



Lichfield
district council
www.lichfielddc.gov.uk

1	Summary & Outcomes	3
2	Introduction	5
3	Methodology	6
4	Sustainability Issues & Character of Lichfield District	8
5	Issues & Options Consultation Document 2007	10
6	Summary of Results of Directions of Growth Appraisal	27
7	Overall Conclusions	33
Appendices		
i	Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth	34
	Glossary	45

1 Summary & Outcomes

Non-technical summary

1.1 The sustainability appraisal process looks at all plans and programmes, which relate to the use of land and development, to find how these will affect Lichfield and how they can help us to make development in Lichfield compatible with the aims of sustainable development.

1.2 Sustainable development is about meeting the needs of this generation without harming the ability of future generations to meet their needs, and the sustainability appraisal also tries to incorporate the effects of social issues as well as environmental and economic issues.

1.3 How it does this is to use all the information gathered from all the plans and policies and make a list of things that Lichfield District needs to consider and wants to change, these are called the Sustainability Framework Objectives. How it is done is written down in a [Scoping Report June 2007](#).

1.4 Then, when the Core Strategy publishes any policies and proposals they are checked against the list of Sustainability Framework Objectives to highlight the main impacts that would result if the proposals went ahead. This can be used to improve the policies and proposals to help reduce their impacts.

1.5 So far, Lichfield District Council have prepared 2 documents; an Issues document and an Issues and Options document and the policy directions and options contained within these have been assessed using the Sustainability Framework Objectives. The Issues and Options document contained 4 options for where development could go. These are assessed in **Section 5**. The Sustainability Appraisal also has to consider a do nothing option and found this would result in development which would not help address Lichfield's existing problems. There was also a need identified for further information in relation to flooding, landscape impact etc. at the time the assessments were undertaken.

1.6 The Sustainability Appraisal also assessed possible directions of growth next to Lichfield, Burntwood, Fradley and other looked at putting new houses at the villages within Lichfield District. It also considered proposals for development around Tamworth, (including Fazeley), and adjoining Rugeley (in Armitage with Handsacre Parish); and a new settlement in the Curborough area **Section 6**. The conclusion was that certain locations/options would have more impacts than others but that no options would address all the sustainability framework objectives for the District and a range of options would be preferable. It identified that all development would have an impact and there is a need for policies to address climate change, design, biodiversity, transport, sport and recreation, character and residential amenity and possibly archaeology.

1.7 Specific issues such as local housing need, avoiding loss of distinctive settlement character and views, and impact on biodiversity, as well as sustainability issues should help make decisions. In addition the combined impacts of building in different locations on the roads, bus routes etc. still need to influence future decisions.

Statement on the difference the process has made

1.8 The Sustainability Appraisal process has identified relevant sustainability objectives for the District and provided an independent assessment throughout the Core Strategy's preparation. It has identified data gaps early in the process and the need for further evidence to inform the assessment of directions of growth and spatial strategies arising from these prior to the identification of a preferred option.

How to comment on the report

1.9 This report can be viewed alongside the Preferred Options Consultation Document. The documents are available for comment for a period of 7 weeks public consultation between 27th November 2008 and 10th January 2009. Comments can be made on either document via our website lichfielddc.gov.uk/newldf, by email, or in writing. Documents are available to view during this period in all our deposit locations or via the website. Paper copies in large print are available on request from 01543 308190.

2 Introduction

Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal

2.1 The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal is to promote sustainable development through the better integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans. The objective of Strategic Environmental Assessment as defined in Government Guidance is “to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans... with a view to promoting sustainable development”. Sustainability Appraisal includes a wider range of considerations, extending beyond the environmental to include the social and economic impacts of plans. The process that has been carried out in relation to the Lichfield District Core Strategy, is designed to meet both the SA and SEA requirements.

2.2 The SA/SEA guidance sets out the main stages of the plan making process. It begins with Stage A, information gathering and progression to this report which is developing and refining options and assessing effects. This report relates to the spatial strategy for the preferred options only. The publication of preferred options is part of the process of refinement and assessment of options, but it should be noted that "preferred options" no longer forms part of the statutory process of preparing development plan documents.⁶⁹

Aims and Structure of the report

2.3 This report assesses the sustainability of development options including assessment of broad spatial options and potential directions for growth. It shows the progression from the Scoping Report to the choice of preferred options derived from the strategic growth options identified in the Issues and Options document for the Lichfield Local Development Framework.

2.4 In effect this report has been prepared as an interim step, published to accompany the non-statutory stage of consultation on preferred spatial options for the Core Strategy. The report demonstrates how the Preferred Options have been influenced and informed by the SA and how potential spatial options perform against the SA objectives.

2.5 The structure of the report follows that identified in the [Scoping Report for the SEA \(Core Strategy\) of June 2007](#) Section 5. “Preparing the Sustainability Report.”

Background to Lichfield District Local Development Framework

2.6 The District Council is preparing a Core Strategy which sets out a spatial strategy and key policies against which development proposals can be assessed. As part of the information gathering stages in the preparation of the Core Strategy the District Council has prepared and published an Issues document in August 2007 and subsequently an Issues and Options Document in December 2007. Other pieces of evidence have also been prepared and the full range of evidence can be viewed through our consultation centre.

i Amendments to Regulations were made in June 2008 by: The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008

3 Methodology

Approach to Sustainability Appraisal

3.1 In February 2007 a multi-disciplinary working group (LSWG) was established, involving LDC officers and representatives from the County Council, Environment Agency, Housing Association and Staffordshire Wildlife Trust. The group was established to give wider consideration to sustainability issues in the District and to assist in the preparation of the Scoping Report and subsequent appraisals of the Local Development Framework.

3.2 Although not all of the invitees attend all of the meetings, a range of professions are represented at each meeting. In addition appraisals are initially undertaken independently, analysed and then discussed by the group before being finalised. Liaison within the group takes place electronically and at regular meetings.

Stages and Tasks Undertaken

3.3 The Scoping Report of June 2007 incorporated the requirements of Stage A of the SA/SEA process.

3.4 This report follows the progression since the Scoping Report which has encompassed testing the plan objectives against the SA objectives; developing the plan and the strategic growth options; predicting the effects of the plan, including the options; evaluating the effects of the plan, including options such as a do nothing option.

Consultation

3.5 In June 2007, the [Scoping Report](#) was published for consultation. Representations were received on this. The LSWG discussed the representations which are summarised below, along with how the document should be changed in light of the responses. The general findings were as follows:

- Additions and updating of relevant plans/programmes, in particular in relation to the European context and environmental framework at national level;
- Broad agreement on the characterisation of the district and sustainability issues, but some useful additions particularly in relation to the role of open space, provision of health and contribution to climate change and biodiversity issues, and heritage and cultural landscape context in relation to consideration of sustainable development and development locations;
- Little criticism of the sustainability objectives, apart from the addition of geodiversity to Sustainability Framework Objective B and some valuable additions to detailed criteria and targets/ indicators against which policies and proposals can be measured;
- One request to add a sustainability objective in relation to meeting the RSS housing requirement was not accepted due to the Cores Strategy needing to be in general conformity with the RSS;
- One or two additions to the baseline information and some useful additional targets, but it was noted that most targets are short term in comparison with the Core Strategy timescale;

- A need to further develop the baseline information, particularly in relation to the historic environment (built and natural) and assess further sustainability issues that arise;
- A need to broaden the scope of interests involved in the SA/SEA group if possible to ensure that wider interests of the historic environment and leisure/health are fully taken into account.

3.6 The LSWG considered a revised [scoping report](#) in September 2007 and decided to utilise this for its analysis. The group has also reviewed the breadth of expertise and its capacity, in the light of the novel approach taken to the SA process and recognition that the level of individual capacity of members would vary related to the nature of their main occupations. It made approaches although unsuccessful in some cases, to seek direct involvement from representatives from sport and leisure, historic environment and health. An additional person was added with specialism in the historic environment and involvement has been achieved from the voluntary sector. Further evidence was prepared in relation to sport and leisure that has assisted the process. Some representatives remain as observers who receive the paperwork and are able to have an input, but do not undertake routine work of the group.

Limitations

3.7 The SA/SEA provides an opportunity for early analysis and for identification of data gaps. Results therefore may change as more information and detail becomes available through the process. Due to the need for a simple scoring system it cannot differentiate between similar options easily and it also does not grade the sustainability framework objectives, or identify those which have greater importance locally.

4 Sustainability Issues & Character of Lichfield District

Links to Other Plans and Programmes

4.1 The Scoping Report of June 2007 considered an extensive list of plans, policies and programmes which was added to in the September version of the Scoping Report. Since this time further additions have been made to keep the document up to date. Additional items include: SFRA, PPS1 Annex "Planning & Climate Change", West Midlands Economic Development Strategy December 2007, Parish Plans, Sustaining Public Health annual report, Draft Health Inequalities Strategy Update 2004/6, Lichfield District Council Policies on Light and Contaminated Land April 2008. Other further pieces of work have been added to the evidence base and the implications of these are included in the social, environmental and economic issues section below.

Social, Environmental and Economic Issues

4.2 The social profile of the District has been amended to reflect the housing stock profile and the need for affordable housing in the District. Subsequent research undertaken through the SHMA and Rural Housing Needs Survey has quantified the need and considered the geographical dimension of the affordability issues.

4.3 The environmental profile has been updated following the publication of the SFRA and the "gold report " which considered recent flooding events within the District. The environmental data has also been amended as there are now 2 RIGS sites within the District. Work towards local standards for open space etc. is developing, and work on historic landscape characterisation is also advancing. The impacts of climate change are being considered through the preparation of a Climate Change Background Paper to inform the spatial strategy and policies for the Core Strategy, and subsequently a Climate Change SPD.

4.4 The economic profile will be influenced by the RSS policy and employment strategy and also by research on the accommodation of offices to meet market demand arising during the plan period.

4.5 Also during the period in preparing the Core Strategy Preferred Options the Eco Town initiative provided information, although the proposal was subsequently withdrawn.

Baseline Data and Indicators

4.6 Changes from the June 2007 [Scoping Report](#) include additions on historic landscape characterisation, historic buildings, SBAP targets, gypsy and traveller and disabled accommodation, accessibility to sport for under represented groups, accessibility to greenspace and the addition of road casualties in communities. Changes to the monitoring of climate change will also be forthcoming.

Sustainability Appraisal Framework

4.7 Through using the Scoping report to appraise options a number of issues have arisen in relation to the Sustainability Framework Objectives and detailed criteria (questions). The group have therefore undertaken further work on the Scoping Report and it has been updated to take on board the SRFA, which had not previously been completed. Duplicate questions

have been removed to reduce the likelihood of too much emphasis being placed on certain criteria. The group also changed the appraisal template to add extra criteria allowing for ++ve and - - ve as well as +ve and -ve as shown below, to help differentiate between the options. A comments box was also added to assist in clarification and to identifying any mitigation or uncertainty remaining.

4.8 The questions are therefore assessed in the following manner:

++ clear and strong positive effect in response to criterion

+ positive effect in response to criterion

- - clear and strong negative effect in response to criterion

- negative effect in response to criterion

+/- mixed effect in response to criterion

0 no effect in response to criterion

? effects impossible to determine from information in Strategy.

5 Issues & Options Consultation Document 2007

5.1 The Issues and options document identified 11 issues facing the District and identified 15 strategic objectives to address these issues. A report was prepared which considered the Sustainability Framework Objectives against both the issues and also the strategic objectives included in the Issues and Options document. The Strategic Framework Objectives are as follows:

Objective A: To maintain and enhance landscape and townscape quality.

Objective B: To promote biodiversity and geodiversity through protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats.

Objective C: To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their settings.

Objective D: To mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.

Objective E: To encourage prudent use of natural resources.

Objective F: To reduce flood risk.

Objective G: To improve availability of sustainable transport options to jobs and services.

Objective H: To encourage sustainable distribution and communication systems.

Objective I: To create mixed and balanced communities.

Objective J: To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime.

Objective K: To improve the health of the population.

Objective L: To enable improved community participation.

Comparing Issues with the Sustainability Framework Objectives:

The issues are as follows:

Issue 1

Meeting the Strategic Housing & Employment Requirements (including cross boundary issues).

Issue 2

Tackling the causes and effects of climate change.

Issue 3

Responding to the changes in demographics. (The population is characterised by a relatively high number of older people and the 2001 Census indicated almost 22% of the population was aged over 60. This population of Lichfield District will continue to get older raising issues of health, transport and service provision).

Issue 4

A choice of means of transport. (Public transport is focused on Lichfield and Burntwood, although internal bus services do not reach all parts of the urban areas. Some villages have infrequent and poorly connecting bus services. Is there potential to improve rail facilities, particularly serving the cross-city line?).

Issue 5

Lack of affordable / specialist housing. (Affordability is an issue across the District, although there is some variation in house prices. Past surveys have shown particular demand for affordable housing in Lichfield and Burntwood, but there is limited access to rural affordable housing).

Issue 6

Making Lichfield District a more attractive place for business to locate and invest.

Issue 7

High proportions of local people commute by car to work. (As well as unattractiveness or unavailability of public transport there are relatively few jobs in Burntwood compared to workers and a need for a wider choice of jobs in Lichfield, to reduce the need to commute).

Issue 8

Protecting Lichfield District's historic environment. (Especially the historic core of Lichfield, but also the 23 other Conservation Areas including many of our villages).

Issue 9

Promoting active and healthy lifestyles. (Improving access to open spaces and links to the countryside will help, but there is a need to improve the quality of open spaces, sports and play and facilities, particularly in parts of Burntwood and Lichfield and to get better access to indoor sports facilities).

Issue 10

Protecting and promoting the natural environment. (A need for better green networks in Burntwood and Lichfield, to maintain the quality and tranquility of our corner of Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and to continue partnership projects such as the Forest of Mercia).

Issue 11

Tackling pockets of deprivation. (Local pockets of deprivation exist located primarily in the urban areas of Lichfield City, Burntwood and parts of Fazeley based on education, skills, training, poor health and low incomes. Six more rural wards of the District - Colton and Ridwares, Kings Bromley, Mease and Tame, Bourne Vale, Longdon and Alrewas and Fradley wards contained barriers to housing and services because of a poor provision of housing, local services and amenities).

5.2 The outcome of the comparison is shown in the Table 5.1 below:

Strategic Framework Objectives												
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1												
2		+		+	+	+						
3							+		+	+	+	
4				+			+		+			
5									+			
6								+	+			
7				+			+		+			
8	+		+									
9									+		+	
10	+	+										

Strategic Framework Objectives												
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
11									+		+	

Table 5.1 Outcome of the Comparison

5.3 All but one of the sustainability objectives scored positively, this suggests that all of the sustainability objectives have been addressed in the document. The one issue which has not been addressed is sustainability objective 11 which relates to community participation and whilst there is no issue relating to this listed in this part of the document, the Issues & Options document in its entirety has been through large scale public participation.

Comparing Strategic Objectives of the Core Strategy Issues and Options Document

5.4 The Strategic Objectives of the Core Strategy Issues and Options Document are listed below:

Objective 1: To create a District where development helps to mitigate the adverse effects of climate change, utilises resources efficiently and promotes renewable energy and green technologies.

Objective 2: To meet the overall development requirements for the District, consistent with the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Objective 3: To focus residential, employment and town centre facilities into high quality developments within the most sustainable locations whilst protecting the quality and character of existing residential environments.

Objective 4: To reduce the difficulties local people have in securing housing within the District that meets their needs, taking into account affordability, special needs and the creation of a balanced housing market.

Objective 5: To ensure that new housing proposals make adequate provision for transport, education, health, open space and social and community facilities.

Objective 6: To ensure that jobs are created within the District that contribute to meeting the identified needs of local people through their type and location.

Objective 7: To ensure an appropriate level of provision and to improve the quality of outdoor and indoor leisure facilities available to residents, by working towards meeting recognised standards for the quantity, quality and accessibility of provision.

Objective 8: To reduce the need for people to travel whilst increasing the opportunities for travel using sustainable forms of transport, through securing improvements to public transport infrastructure and facilities to promote walking and cycling.

Objective 9: To improve our town centres to provide better local opportunities for shopping, leisure, culture and improved accessibility, by providing a wider range of facilities within Lichfield City and through creation of an enlarged town centre at Burntwood.

Objective 10: To protect the quality of the countryside and the villages it contains from inappropriate development whilst still allowing identified development needs arising in these areas to be met.

Objective 11: To ensure that rural settlements contain an adequate, or where necessary, improved range of services and facilities to meet the needs of their area.

Objective 12: To reduce the relative isolation of rural areas through improvements to public transport facilities and rural services.

Objective 13: To improve the biodiversity resources of the District through habitat management, creation and enhancement and to make habitats more accessible to the public where possible, without damage to the species.

Objective 14: To protect the District's natural and built environmental assets from loss or damage by development and the effects of traffic, and secure enhancements in their conservation and management, having particular regard to the historic environment of Lichfield City, the conservation areas and the wide ranging landscape character of the District.

Objective 15: To increase the attraction of Lichfield District as a tourist destination through provision of a greater variety of accommodation, the development of new and the enhancement of existing tourist attractions.

Strategic Framework Objectives												
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1				+	+	+						
2												
3							+		+	+		
4									+			
5									+	+	+	
6							+		+			
7									+		+	
8							+	+	+	+	+	
9									+			
10	+		+						+			
11	+						+		+			
12									+			
13	+	+									+	
14	+	+	+									
15									+			

5.2 Compatibility Matrix

5.5 The matrix shows that only Objective 2 does not contribute positively towards the District, this is to be expected as the provision of employment and housing within the RSS does not specifically relate to local need and as locations are not specified the impact of development on landscape/biodiversity is impossible to assess. Development which does not relate to, or help meet local need, will generate car trips which scores poorly in the Sustainability Objectives. None of the other strategic objectives score negatively or necessarily conflict with any other objective, however at this stage it is impossible to provide this level of certainty as when sites and locations are identified there may be conflict.

5.6 Sustainability Objective L relates to community participation and there is no objective relating to this listed at this part of the Issues and Options document. However the document in its entirety has been through large scale public participation.

Core Strategy Draft Vision

5.7 The draft vision published within the Core Strategy Issues and Options Document is not contrary to any of the sustainability objectives identified in the Scoping Report. However reference to both Sustainability Objective F which relates to reducing flood risk is omitted from the vision, and sustainability objective L relating to improved community participation is also not directly referred to.

5.8 However, no reference to objective L is required in the vision. Reference to Sustainability objective F Flood risk could be considered as part of the impacts of tackling climate change. No changes were suggested by the LSWG.

Core Strategy Key Topic Options

5.9 The Core Strategy Issues and Options Document identified a number of topic areas in order to consider the extent to which they should influence the Core Strategy, and would require specific policies to be included within it. The following section sets out the conclusions of the LSWG on the main sustainability issues related to the questions asked in the Document on the key topics, and in particular how they relate to the sustainability objectives.

Climate Change

Question 10: Which types of renewable energy would you like to see in the District? e.g wind farms, biomass, hydro-electric, solar panels, wind turbines, geothermal?

5.10 The Scoping report does not exclude any types, but sets objectives which development should follow, including development for renewable energy. It also includes potential areas where there may be conflict, such as sustainability objective A: To maintain and enhance landscape and townscape quality, and Sustainability objective B: To promote biodiversity and geodiversity through protection, enhancement and management of species and habitats.

Question 11: Should all new development be required to generate a proportion of its energy use on-site from renewable sources?

5.11 Where this is economic in scale there should be a requirement to generate energy on-site, and there should be a strong obligation to justify why energy should not be generated on-site. A threshold such as that in the Merton rule should be investigated to assist in meeting the targets identified in the Scoping Report of a reduction of CO₂ emissions in Lichfield per capita to 9.79 in 2010 (these targets are subject to review through the AMR) , and the government target of achieving 20% of electricity produced from renewable sources by 2020.

Services and Facilities

Question 12: Should the Council aim to support community facilities in settlements within the District? If so, which ones and where?

5.12 Promotion of community is evident in many of the sustainability objectives; I –To create mixed and balanced communities; J - To promote safe communities, reduce crime and fear of crime; and L – To enable improved community participation.

Sustainable Transport

Question13: Should major development incorporate measures to encourage more sustainable patterns of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport? If so, what measures?

5.13 Development should support sustainable patterns of transport. No measures are specified in the Scoping Report but this principle is supported by the Sustainability Objectives. The Scoping report does not differentiate between “any development” and “major development”, and these phrases should be defined if they are to be referred to.

Question 14: Current policy allows for a park and ride facility at Lichfield Trent Valley Railway station. Should other park and ride schemes be encouraged? If so, at which locations e.g Shenstone, Blake Street , Rugeley Trent Valley ?

5.14 The Scoping Report supports measures to reduce the length of car borne trips, which park and ride schemes can do as they encourage shift in mode from car to train, – sustainability objective D. However this could be contrary to objectives such as Sustainability objective I, to create mixed and balanced communities – which encourages new employment to meet local need and thus discourages travel, due to generated to access rail stations.

Housing

Question 15: Do you consider that affordable housing is needed in Lichfield/Burntwood/Rural Settlements? If so, which settlements?

5.15 Provision of affordable housing to meet local needs is compatible to sustainability objective I. There is a need for affordable housing across the entire district (see response to question16).

Question 16: What proportion of housing in Lichfield District do you think should be affordable? Should this vary between different parts of the District?

5.16 There is a need for affordable housing across the district, and there are areas which have greater affordability issues than others. This however needs to be considered alongside issues of demand and the deliverability/viability of sites. Further research should be undertaken to inform a policy approach.

Question 17: Do you think, if the evidence shows a need, that sites should be specifically allocated for affordable housing only?

5.17 There is no information within Scoping Report that enables this question to be addressed at present.

Employment

Question 18: How can the District Council ensure that there is sufficient employment land available to meet local needs when the current committed supply is equivalent of the District's strategic requirement set out in RSS Phase 2 Preferred options? Would you support any current committed but undeveloped employment sites being re-allocated for alternative uses such as housing?

5.18 There is no information within Scoping Report that enables this question to be addressed. Sustainability Objective I seeks to create mixed and balanced communities, and employment provision is part of this.

Question 19: Are there any existing employment sites or industrial estates that you consider should be protected?

5.19 As a principle employment sites and industrial estates need to be safeguarded. However, further research should be undertaken to establish current viability and long term suitability of retaining all sites. The Scoping report supports sites for distribution and warehousing to be close to main transport networks.

Question 20: Where should office development in the District be directed? If the strategic office requirement of 30,000sqm. cannot be met within Lichfield City Centre, where should it be directed? (Peripheral city centre locations/outskirts of Lichfield City / Burntwood Town Centre/ elsewhere?)

5.20 These options/locations were assessed using the SA Appraisal Framework and it was found that Lichfield City Centre scored well especially with regard to accessibility and on providing a wide range of jobs, thereby fulfilling local needs. However there were some negatives with regard to impact on townscape. Burntwood town centre scored highest where this would involve redevelopment of existing employment sites rather than peripheral development near to sites with biodiversity interest. The option which was least sustainable was office development in countryside locations especially with regard to improving the availability of sustainable transport to jobs and services and in creating mixed and balanced communities. Development on the edge of Lichfield City and on the periphery of Lichfield City scored less well than options in Burntwood and Lichfield City Centre, but were more sustainable than countryside locations.

Question 21: Should employment development, housing and other development be encouraged where there are good public transport links – such as close to railway stations or key bus routes?

5.21 This approach supports sustainability objectives I - To create mixed & balanced communities, H - To encourage sustainable distribution and communication systems , G - To improve availability of sustainable transport options to jobs and services and D - To mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.

Question 22: Do we need more train stations? If so, where?

5.22 There is no information within Scoping Report that enables this question to be addressed.

Built and Historic Environment

Question 23: How can the Council encourage the re-use of historic buildings?

5.23 This question was too specific for the group to comment upon, the principle is supported by sustainability objective A - To maintain and enhance landscape and townscape quality and C - To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their settings.

Recreation, Leisure, Culture and Tourism

Question 24: Should the Council aim to identify and protect key public open spaces in the District from development? If so, which ones?

5.24 As no-where is identified as having a surplus in open space, all should be protected. Protection in principle is supported by sustainability objectives I - To create mixed and balanced communities and K - To improve the health of the population and to a lesser extent by sustainability objectives A - To maintain and enhance landscape and townscape quality and C - To protect and enhance buildings, features and areas of archaeological, cultural and historic value and their settings.

Question 25: Where new facilities are created or existing ones expanded, should they maximise the use of sustainable transport modes?

5.25 This would contribute greater to the sustainability objectives I - To create mixed and balanced communities and K - To improve the health of the population.

Question 26: What do you think would make Chasewater a more popular visitor destination?

5.26 The response of the LSWG to the Draft Chasewater SPD identified a number of issues. Whilst they did not specifically address "what would make it more popular", the response to the draft SPD was positive where it was possible to determine the effects. The group identified that a high quality of build would be required in order to improve the landscape and there would be a need to avoid inappropriate new attractions in relation to nature conservation; in addition the lack of accessibility by public transport should be considered;

Question 27: Would you agree with the expansion of Drayton Manor Theme Park to provide for year round use to include visitor accommodation?

5.27 The proposal submitted was considered to have significant impact upon the watercourses in the Bonehill conservation area and the canal and road junctions in the Fazeley Conservation Area. There are clear and strong negative impacts upon nature conservation and landscape impact within the site, especially relating to protected species,

the historic parkland, woodland and associated grassland, ancient trees and veteran trees. The expansion of the park is likely to have significant energy and water use implications which should be tackled through design and layout. Most new visitors will arrive by car and whilst there will be positive contributions for local labour force and local supply chains, small and micro business, no increase in local transport options is proposed, there would however be a green travel plan which may address some of these issues.

5.28 The proposal will have no effect on provision of affordable housing or local facilities, although none would currently be expected from commercial development.

5.29 This proposal needs to be considered with regard to its impact upon the region as well as the locality.

Natural Environment

Question 28: Are there any areas of the Lichfield District countryside that require additional protection?

5.30 From the information available at the time this was considered to be preferable to be left as a general statement rather than try and list individual assets.

Sustainability Appraisal of Spatial Strategy

5.31 The Issues and Options document identified 4 options for growth. Due to the eco-town submission at Curborough a further option was also considered together with a do nothing option.

Alternative Options Considered

Overall Conclusions

Option 1 : Town focussed development (50% Lichfield , 20% Burntwood, 20% Tamworth , 10% Rugeley)

5.32 Option 1 provided good opportunities to encourage fewer journeys by car due to the physical proximity of a larger range of goods and services, cultural activities and transport provision. However more journeys within an urban area can be harmful to road safety as there are generally more vulnerable road users within the built up area, and there is greater potential for congestion, which results in poorer air quality. Negative impact on SSSI's due to proximity and connectivity, from increases in visitor numbers, and potential impact upon archaeology at Gentleshaw Common. Potential for opportunities for renewable energy due to economies of scale. Good opportunities to enable affordable housing on larger sites.

Option 2 : Town and key rural village focussed development (40% Lichfield , 20% Burntwood, 40% between other sustainable settlements – Alrewas, Armitage with Handsacre, Fazeley, Little Aston, Shenstone and Whittington)

5.33 Key village developments may encourage more car use and more reliance on the car, however these areas have the same level of service provision of public transport as the edges of the urban locations. Parts of Alrewas, Shenstone, Armitage with Handsacre and Fazeley are in Flood Zone 3. With regard to the historic environment it is no better than Option 1 as whilst a greater spread of development is likely to protect the historic core of Lichfield, there will be a greater number of conservation areas affected.

Option 3 : Dispersed development (30% Lichfield , 15% Burntwood, 55% Rural Areas)

5.34 This option would result in the largest increase in car usage, and as such provides the least possibilities for increasing opportunities for walking and cycling. Dispersed development is unlikely to enable the introduction of local amenities, due to the lack of access to facilities and is likely to have a negative influence on supporting healthy lifestyles. There may be more potential for local renewable energy, but it would be harder to be reliant upon this being successfully incorporated into smaller developments due to the economies of scale. This option also scores lowest for provision of affordable housing, but scores well on protection of Lichfield's historic core and protection of the nationally designated nature conservation sites which are generally on the edges of the built up areas within Lichfield District, however this is potentially the worst for archaeological sites affected due to a larger number of these possibly being affected.

Option 4 : New Settlement development (60% new settlement, 20% Lichfield , 10% Burntwood, 10% Rural Areas)

5.35 Dependent upon location, this option could have the greatest potential to have the least impact upon the historic core of Lichfield and the district wide historic environment, landscape etc. due to the majority of development being concentrated in a single location. However, due to the scale of development this option is likely to have a profoundly negative impact on wildlife and connectivity between habitats, which, subject to location, could impact upon priority habitats. It has the highest potential for using renewable energy/ low energy fuel source/SUDs – due to new build design and economies of scale. Not as positive as for option 1 but due to economies of scale the option has great potential for a high level of provision of affordable housing subject to size of development, although this would all be in one location and is contrary to the recognition that there is a need for more affordable housing across the whole district. It does have the potential to have “green travel” built in to the development but there is likely to be a strong negative on the ability to reduce car borne trips, due to length of time to implement the services and facilities needed to reduce the need to travel. Depending on the scale of the development and the level and range of provision of facilities, if the settlement was smaller than Lichfield or Burntwood then there would still be a need to travel by car for shopping and services. Similarly if there was no health centre this would be have a negative effect on improving the health of the population.

Do Nothing Option

5.36 There are 2 possible descriptions of a “do nothing option” in relation to current policy:

- Do the minimum: Little or no net new development – new build as replacement for demolition, only modest increases in dwellings through conversion of existing buildings,

reduction in vacant properties and land, and more intensive use of buildings. De-allocate all existing greenfield allocations and no windfall development beyond those already with permission.

- Alternatively no change: Maintain existing densities and greenfield allocations and allow development on windfall sites. Modest net increase in housing stock.

5.37 The impact of a do nothing option has been assessed on a short term, medium term and long term basis.

5.38 The current position in relationship to Lichfield District

- Urban Capacity: approx 700 dwellings – approx 2 years supply
- Amount of greenfield with outstanding planning permission: Zero sites
- Existing policies are saved until superseded by LDF, no end date set yet.

LDC Option: Do nothing

5.39 In the short term: there would be a dip in affordable housing provision which would result in a crisis for those in housing need as large scale building would cease. A decline in local relevance of policies, as local policies are replaced with more up to date national policy guidance. Nature conservation would benefit from fewer new build developments. Decontamination of land would be more difficult as this is largely reliant upon development and developers to remediate sites. There may be more issues of disturbance to existing residents due to pressure to ‘cram’ developments into built up areas. No new road building would take place. Walking, cycling and public transport contributions would stay the same however they may be hindered due to lack of S.106 funding.

5.40 In the medium term : Rising house prices would be likely as demand outstrips supply. Pressure for housing may increase on non-residential sites – such as existing employment land, local authority nursing homes which are closing, petrol filling stations, rural shops and pubs, with the price of residential land being higher than for other land uses. Pressure on greenfield sites would continue and there would be susceptibility to ad hoc large scale residential planning applications such as the new settlement proposal due to not fulfilling local/regional/national obligations to provide housing (the lack of a 5 yr housing supply). Development would not be being delivered to address local issues – congestion, flood relief, ageing population, rural isolation, energy consumption, use of renewables. Nature conservation may be harmed as most of our nationally recognised sites are close to our main centres of population, which are likely to be the areas where most appeals would be submitted, and potentially, if allowed, would result in growth close to them, with increased activity on the sites causing them harm. Rural landscape may begin to change due to renewed pressure for barn conversions which could lead to a need for new farm buildings.

5.41 Greater pressure may result on the historic Lichfield City Centre and potentially other conservation areas. There would be a reduced ability to address issues such as accessibility to facilities or lack of open space due to a piecemeal approach to provision of housing. The southern part of Lichfield city has critical drainage problems and major aquifers, so there may be problems created in the future without proper planning. Decontamination of land would continue to be more difficult as it is largely reliant upon development and developers to remediate sites. An increased likelihood of issues of disturbance to existing residents

due to pressure to 'cram' developments into built up areas. No new road building would take place. Walking, cycling and public transport contributions would stay the same however they may be hindered due to lack of S.106 funding.

5.42 Long term: Lost opportunity to address issues affecting the district, and a magnification of medium term issues.

Conclusion:

5.43 A do-nothing option should not be considered further as it does not conform to regional policy to provide sufficient homes to 2026. Due to the limited housing supply that would remain it is considered the medium and long term effects would be felt within a 5 yr period.

The need for further work

5.44 The results identified a number of areas in which the LSWG felt they were unable to satisfactorily answer the questions due to a lack of information. This was reported back to the LDF team and further work was commissioned. Areas where further work has been undertaken are historic landscape character analysis, affordable housing and rural housing need, demographic information e.g ageing population/migration, SFRA, employment demographics, crime, health, community participation, offices, sport and recreation and improvements to public access to information and services.

6 Summary of Results of Directions of Growth Appraisal

6.1 Following the submission of potential housing locations through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), the completion of the data gaps and discussions with the Council LDF team, a need arose to consider directions of growth options, principally around the urban areas (Lichfield and Burntwood), but also in relation to Tamworth, Rugeley and Fradley. Lichfield and Burntwood are the 2 largest settlements within the district and hold the best opportunities for the most sustainable locations for development. However both settlements have areas which would be more sensitive to development than others, and as data was available to assess these broad locations it was felt that it would be of benefit to the core strategy to undertake further analysis and enable a more specific locational perspective to be added to the Core Strategy.

6.2 The directions of growth around the largest settlements were identified using SHLAA sites and compared with options 2 and 3 of the Issues and Options Document, and with the proposed new settlement option, using information in relation to a proposal at Curborough which is the only location put forward that potentially meets the criteria for a new settlement set in the Issues and Options Report.

6.3 The methodology used in assisting the LSWG to identify a preferred directions of growth involved assessing each of the options identified throughout the process against each other and against the Sustainability Framework Objectives as broken down by the sustainability framework questions. This was fed into a matrix (the Directions of Growth matrix) which is summarised at the end of this report.

6.4 Initially, the questions which would not have a spatial influence were identified and excluded from the Directions of Growth matrix. Thus questions relating to design of buildings, reducing waste, water efficiency, use of primary resources, employment (as this was housing specific exercise), local retail needs, crime, community involvement, were excluded. Not all boxes of the Directions of Growth matrix are therefore completed.

6.5 The scoring system identified in the Scoping Report was utilised to complete the matrix and helped identify key deciding factors.

6.6 The Directions of Growth matrix was completed during a meeting of the LSWG and then redistributed electronically for verification by those contributing and the rest of the group who did not attend the meeting, to enable the whole group to comment. The summary of the matrix is shown at the end of this report - Section 8.

The Findings:

6.7 Whilst some sites scored better than others there was still an overriding need for certain local spatially significant issues to be addressed: e.g rural housing need, needs of gypsies and other specialist housing needs and a need to safeguard buildings at risk in Fazeley. In relation to District-wide issues there is also a need to utilise brownfield sites to assist in reducing contamination and in flood risk reduction, and for new development to assist in regeneration of areas. Affordable housing also needs to be considered as a local issue to ensure that the needs of individual communities are addressed and thus for the provision not to be made in one location only.

Results of the Spatial Analysis

6.8 Options around the periphery of Lichfield to the south, north and east scored better than all the options around the periphery of Burntwood. The most suitable location for future development in the District was around Fazeley, (West of Tamworth) and south Lichfield. Development around the periphery of Burntwood scored worse than development to the East of Rugeley and a new settlement. A new settlement at Curborough scored better than developing to the north of Tamworth, within Lichfield District. Option 2, Town and Key Rural Village Focussed development and sites south of Burntwood around Hammerwich both scored poorly in relation to other directions of growth. However all the above location options score better than developing Option 3, Dispersed Development. **Section 8** shows the complete directions of growth matrix.

Lichfield Directions of Growth

6.9 The SHLAA identified 4 potential directions of growth around Lichfield City. South, West, East around Streethay and North. These are identified on Map 8.1 Lichfield City : The Spatial Options in the Preferred Options document. All options around Lichfield would provide a clear and strong positive impact upon provision of affordable housing for local people in need of a home.

6.10 The options to the south of Lichfield had the highest number of benefits and the least number of negative impacts. Development here would have clear and positive impacts on providing increased opportunities for walking and cycling to jobs and services and for improving transport provision and accessibility. It would also have a positive effect upon providing opportunities to reduce trips by car, providing access to new development for those without a car and thus reduce the impact upon traffic sensitive areas and upon improving choice of transport mode in the proposed and existing residential area. However, it could have a negative impact upon a building or its setting that contributes to the District's heritage and medium or large scale development could have a clear and strong negative impact upon landscape quality, archaeology, historic views and skylines.

6.11 Options to the east around Streethay score positively for providing opportunities to reduce trips by car to jobs and services and providing increased opportunities for walking and cycling, providing access to new developments for those without a car and reducing the overall impact of traffic sensitive areas. It would also have a positive effect upon improving choice of transport mode generally, but a mixed effect on improving transport provision and accessibility which is dependent on how easy it is to extend existing bus/cycle routes. There could be a clear and strong negative impact upon a site of archaeological importance in this area. There would be a negative impact upon protection of locally distinctive settlement pattern as Lichfield meets Streethay.

6.12 Options to the north of Lichfield would have a mixed effect upon providing opportunities to reduce trips by car and providing increased opportunities for walking and cycling to jobs and services, also for providing access to new developments for those without access to a car and thus reducing the impact upon traffic sensitive areas. The effect would be mixed with regard to improving transport provision and accessibility generally.

6.13 Options to the West of Lichfield would have some positive impacts but would also have the most negative impacts of all the urban extensions to Lichfield City and was thus the least favoured option around Lichfield. There would be clear and strong positive impacts

upon providing opportunities to reduce trips by car and for providing access to new developments for those without a car for jobs and services; and positive impacts upon providing increased opportunities/facilities for walking and cycling and for improving transport provision and accessibility as it would be relatively easy to extend existing bus and cycle routes. However it would have a negative impact upon preserving and enhancing the Lichfield City conservation area, and it is most likely to have a negative impact upon locally distinctive settlement character, and on historic views and valuable skylines. A clear and strong negative impact would also result upon priority habitats, sites of archaeological importance, preservation of historic landscape elements and buildings or structures which contribute to the District's heritage.

Burntwood Directions of Growth

6.14 The SHLAA identified 3 growth options for around Burntwood. These were North Burntwood, South of Burntwood and South-east of Burntwood extending to Hammerwich and are identified on Map 9.1 Burntwood : The Spatial Options in the Preferred Options document.. All Burntwood options would have a positive impact upon providing affordable housing for local people in need of a home. It should also be noted that cumulative development to the south and south-east of Burntwood along with development to the west of Lichfield is likely to result in congestion at the Pipehill road junction (even after its scheduled improvements due shortly.)

6.15 The options to the south of Burntwood adjoining the settlement and to the north of Burntwood both scored equally, however development in either direction was considered to have as many negative impacts as positive impacts.

6.16 Options to the south of Burntwood, adjoining the existing settlement, would have a positive impact upon providing increased opportunities/facilities for walking/cycling to jobs and services, providing affordable housing for local people in need of a home and improving choice of transport mode as it has easier to extend existing cycle/bus routes than other areas. It would have mixed impacts upon providing opportunities to reduce trips by car to jobs and services, providing access to new development for those without a car and reducing the impact of traffic sensitive areas and improving transport provision and accessibility. It would have a negative impact upon priority habitats and upon current data for reducing flood risk. It would have a clear and strong negative impact upon protecting locally distinctive settlement character, because of potential coalescence with the conurbation.

6.17 Options to the north of Burntwood showed no clear and strong positive impacts and a clear and strong negative impact due to surviving nature of historic field pattern and potential for survival of many historic buildings. Development had positive results for providing increased opportunities for walking/cycling to jobs and services, providing affordable housing for local people in need of a home, improving transport provision and accessibility and for improving choice of transport mode for new and existing residents. However negative impacts on priority habitats, on current data for reducing flood risk and on providing opportunities to reduce trips by car were identified in relation to providing access to new development for those without a car and reducing the overall impact of traffic sensitive areas, due to poor bus penetration at present.

6.18 Options to the south-east of Burntwood incorporating Hammerwich show overall a negative impact. Development would have a positive impact upon providing affordable housing for local people in need of a home, and upon improving choice of transport mode.

A mixed impact was identified upon providing access to new development for those without a car and reducing the overall impact on traffic sensitive areas. Development in this area was shown as having negative impact upon priority habitats, and upon current data for reducing flood risk. It is shown as having a clear and strong negative impact upon locally distinctive settlement character, providing opportunities to reduce trips by car, providing increased opportunities for walking/ cycling and improving transport provision and accessibility, this is partly due to the narrow carriageway through Hammerwich village, which restricts bus access.

Other Potential Directions of Growth

6.19 Other options for growth considered were North of Tamworth, West of Tamworth around Fazeley, East of Rugeley, Fradley and a new settlement in the Curborough area, where in all cases potential housing locations had been identified through the SHLAA process. These were compared to options around Lichfield and Burntwood (option 1) and options 2 and 3 of the [Issues and Options Document \(December 2007\)](#)

West of Tamworth, around Fazeley

6.20 This option shows mainly positive impacts with negative impacts only for the effect upon conservation areas and their settings. However a positive impact on preserving buildings and structures which contribute to the District's heritage was identified, and on providing increased opportunities for walking/cycling and reducing the impact of traffic sensitive areas. It was also shown as having a clear and strong positive impact upon providing opportunities to reduce trips by car and providing access to new developments for those without a car. It would also have no effect upon improving transport provision and accessibility and improving choice of transport mode.

North of Tamworth

6.21 This option is shown as having only no effects or a negative impact. The option showed no effect upon improving choice of transport mode. Development in this area is shown as having a negative impact upon retaining distinctive settlement character; providing opportunities to reduce trips by car; providing increased opportunities/facilities for walking and cycling; for providing affordable homes for local people in need of a home (as it would meet more of the housing needs arising from Tamworth than from Lichfield District) and also a negative impact upon improving transport provision and accessibility. This option would have a clear and strong negative impact upon conservation areas, namely Wiggington conservation area. It would also have a clear and strong negative impact upon providing access to new development for those without a car and for reducing the overall impact of traffic sensitive areas, including Fountains junction and approaches to the town centre in Tamworth.

East of Rugeley

6.22 Options here show a positive impact for providing opportunities to reduce trips by car and for improving transport provision and accessibility. It would have a mixed impact upon priority habitats, and on providing increased opportunities/ facilities for walking and cycling, providing access to new developments for those without a car and reducing the overall impact of traffic sensitive areas. It would have no impact on improving choice of transport mode. It would have a negative impact on conservation areas, Trent and Mersey

canal conservation area, and upon providing affordable housing for local people in need of a home, as it would not meet the needs of Lichfield and Burntwood which generate the largest need in Lichfield District. It could also have a clear and strong negative impact upon the locally distinctive settlement character.

Fradley

6.23 Options around Fradley would have a clear and strong positive impact upon providing affordable housing for local people in need of a home, as Fradley is seen as accessible to Lichfield and is attractive as the properties are new. Thus it would help meet the local need arising from Lichfield City. It would have a mixed impact upon landscape quality and, dependent upon where development is proposed, providing opportunities for walking/cycling, for providing access to new development for those without a car, for providing opportunities to reduce trips by car and the Trent and Mersey Canal conservation area. It would have a negative impact upon priority habitats, reducing the overall impact of traffic sensitive developments and improving transport and accessibility. Development would have no impact upon improving choice of transport mode.

Curborough New Settlement

6.24 Concentrating development in one location through the development of a new settlement (in the Curborough area) would not satisfy the District's affordable housing need which is spread throughout the District. However this option would have a clear and strong positive impact upon improving transport provision and improving choice of transport mode, as currently there is little provision at present, and a new settlement of the size proposed would be of sufficient size to sustain public transport in the future. It would have a positive impact upon providing increased opportunities for walking and cycling. Development would have a mixed impact upon reducing trips by car, providing access to developments for those without a car and reducing the impact of traffic sensitive areas, as clearly there is little transport provision on this area at present. The option would have a clear and strong negative impact upon priority habitats and a negative impact upon landscape quality, and a negative impact upon the Trent and Mersey Canal conservation area and Fradley Junction conservation area.

Comparison of Option 1 (Town Focused Development) with Options 2 and 3:

Option 2 Town and key rural village focused development (40% Lichfield, 20% Burntwood, 40% between other sustainable settlements – Alrewas, Armitage with Handsacre, Fazeley, Little Aston, Shenstone and Whittington)

6.25 This would involve a reduced scale of growth in Lichfield and Burntwood (and around Tamworth and Rugeley) and the redistribution of this towards the larger rural settlements to reinforce their role as local service centres. It would have clear and strong negative impacts upon priority habitats and upon providing increased opportunities for walking and cycling. It would also have a negative impact upon improving levels of housing consistent with local employment opportunities, upon conservation areas, reducing trips by car, providing access to new developments for those without access to a car and for providing affordable housing for local people. However it was identified in the group that whilst this option was the poorest

in terms of providing enough affordable housing, it would assist in addressing the small affordable housing need for the rural areas, possibly for specific types of affordable housing. It would also have no effect upon improving transport provision and accessibility nor on improving the choice of transport mode.

Option 3 Dispersed development (30% Lichfield, 15% Burntwood, 55% Rural Areas)

6.26 This would involve a reduced scale of growth in Lichfield and Burntwood (and Tamworth and Rugeley) and the redistribution of this towards all rural villages. This option was the worst option of the three having no positive impacts. It would have clear and strong negative impacts upon improving the availability of sustainable transport options to jobs and services; providing affordable housing, (as the greatest need is within Lichfield and Burntwood) and upon addressing sport and recreation needs and healthcare for the elderly. However it was identified in the group that whilst this option was the poorest in terms of providing enough affordable housing, it may assist in addressing the need for a small amount of affordable housing in the rural areas, for specific types of affordable housing. It would also have a negative impact upon reducing the risk of flooding, as some of the villages have flooding issues such as Elford, and improving levels of housing consistent with local employment needs as there are fewer employment opportunities in the smaller villages.

7 Overall Conclusions

Overall Conclusions:

7.1 The Matrix showed that no one option would address all the sustainability framework objectives for the District. Thus a range of options would need to be considered in order to address the range of issues affecting Lichfield District in the next 20 years and prepare it for beyond this time. Specific issues which will influence this decision include addressing local housing needs, avoiding loss of distinctive settlements, landscape character and views and impact on biodiversity, as well as sustainability issues for the District. Any cumulative impacts of development, especially with regard to transport infrastructure as a whole, are still to be established and will be addressed through further studies and assessments forming part of the evidence base, together with a Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Option.

Mitigation and maximising benefits

7.2 All of the sites identified and directions of growth, will have impacts upon issues such as climate change, design, biodiversity, transport, sport and recreation needs and potentially archaeology and settlement character and residential amenity. The Core strategy therefore needs to address these issues through its policies. The sustainability framework objectives include within them criteria such as reducing the need to travel and opportunities for linking cycle routes and pedestrian networks. Development should ensure connectivity to facilitate this objective, as well as take advantage of natural site conditions for reducing the impacts of climate change through solar gain, ground source heat pumps or other solutions that may be appropriate in individual cases.

7.3 Other concerns expressed were that the impact upon the historic core of Lichfield could be too great if too much development was concentrated around Lichfield. (However the appropriate scale in relation to impact is difficult to define without consideration of particular locations). The impact of additional development on every settlement could be detrimental to the historic environment if excessive in scale, as has been seen in many of the villages following large scale development in the 1960's. In addition expansions beyond a reasonable scale could have a negative impact upon cultural activity in the area and if settlements grow too large this could contribute to a decline in their community spirit.

Appendix i Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth

Appendix i Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth

Options (as per directions of growth maps in Preferred Options document)	Sustainability Framework Objectives											Conclusion		
	A	B	C	D (not Spatial)	E (mostly not spatial)	F	G	H (not Spatial)	I	J	K		L (not Spatial)	
11a North Lichfield	+/-						+/-		+	-		+/-		0
	<p>Development would have little impact on historic environment, as area subject to major developments over 19th Century and 20th Century.</p> <p>Existing bus stops over 350 m from potential growth locations/ No cycle ways at present to edges/Close to jobs and facilities.</p> <p>Strong and positive for affordable housing/mixed response for ease in extending bus/cycle routes/no effect on improving transport choice.</p> <p>Good access to sport and recreation facilities for supporting healthy lifestyles but is still a need.</p>													
11b East Lichfield Streethay	-		--		+/-		+		+	-		+		-1
	<p>Loss of locally distinctive settlement character. Much of the historic landscape has been impacted by agricultural improvements.</p> <p>Site of Archaeological importance within the site.</p> <p>Access to existing bus stop within 350m of site. Existing cycle routes and pedestrian routes accessible. Good connectivity for transport options to jobs and services.</p> <p>Strong and positive impact on affordable housing. Mixed impact upon improving transport provision. Positive for improving transport choice.</p> <p>Has good and adequate access to sport and recreation facilities.</p> <p>Potential mixed impact upon the pumping station as it is within the inner source protection zone area.</p>													

Options (as per directions of growth maps in Preferred Options document)	Sustainability Framework Objectives											Conclusion	
	A	B	C	D (not Spatial)	E (mostly not spatial)	F	G	H (not Spatial)	I	J	K		L (not Spatial)
12 West Lichfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	++		+	-	+/-		-4
	<p>Comments</p> <p>Clear and strong negative impact upon landscape quality and upon the nature of the historic landscape and its relationship with the dispersed settlement pattern. Negative impact upon conservation areas, locally distinctive settlement character and upon historic views and skylines.</p> <p>Clear and strong negative impact upon priority habitats.</p> <p>Clear and strong negative impact upon archaeology and heritage buildings and their settings. Clear and strong positive impact upon reducing trips by car and for access for those without a car due to proximity to jobs and services (Lichfield City Centre).</p> <p>Positive impact on providing opportunities to increase walking and cycling and reducing traffic in sensitive areas. (May have negative impact upon Pipe Hill road junction if combined with development to the east and south of Burntwood.)</p> <p>Clear and strong positive for provision of affordable housing. Positive for improving transport provision and accessibility. No effect upon increasing transport choice.</p> <p>Good access to sport and recreation facilities for supporting healthy lifestyles but is still a need.</p>												
13 South Lichfield	-		-				++		++	-	+/-		1
	<p>Comments</p> <p>Negative impact upon heritage buildings and their setting. Some potential for historic environment to have a negative impact from medium/large scale development, although historic landscape has lost much of its pre 20th Century character through agricultural practises.</p> <p>Clear and strong positive impact upon providing increased opportunities for walking / cycling. Positive impact upon providing opportunities to reduce trips by car, providing access to new developments for those without a car and reducing the overall impact of traffic in sensitive areas.</p> <p>Clear and strong positive impact upon provision of affordable housing and for improving transport provision and accessibility. Positive impact upon improving transport choice.</p>												

Appendix i Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth

Appendix i Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth

Options (as per directions of growth maps in Preferred Options document)	Sustainability Framework Objectives										Conclusion						
	A	B	C	D (not Spatial)	E (mostly not spatial)	F	G	H (not Spatial)	I	J		K	L (not Spatial)				
14a South-east Burntwood (Hammerwich)	-	-				-	--			-							-7
	<p>Comments</p> <p>Good access to sport and recreation facilities for supporting healthy lifestyles but is still a need.</p> <p>Clear and strong negative impact upon locally distinctive settlement character. Overall a negative impact upon landscape character, but some of this area has been subject to intensive disturbance from either development or quarrying.</p> <p>Negative impact upon priority habitats.</p> <p>Potentially negative impact upon reducing opportunities for flood risk reduction.</p> <p>Clear and strong negative impact upon reducing trips by car and for providing opportunities for increasing walking and cycling. Mixed impact for providing access to those without access to a car and for reducing impact of traffic in traffic sensitive areas. (May have negative impact upon Pipe Hill road junction if combined with development west of Lichfield.)</p> <p>Positive for provision of affordable housing, but clear and strong negative impact for improving transport provision and accessibility due to inability of large buses to travel through Hammerwich. Positive impact upon improving transport choice.</p> <p>Existing shortfall in provision of sport and recreation. Negative impact upon supporting healthy lifestyles due to lack of provision in Burntwood.</p>																
14b South Burntwood (adjoining settlement)	-	-				-	+/-			+							-4
	<p>Comments</p> <p>Clear and strong negative impact upon locally distinctive settlement character. Mixed impact upon landscape character, as area considerably impacted by development, quarrying and road and only a few known historic assets.</p> <p>Negative impact upon priority habitats.</p> <p>Potentially negative impact upon reducing opportunities for flood risk reduction.</p>																

Options (as per directions of growth maps in Preferred Options document)	Sustainability Framework Objectives													
	A	B	C	D (not Spatial)	E (mostly not spatial)	F	G	H (not Spatial)	I	J	K	L (not Spatial)	Conclusion	
														<p>Positive impact upon reducing trips by car and providing increased opportunities for walking/cycling. Mixed impact for providing access to those without access to a car and for reducing impact of traffic in traffic sensitive areas.</p> <p>(May have negative impact upon Pipe Hill road junction if combined with development to the south-east of Burntwood and west of Lichfield.)</p> <p>Positive for provision of affordable housing, Positive impact upon improving transport provision and accessibility and for improving transport choice.</p> <p>Existing shortfall in provision of sport and recreation. Negative impact upon supporting healthy lifestyles due to lack of provision in Burntwood.</p>
15 North Burntwood	-	-				-			+		-			-5
	<p>Comments</p> <p>Clear and strong negative impact upon historic landscape character, zone highly sensitive to medium/large scale development, due to surviving nature of historic field pattern and potential for survival of many historic buildings.</p> <p>Negative impact upon priority habitats.</p> <p>Potentially negative impact upon reducing opportunities for flood risk reduction.</p> <p>Negative impact upon reducing trips by car, for providing access to new development for those without a car and for reducing the overall impact on traffic sensitive areas. Positive impact upon providing increased opportunities for walking / cycling. (May have negative impact upon Pipe Hill road junction if combined with development to the south-east of Burntwood and west of Lichfield.)</p> <p>Positive for provision of affordable housing. Positive impact upon improving transport provision and accessibility and for improving transport choice.</p>													

Appendix i Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth

Appendix i Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth

Options (as per directions of growth maps in Preferred Options document)	Sustainability Framework Objectives												
	A	B	C	D (not Spatial)	E (mostly not spatial)	F	G	H (not Spatial)	I	J	K	L (not Spatial)	Conclusion
													Existing shortfall in provision of sport and recreation. Negative impact upon supporting healthy lifestyles due to lack of provision in Burntwood.
16 West Tamworth, around Fazeley	-		+				++		0	-			1
	<p>Comments</p> <p>Varying impacts upon historic landscape character, but generally negative impact. Negative impact upon Bonehill and Fazeley Conservation Area.</p> <p>Positive impact upon Heritage Buildings and their settings as investment would allow buildings currently at risk to be restored.</p> <p>Clear and strong positive impact upon reducing the need to travel by car and for providing access to new developments for those without a car. Due to the number of locations to access jobs and services from a frequent public transport service. Positive impact upon providing increased opportunities for walking/ cycling and for reducing the overall impact of traffic sensitive areas.</p> <p>The proposal would have a negative impact upon provision of affordable homes for local people in need of a home as the location is likely to serve mostly the needs arising from Tamworth rather than from Lichfield District.</p> <p>No impact upon choice of transport choice or on improving transport provision and accessibility.</p>												
17 North Tamworth	-	AA ?				--			-	-			-5
	<p>Comments</p> <p>Negative impact upon historic landscape character, especially regarding Wiggington. Area sensitive and moderately sensitive to large scale development due to impact upon historic earthworks, field systems and patterns, especially on Statfold area.</p> <p>Clear and strong impact upon Wiggington Conservation Area.</p> <p>May require Appropriate Assessment due to Mease SAC</p>												

Options (as per directions of growth maps in Preferred Options document)	Sustainability Framework Objectives										Conclusion			
	A	B	C	D (not Spatial)	E (mostly not spatial)	F	G	H (not Spatial)	I	J		K	L (not Spatial)	
18 East Rugeley	-	+/-					+		+/-	-				-1
	<p>Comments</p> <p>Proposal would have a clear and strong negative impact upon traffic sensitive areas due to the impact upon Fountains Junction in Tamworth, and would have a negative impact upon reducing trips by car due to the proximity of existing bus routes, providing increased opportunities for walking and cycling due to existing accessibility to walking / cycle routes and therefore will have a negative impact upon providing access to new developments for those without a car.</p> <p>The proposal would have a negative impact upon provision of affordable homes for local people in need of a home as the location is likely to serve mostly the needs arising from Tamworth rather than from Lichfield District.</p> <p>There would be a negative impact upon improving transport provision and accessibility and would have no effect upon improving transport choice</p> <p>This area is currently not being assessed by HECA work.</p> <p>There is a clear and strong negative impact upon locally distinctive settlement character and a negative impact due to the proximity of Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area.</p> <p>There is a mixed impact upon priority habitats.</p> <p>There is a positive impact upon reducing trips by car, providing access to new development for those without a car and reducing the overall impact of traffic sensitive areas. There is a mixed effect upon providing opportunities for walking and cycling as whilst there are routes which could be used the distances to the jobs and services is not short.</p> <p>The proposal would have a negative impact upon provision of affordable homes for local people in need of a home as the location is likely to serve mostly the needs arising from Rugeley rather than from Lichfield District.</p> <p>There would be a positive impact upon improving transport provision and accessibility but no effect upon transport choice.</p>													
19 Fradley	+/-	-					+/-		+	-				-1

Appendix i Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth

Appendix i Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth

Options (as per directions of growth maps in Preferred Options document)	Sustainability Framework Objectives												
	A	B	C	D (not Spatial)	E (mostly not spatial)	F	G	H (not Spatial)	I	J	K	L (not Spatial)	Conclusion
	<p>Comments</p> <p>There is a mixed impact upon landscape character and upon the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area. Historic environment could accommodate medium / large scale development (especially on and around airfield)</p> <p>There is a negative impact upon priority habitats.</p> <p>There is a mixed impact upon reducing trips by car, providing increased opportunities for walking and cycling and for providing access to new developments for those without a car due to longer journey times into centres of jobs and services. There would be a negative impact on reducing the impact on traffic sensitive areas.</p> <p>There would be a clear and strong impact upon providing affordable homes for local people in need of a home, Fradley. Fradley is considered an accessible location and new properties are considered attractive to those on the register/There is a negative impact upon improving transport provision and accessibility as there would be an increased journey times if routes were altered to accommodate growth. There would be no effect on improving transport choice.</p>												
20 Curborough new settlement	-	-					+/-		+	-			-2
	<p>Comments</p> <p>Clear and strong negative impact upon landscape quality, due to medium - large scale development will have impact upon nature of dispersed settlement and upon coherency of some of the landscapes</p>												

Options (as per directions of growth maps in Preferred Options document)	Sustainability Framework Objectives												
	A	B	C	D (not Spatial)	E (mostly not spatial)	F	G	H (not Spatial)	I	J	K	L (not Spatial)	Conclusion
	<p>Negative impact upon priority habitats.</p> <p>Positive impact upon providing increased opportunities for walking / cycling to jobs and services. A mixed response in relation to reducing trips by car, providing access to new developments for those without a car and for reducing the impact of traffic sensitive areas.</p> <p>Mixed response in relation to the provision of affordable housing as whilst it is similar to Fradley with regard to location the provision of social housing in high concentrations may not achieve a good social balance and social mix, these are essential to promote community cohesion and avoid social exclusion. Social housing is more likely to be occupied by some of the most vulnerable members of society and residents are more likely to be out of work or in low paid employment, less mobile and thus less able to travel to gain access to essential services. It is therefore essential that the correct social infrastructure is in place on any large development before homes are occupied. The proposal would have a clear and strong positive impact upon improving transport provision and accessibility and improving transport choice as it is of sufficient scale to sustain and require additional provision of buses.</p> <p>As a new settlement there is a mixed response to sport and recreation part of supporting healthy lifestyles as the development would be required to be built to modern standards of provision.</p>												
Option 2 Key Rural Settlements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-7
	<p>Comments</p> <p>HECA work on landscape character awaited.</p> <p>Negative impact on Conservation areas, all these settlements have conservation areas and dependent upon location and scale of development proposed. It may be preferable to direct development to the villages in order to reduce the impact upon the Lichfield City Conservation area, but this will depend upon the final numbers proposed.</p> <p>Clear and strong negative impact upon priority habitats.</p> <p>Negative impacts upon reducing flood risk as parts of Ailrewas are prone to flood.</p>												

Appendix i Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth

Appendix i Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth

Options (as per directions of growth maps in Preferred Options document)	Sustainability Framework Objectives											Conclusion					
	A	B	C	D (not Spatial)	E (mostly not spatial)	F	G	H (not Spatial)	I	J	K		L (not Spatial)				
Option 3 Dispersed Rural Settlements	-	-- (AA)	Wall			-	--		--	-	--						-11 (exc Wall)
	Comments																
HECA work not being undertaken for these areas.																	
Negative impact on Conservation areas, many of these settlements have conservation areas and impacts would be dependent upon location and scale of development proposed. It may be preferable to direct development to the villages in order to reduce the impact upon the Lichfield City Conservation area, but this will depend upon the final numbers proposed.																	
Clear and strong negative impact upon priority habitats.																	
The impact upon archaeology has not been assessed district wide but there is a nationally important site at Wall and development around Wall would have a clear and strong negative impact upon this.																	
Negative impacts upon reducing flood risk as parts of Elford and other villages are prone to flood.																	
Clear and strong negative impacts upon reducing trips by car, providing increased opportunities for walking / cycling, providing access to new development for those without a car and for reducing the impact of traffic sensitive areas due to the existing poor frequency of public transport serving these settlements and distance to jobs and services.																	
A clear and strong negative impact upon providing increased opportunities for increasing walking and cycling due to the choice and distances from jobs and services. A negative impact upon reducing trips by car and for providing access to new developments for those without a car.																	
Negative impact on the provision of affordable housing for local people in need of a home, unless there is a change in policy to achieve local need.																	
Negative impact upon improving levels of housing consistent with local employment opportunities, as many villages have limited employment opportunities. There would be no effect upon improving transport choice or transport provision and accessibility as the scale of development would not be sufficient to require change.																	

Options (as per directions of growth maps in Preferred Options document)	Sustainability Framework Objectives													
	A	B	C	D (not Spatial)	E (mostly not spatial)	F	G	H (not Spatial)	I	J	K	L (not Spatial)	Conclusion	
														<p>Clear and strong negative impact on the provision of affordable housing for local people in need of a home, unless there is a change in policy to achieve local need. Negative impact upon improving levels of housing consistent with local employment opportunities, as many villages have limited employment opportunities. Clear and strong negative impact upon addressing the sport and recreation and a negative impact upon encouraging cultural activity as there is less choice in these small settlements at present. There would be no effect upon improving transport choice or transport provision and accessibility as the scale of development would not be sufficient to require change.</p> <p>Development in these locations would have a clear and strong negative impact upon the standard of health care for the elderly due to the distances to GP Surgery.</p>

Table i.1

Key:

- ++ clear and strong positive effect in response to criterion
- + positive effect in response to criterion
- clear and strong negative effect in response to criterion
- negative effect in response to criterion
- +/- mixed effect in response to criterion
- 0 no effect in response to criterion
- ? effects impossible to determine from information in Strategy

Appendix i Sustainability Appraisal Matrix of Directions of Growth

SO A - scores may change as HECA landscape assessments awaited

AA? - Appropriate Assessment may be required

Order:

Least impact to most impact:

South Lichfield, West Tamworth

North Lichfield

East Rugeley, East Lichfield (Streethay), Fradley

Curborough New Settlement

West Lichfield, South Burntwood (adjoining Burntwood)

North Burntwood

North Tamworth

South Burntwood (including Hammerwich), Key Rural Settlements

Dispersed Rural Settlements

Glossary

Affordable Housing		Including social rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Affordable housing should meet the needs of eligible households and remain at an affordable price for future eligible households.
Allocation		The use assigned to a piece of land in a local Development Plan.
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)		A Site with statutory national Landscape designation to provide special protection of the areas natural beauty. These are designated by Natural England.
Biodiversity		The whole variety of life encompassing all genetics, species and ecosystem variations, including plants and animals.
Brownfield Land and Sites		See 'Previously-Developed Land'.
Combined Heat and Power (CHP)		The use of waste heat from power generation to provide heating for a building or a neighbourhood.
Conservation Area		Areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character, appearance or setting of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.
Core Strategy		A Development Plan Document setting out the spatial vision and objectives and strategy of the planning framework for an area, having regard to the Community Strategy (see also DPDs).
Cycle Network		An integrated network of both on and off road routes to facilitate an easier and safer journey for cyclists.
Density		In the case of residential development, a measurement of either the number of habitable rooms per hectare or the number of dwellings per hectare.
Development		Development is defined under the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act as "the carrying out of building, engineering, mining or other operation in, on, over or under land, or the making of any material change in the use of any building or other land."
Development Plan		A document setting out the local planning authority's policies and proposals for the development and use of land and buildings in the authority's area. It includes Unitary, Structure, and Local Plans prepared under transitional arrangements, and new Regional Spatial Strategies and Development Plan Documents prepared under the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act of 2004.
Development Plan Documents (DPD's)		DPDs are Local Development Documents that have development plan status. Once adopted, development control decisions must be made in accordance with them unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The DPDs which local planning authorities must prepare, include the core strategy, site-specific allocations of land and, where needed, area action plans. There will also be

		a proposals map, which illustrates the spatial extent of policies that must be prepared and maintained to accompany all DPDs. All DPDs must be subject to rigorous procedures of community involvement, consultation and independent examination, and adopted after receipt of the inspector's binding report.
Environmental Impact Assessment	(EIA)	Procedure and management technique that ensures that the likely effects of new development on the environment are fully appraised and taken into account before the development is allowed to go ahead.
Evidence Base		The information and data gathered by local authorities to justify the "soundness" of the policy approach set out in Local Development Documents, including physical, economic, and social characteristics of an area.
Flood plain		Generally flat-lying areas adjacent to a watercourse, tidal lengths of a river or the sea where water flows in times of flood or would flow but for the presence of flood defences.
Government Offices	(GO's)	Representatives of central Government in the regions, bringing together the work of ten government departments.
Green Belt (not to be confused with the term 'greenfield')		A designation for land around certain cities and large built-up areas, which aims to keep this land permanently open or largely undeveloped. Areas of Green Belt within Lichfield District form part of the West Midlands Green Belt. The purposes of Green Belt are to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; • prevent neighbouring towns from merging; • safeguard the countryside from encroachment; • preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and • assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
Greenfield Land or Site		Land (or a defined site) which has never been built on before or where the remains of any structure or activity have blended into the landscape over time.
Habitat		The natural home of an animal or plant. Can be often designated as an area of nature conservation interest.
Historic Environment Character Assessment	(HECA)	There are 13 areas, and each gives an assessment of the landscape based on historic and archaeological value.
Independent Examination		The process by which an Independent Planning Inspector may publicly examine a 'Development Plan Document' or a 'Statement of Community Involvement', and any representations, before issuing a binding report.
Issues, Options & Preferred Options		The "pre-submission" consultation stages on DPDs with the objective of gaining public consensus over proposals ahead of submission to Government for independent examination.

Lichfield Sustainability Working Group	(LSWG)	A group which meets to undertake the Sustainability Appraisals and Strategic Environmental Assessments for Lichfield District Council.
Listed Building		A building of special architectural or historic interest. Graded I (highest quality), II* or II.
Local Development Documents	(LDD's)	These include Development Plan Documents, which will form part of the statutory development plan, and Supplementary Planning Documents, which do not form part of the statutory development plan. LDDs collectively deliver the spatial planning strategy for the local planning authority's area, and they may be prepared jointly between local planning authorities.
Local Development Framework	(LDF)	The local development framework is a non-statutory term used to describe a folder of documents, which includes all the local planning authority's local development documents (comprised of development plan documents, which will form part of the statutory development plan, and supplementary planning documents). The local development framework will also comprise the statement of community involvement, the local development scheme and the annual monitoring report.
Local Plan		An old-style development plan prepared by District and other Local Planning Authorities. These plans will continue to operate for a time after the commencement of the new development plan system, by virtue of specific transitional provisions.
Local Planning Authority		The local authority or council that is empowered by law to exercise planning functions. Often the local borough or district council.
Local Transport Plan	(LTP)	A five-year integrated transport strategy, prepared by local authorities in partnership with the community, seeking funding to help provide local transport projects. The plan sets out the resources predicted for delivery of the targets identified in the strategy. Local transport plans should be consistent with the policies and priorities set out in the Regional Transport Strategy as an integral part of the RSS.
Nature Conservation		The protection, management and promotion of wildlife habitat for the benefit of wild species, as well as the communities that use and enjoy them.
Open Space		All space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs, which can offer opportunities for sport and recreation. They can also act as a visual amenity and a haven for wildlife.
Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004		The Act updates elements of the 1990 Town & Country Planning Act. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a statutory system for regional planning;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a new system for local planning; reforms to the development control and compulsory purchase and compensation systems; and removes crown immunity from planning controls.
Planning Policy Guidance	(PPG)	Issued by central Government setting out its national land use policies for England on different areas of planning. These are being replaced by Planning Policy Statements.
Planning Policy Statement	(PPS)	Issued by central Government to replace the existing Planning Policy Guidance notes, in order to provide greater clarity and to remove from national policy advice on practical implementation, (most PPS's are accompanied by Practice Guidance Notes)
Previously Developed Land or 'Brownfield' land	(PDL)	Previously developed land is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure (excluding agricultural or forestry buildings), and associated fixed surface infrastructure. The definition covers the curtilage of the development. Planning Policy Statement 3 "Housing" has a detailed definition.
Protected Species		Plants and animal species afforded protection under certain Acts of Law and Regulations.
Regional Planning Body / Regional Assembly	(RPB)	Each of the English regions outside of London has a Regional Chamber that the regions generally call "Regional Assemblies" (not to be confused with the term "Elected Regional Assemblies"). They are responsible for developing and co-ordinating a strategic vision for improving the quality of life in a region. The Assembly is responsible for setting priorities and preparing certain regional strategies, including Regional Spatial Strategies. For example, in the West Midlands the RPB is the West Midlands Regional Assembly.
Regional Spatial Strategy	(RSS)	A strategy for how a region should look in 15 to 20 years time and possibly longer. It identifies the scale and distribution of new housing in the region, indicates areas for regeneration, expansion or sub-regional planning and specifies priorities for the environment, transport, infrastructure, economic development, agriculture, minerals and waste treatment and disposal. The West Midlands Regional Planning Guidance (RPG 11), approved June 2004, is now considered RSS and forms part of the development plan. The RPB has commenced a partial review of the RSS.
Renewable Energy		Energy produced from a sustainable source that avoids the depletion of the earth's finite natural resources, such as oil or gas. Sources in use or in development include energy from the sun, wind, hydro-power, ocean energy and biomass.
Regionally Important Geological Site	(RIGS)	A site which has been identified as regionally important for geology.
Rural Housing Needs Survey 2008	(RHNS)	A survey undertaken to assess the rural housing needs in Lichfield District.

Saved Policies / Saved Plan		Policies within Unitary Development Plans, Local Plans, and Structure Plans that are saved for a time period during replacement production of Local Development Documents.
Site of Special Scientific Interest	(SSSI)	A site identified under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as incorporated in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000) as an area of special interest by reason of any of its flora, fauna, geological or physiographical features (basically, plants, animals, and natural features relating to the Earth's structure).
Spatial Planning		Spatial planning goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function. That will include policies which can impact on land use, for example by influencing the demands on, or needs for, development, but which are not capable of being delivered solely or mainly through the granting or refusal of planning permission and which may be implemented by other means.
Special Areas of Conservation	(SAC)	Protection for rare and threatened habitats, plants and animals, on land and sea.
Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan	(SBAP)	A plan which identifies plants and animal species which are significant in Staffordshire.
Statement of Community Involvement	(SCI)	The SCI sets out standards to be achieved by the local authority in involving the community in the preparation, alteration and continuing review of all local development documents and development control decisions.
Statement of Consultation / Statement of Compliance		A report or statement issued by local planning authorities explaining how they have complied with their SCI during consultation on Local Development Documents.
Strategic Environmental Assessment	(SEA)	An environmental assessment of certain plans and programmes, including those in the field of planning and land use, which complies with the EU Directive 2001/42/EC. The environmental assessment involves the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preparation of an environmental report; • carrying out of consultations; • taking into account of the environmental report and the results of the consultations in decision making; • provision of information when the plan or programme is adopted; and • showing that the results of the environmental assessment have been taken into account.
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	(SFRA)	An assessment of the likelihood of flooding in a particular area so that development needs and mitigation measures can be carefully considered.

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)	A report which assesses the household demand for a sub regional area, the area is based upon where people live and work rather than administrative boundaries. The SHMA area is Lichfield District, Birmingham City, Solihull Borough and Tamworth Borough.
Structure Plan	An old-style development plan, which sets out strategic planning policies and forms the basis for detailed policies in local plans and Development Plan Documents. These plans will continue to operate for a time after the commencement of the new development plan system, due to transitional provisions under planning reform.
Submission Document	A Development Plan Document submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination before a Government appointed Planning Inspector.
Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	An SPD is a Local Development Document that may cover a range of issues, thematic or site specific, and provides further detail of policies and proposals in a 'parent' DPD.
Sustainability Appraisal (including Environmental Appraisal)	The process of weighing and assessing all the policies in a development plan, Local Development Document, or Regional Spatial Strategy, for their global, national and local implications. (See also Strategic Environmental Assessment).
Sustainable Communities	Central Government has referred to sustainable communities as 'places where people want to live and work, now and in the future'. Creating communities that are more sustainable will generally mean seeking to provide a range of homes, jobs and facilities that enables people to meet more of their needs locally without the need to make long journeys by private transport.
Sustainable Community Strategy	A strategy prepared by a community to help deliver local aspirations, under the Local Government Act 2000.
Sustainable Development	A widely used definition drawn up by the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". The Government has set out four aims for sustainable development in its strategy "A Better Quality of Life, a Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK". The four aims, to be achieved at the same time, are: social progress which recognises the needs of everyone; effective protection of the environment; the prudent use of natural resources; and maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.
Sustainable travel / Sustainable Transport	Often meaning walking, cycling and public transport (and in some circumstances "car sharing"), which is considered to be less damaging to the environment and which contributes less to traffic congestion than one-person car journeys.

Travel Plan (sometimes called a 'green travel' or 'commuter' plan)	A travel plan aims to promote sustainable travel choices (for example cycling) as an alternative to single occupancy car journeys that may impact negatively on the environment, congestion and road safety. Travel Plans can be required when granting planning permission for new developments.
Windfall Site	A site not specifically allocated for development in a development plan, but which unexpectedly becomes available for development during the lifetime of a plan. Most "windfalls" are referred to in a housing context.