belt sites would potentially add capacity for a further 175 dwellings.

- Only after consideration of these sites, should other Green Belt sites be considered.
- It is considered that Green Belt sites at Little Aston should be the lowest in priority for release. It is recommended earlier that Little Aston should no longer be included within the settlements having a 'key settlement' function in terms of housing growth. In addition release of Green Belt sites in this location would have the greatest potential harm in terms of the precedent set for the outward expansion of the West Midlands conurbation within Lichfield District

116. The potential capacity identification process used for the preparation of the Local Development Framework has had a tendency to rely on sites coming forward through the SHLAA that have been promoted by developers and landowners. The Rural Planning Project has identified additional sites that fall into this category, at Armitage and_{2 2}

Shenstone. If additional rural housing sites are required following determination of overall growth requirements, there may be a need to add to this process by further pro-active assessments of potential within villages, such as those mentioned at Fazeley.

117. For specific land allocations to take place within the Local Development Framework further work will be required on some of the individual sites included within the list of suggested village sites within the Village Reports. Although most of these sites have already been subject to consideration through the SHLAA process, the Rural Planning Project has raised some issues where clarification is needed for some sites in order to fully determine the infrastructure requirements. Sites which would fall into this category include:

- Shenstone Industrial Estate, to determine a housing site boundary and to consider in particular the transport requirements and implications for connections to the village. The potential to encourage redevelopment of a part of the site for new employment uses should also be considered.
- Blacksmith Lane/Chapel Lane Whittington to consider access and site capacity issues.

- Detailed implications for Alrewas Village of development to the north of the village.
- Access requirements for any Green Belt development related to Brick Kiln Lane, Armitage.
- Access requirements for any development at Huddlesford Lane, Whittington.