

Tamworth draft Local Plan consultation Summary of Comments received

Chapter 1

No detailed comments received

Chapter 2

Question	Yes	No	Comments
1a: Do you agree with the Strategic Spatial Policies?	75	13	
1b: Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	19	67	
1c: Please explain further			33

Summary of comments made

- Make reference to the two natural character areas (Mease/Sense Lowlands and Trent Valley National Character Area) within Vision and Spatial Priorities (LP122)
- Chapter text and SOs need alterations, in particular to reference water management/floodplains (LP124)
- Would like to see references to Tame Valley Wetlands Partnership and Tame Valley Wetlands Landscape Partnership Scheme and for it to be on the maps/diagrams as is the Central Rivers Initiative (The initiatives help towards meeting SO's and provide strategic links across boundaries) (LP046)
- No indication of where housing and employment outside of borough boundary in Lichfield and North Warwickshire will go (LP004)
- Responsibility to inform residents of a change of use of land, e.g. building on Greenfield sites (LP010)
- HS2 will restrict access to the countryside and no mitigation proposed in policies (LP026 and LP118)
- Impact of new development on highway network (LP026 and LP077)
- Closure of the golf course contradicts SP1, CP3, SP8, CP9 and CP12 (LP033) and SO7 (LP035 and LP102)
- SO1 – co-operation with neighbouring authorities to meet housing need has not been achieved so housing needs cannot be met (LP043)
- SO1 – Lichfield Local Plan broad area allocation (Anker Valley) cannot be achieved (LP103)
- SO1 – Should not provide housing outside of borough and should release land from green belt to meet housing needs (LP056 and LP058)
- Green belt sites sequentially preferable to others being allocated (LP056 and LP058)
- Spatial portrait lacking in information (LP062)
- SO2 – town centre needs more accessibility (LP026)
- SO2 – does not provide wide enough scope – should reference diverse range of uses and add the words “commercial” and “employment” after word “retail” in SO2 (LP052)
- SO2 is unrealistic and town centre should be focus for regeneration based on land uses other than retailing (LP055 and LP057)
- SO3 – should refer to all types of economic development that promote local job opportunities (LP069)
- SO4 – should make reference to importance in meeting shopping
- SO5 – affordable housing needs cannot be met (LP060)
- SO6 should be changed to “to provide a minimal number of new homes, avoiding any loss of green space” (LP038)

- SO7 – people are forced down particular paths due to cul de sacs already created and impact on roads (LP026)
- The Strategic Spatial Priorities do not place enough emphasis on open space and on sports and leisure facilities (LP033) Protection and creation of open green space should be stronger (LP110 and LP112))
- SO9 – does not safeguard heritage assets (LP051)
- Lacking in provision for improved equestrian access – rights of way, parks etc (LP064)
- requirements locally (i.e. beyond the town centre) (LP069)
- SO11 – no reference to energy efficiency (LP108)
- SO12 – Transport links dependant on ability of individuals and quality of roads (LP026)

Chapter 3

Question 2a	# Yes	# No	# Comments
Do you agree with the Policy SP1?	14	69	
Question 2b			
Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	76	6	
Question 2c			
Please explain further			87

- Unclear why plan period starts in 2006 and in being extended to 2031, there is no evidence to support any figures for the final three years (LP060)
- Not based on robust approach to inform proper distribution of housing in the borough; SHMA does not represent true objectively assessed need, realistic figure will be much higher (LP060)
- Evidence exists to show that the dwelling requirement should be higher than 6250, more dwellings can be accommodated in the urban area and required outside the borough (LP036, LP054)
- Housing and employment figures are not clearly evidenced (LP048)
- Housing numbers are excessive, employment allocations outside the borough should be resisted until needed (LP093)
- Tamworth should meet housing needs within its boundaries, there is no justification for 2000 homes outside the boundaries (LP056, LP058)
- Tamworth can meet its employment needs on existing allocations (LP056, LP058)
- Two of the SUEs at Anker Valley, Dunstall Lane and Golf Course are unsuitable for residential development because they are in the flood plain or open space (LP056, LP058)
- Green belt boundary should be amended and sites released (LP056, LP058)
- Council is not meeting full market and affordable housing and employment needs (LP060)
- Actual amount of housing to be found in adjoining authorities has not been determined (LP060)
- No indication of where and when the housing and employment outside the borough will be provided, policy is not sound without this (LP004, LP113)
- The Council is unable to meet its objectively assessed need within the borough boundary and will have to rely on neighbouring authorities to provide approximately 2000 dwellings (LP025, LP054, LP104)
- Accommodating Tamworth's need should not fall to just immediate neighbouring authorities, look to the wider GBSLEP area (LP048)

- Tamworth should only cater for its own needs rather than aspiring to substantial growth (LP048)
- Neighbouring authorities should not be able to delay their contribution until the later stages of the Plan (LP104)
- Dwellings in neighbouring authorities need to be in sustainable and suitable SUE locations close to the Tamworth urban area (LP104)
- Tamworth does not have the land to build this quantum of housing without losing large green areas or enough work to support residents (LP050)
- Land at Mile Oak and Fazeley should be considered to meet Tamworth's need (LP103)
- Land in Lichfield and north of Ashby Road are critical to deliver spatial priorities (LP105)
- Land south off Tamworth Road, Polesworth can contribute towards Tamworth's needs (LP070)
- Spatial strategy does not allow for enough green space (LP033)
- No need for additional allocations when industrial and retail units are vacant (LP033)
- Provision to protect high quality open space and sports/leisure facilities is contradicted by SP6: Strategic urban extensions with particular reference to the Golf Course (LP014, LP015, LP016, LP017, LP018, LP019, LP020, LP021, LP022, LP023, LP024, LP027, LP031, LP032, LP034, LP040, LP045, LP047, LP059, LP071, LP072, LP073, LP074, LP075, LP076, LP079, LP080, LP081, LP082, LP083, LP084, LP085, LP086, LP087, LP088, LP089, LP090, LP091, LP092, LP094, LP095, LP096, LP097, LP098, LP099, LP100, LP101, LP111, LP116, LP117, LP119)
- Policy is contrary to saved Local Plan Policy ENV3 to protect open space (LP035, LP045, LP074, LP076, LP079, LP081, LP088, LP089, LP090, LP091, LP092, LP095, LP096, LP098, LP099, LP100, LP101, LP102, LP111, LP116,
- Protect and enhance environmental assets, not just minimise or mitigate (LP045, LP074, LP076, LP079, LP081, LP088, LP089, LP090, LP091, LP092, LP095, LP096, LP098, LP099, LP100, LP101, LP111, LP116,
- Tamworth should extend its boundaries to accommodate development rather than build on green space (LP014, LP015, LP016, LP017, LP018, LP019, LP020, LP021, LP022, LP023, LP024, LP027, LP031, LP032, LP033, LP034, LP045, LP047, LP059, LP071, LP072, LP073, LP074, LP075, LP076, LP079, LP080, LP081, LP082, LP083, LP084, LP085, LP086, LP087, LP088, LP089, LP090, LP091, LP092, LP094, LP095, LP096, LP097, LP098, LP099, LP100, LP101, LP111, LP116, LP117,
- Council should retain all existing sport and recreation facilities including the golf course (LP038, LP078, LP0119)
- Policy states retention and enhancement of high quality open space and sports facilities, what about low quality facilities? All facilities should be retained and enhanced due to existing shortfall (LP029)
- It is inflexible to state the longer term requirement for retail floor space, policy should concentrate on protecting and supporting existing retail commitments i.e. Gungate redevelopment (LP037)
- Lack of reference to HS2 in key diagram (LP026, LP114)
- No policy to mitigate effects of HS2 on Tamworth borders (LP118)
- Need to address full educational facilities (LP118)
- More reference needed to affordable housing provision in the town centre (LP078)
- Retail also provides employment benefits and this should be recognised (LP069)
- Quasi commercial uses contribute towards vitality and viability of town centres (LP052)
- Unrealistic to think that the town centre will be the primary focus for retail development, no appetite for proposed increase in town centre floorspace, maintain existing town centre floorspace and allow new floorspace at Ventura/other retail parks (LP055, LP057)
- No reference to Gypsy and Traveller needs (LP012)
- Only water compatible development is allowed in the functional floodplain (LP124)
- Transport analysis has not been updated to reflect changes in the plan regarding plan period, dwelling and employment land quantum including that to be found outside the borough (LP067)

- No reference to improving provision for equestrians where horse riding is allowed, applicants should be encouraged to improve cycle and horse riding networks (LP064)
- Shuttle bus service is no longer required, service 6 serves Ventura Park, town centre and railway station (LP061)
- Local environment cannot cope with additional traffic (LP077)
- Use term “heritage assets” (LP051)

Chapter 4

	# Yes	# No	# Comments
3a: Do you agree with Policy SP2 (Supporting Investment in Tamworth Town Centre)?	18	7	
3b: Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	13	12	
3c: Do you think the comparison and convenience retail need for Tamworth is appropriate?	14	5	
3d: Do you think town centre allocations should be made?	11	5	
3e: Please explain further			19
4a: Do you agree with the list of Local Centres?	12	5	
4b: Please explain further			8
5a: Do you agree with the list of neighbourhood centres?	13	3	
5b: Please explain further			6
6a: Do you agree with Policy SP3 (Supporting Investment in Local and Neighbourhood Centres)?	14	23	
6b: Please explain further			29
7a: Do you agree with Policy CP1 (Hierarchy of Centres for Town Centre Uses)?	12	6	
7b: Do you agree	15	4	

with the town centre use hierarchy?			
7c: Do you agree with the floorspace threshold for applications outside of the hierarchy?	9	7	
7d: Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	9	6	
7e: Please explain further			15
8a: Do you agree with the overall employment need for Tamworth?	14	4	
8b: Please explain further			7
9a: Do you agree with Policy SP4 (Sustainable Economic Growth)?	13	7	
9b: Do you agree with the quantum of employment land to be allocated in Tamworth?	12	6	
9c: Do you agree with the proposed sites for employment allocations?	15	5	
9d: Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	7	10	
9e: Please explain further			14
10a: Do you agree with Policy CP2 (Employment Areas)?	12	6	
10b: Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	7	10	
10c: Please explain further			7
11a: Do you agree with Policy	16	5	

CP3 (Culture and Tourism)?			
11b: Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	8	9	
11c: Please explain further			14

- Town centre no longer suitable for retail (LP033, LP035 and LP102)
- Retail need/capacity calculations not accurate – either too high or too low (LP035, LP037, LP055 and LP102)
- Retail figures will become out of date (LP037 and LP107)
- SP2 - Highways issues surrounding retail parks (LP050 and LP112)
- Role of out of centre retail parks for bulky goods and convenience shopping not acknowledged (LP112)
- SP2 - No reference to Town Centre Appraisal and little reference to historic environment (LP051 and LP062)
- SP2 - No retail allocation to meet identified need after 2021 (LP055 and LP057)
- Town centre not suitable for convenience retail development (LP069)
- SP2 - Need to improve links between town centre and out of centre shopping (LP078 and LP093 and LP109)
- Policy SP2 does not encourage residential in upper floors within town centre (LP093)
- Parking fees in town centre hinder its success against retail parks (LP107)
- SP2 - Primary frontages restrictive and undermined by current permitted development rights (LP055 and LP057)
- SP2 - Evidence and requirements of primary frontage policy not clear (LP107)
- SP2 - No greenspace and woodland access standards (LP110)
- Uncertainty over deliverability of Gungate site (LP113, LP055 and LP057)
- SP2 - No policy consideration of disability/mobility issues (LP118)
- SP2 - Aging population – policy does not prioritise elderly (LP119)
- SP2 - Enhancing public realm does not include seeking opportunities for GI provision (LP122)
- Local centres do not provide social, community and cultural activities (LP004)
- SP3 - Impact of SUEs/large residential development proposed on local and neighbourhood centres has not been considered in the policies (LP026)
- Some neighbourhood centres inappropriate as will not sustain additional development (LP078 and LP112)
- Kerria centre and wilnecote neighbourhood centre require review and should be local centres (LP093)
- Kerria Centre is underused and underdeveloped and needs regeneration and refurbishment (LP112)
- Tamworth Road, Amington not suitable as designated centre as shops are well separated, narrow road and limited parking facilities (LP112)
- Dosthill should be included in list of centres (LP118)
- SP3 too broad – each centre has its individual problems and opportunities (LP004)
- Role and function of each centre is not clear (LP004)
- SP3 does not encourage/support initiatives that provide additional support, information and services (LP045, LP047, LP074, LP075, LP076, LP079, LP081, LP088, LP089, LP090, LP091, LP092, LP095, LP096, LP098, LP099, LP100, LP101 and LP114)
- Fazeley not included in list of centres or as a regeneration area (LP103)
- SP3 needs to put more emphasis on importance of GI (LP110)
- CP1 - Impact Assessment does not ask to have regards to impact on centres outside of Tamworth (e.g. Lichfield City Centre) (LP044)

- CP1 - Hierarchy does not acknowledge the role of the retail parks in meeting shopping needs (LP055 and LP057)
- CP1 - The threshold for impact assessments for retail outside of centres has not been properly justified (LP055 and LP057)
- CP1 does not set the threshold for retail development falling outside of the specified criteria (LP069)
- Local Centre assessments should be required for applications over 100sqm, as with the Neighbourhood Centres (LP078 and LP119)
- Last para of CP1 undermines the policies aims (LP093)
- CP1 – any size of retail development outside of centres could have an impact (LP109)
- Good access for pedestrians and vehicle users into the centres is important (LP117)
- CP1 – Unclear whether sequential test referring to retail or to flood risk. Policy needs to refer to flood risk (LP124)
- Concern re impact of HS2 on economic development (LP025)
- Employment land need not properly explained (LP044)
- Para 4.45 refers to scenario 4a which does not exist in ELR (LP044)
- Employment land at Dunstall Lane is in flood zone 2 and unsustainable location for housing - better suited to employment than housing allocation (LP056 and LP058)
- employment should be kept within the Borough as far as possible (LP056 and LP058 and LP093)
- Existing Employment units in poor condition and many vacant (LP093)
- Not shown where new employment land outside of the borough will be (LP004)
- EMP26 and EMP34 adjacent to sports facilities and have potential to have a negative impact (LP029)
- Employment figure too high (LP033)
- Further employment sites may be available for allocation within the borough (LP044)
- Lack of detail in how historic environment has been considered in employment allocations (LP051)
- EMP1 should be allowed for B1a uses (previous planning history) (LP055)
- Uncertainty over deliverability of employment allocations in Tamworth (LP065)
- Land in NW (not allocated) could contribute to Tamworth’s employment land needs (LP065)
- Need to clarify balance between housing and employment allocations – particularly where extant employment permission now being allocated for housing (LP113)
- Impact of employment sites on Broad Meadow Local Wildlife Site and the River Tame (LP122)
- EMP2 - would result in the loss of grade 2 agricultural land (LP122)
- CP2 – Overly restrictive as refers to traditional use classes (B1, B2 and B8) and does not allow for other employment opportunities (LP055 and LP057)
- B8 uses best located close to good transport links (LP093)
- Link to RSPB reserve (Middleton Lakes) should be provided (LP004)
- CP3 – use of word viable does not allow for community facilities that would rely on public subsidy (LP007)
- Golf Course is a key tourist attraction (LP033)
- Lichfield City is a tourist attraction (LP044)
- TWWLPS should be identified as a tourist attraction (LP046)
- Policy CP3 is aspirational but not realistic (LP055 and LP057)
- CP3 needs additional historic environment references/wording (LP062)
- CP3 (h) should also refer to weekends (LP093)
- CP3(e) should refer specifically to town centres (LP118)
- CP3(h) should include provision of public transport facilities for non car owning families (LP118)
- No reference to maintaining character of floodplains and river valleys in CP3

Chapter 5

Question	Yes	No	Comments
----------	-----	----	----------

12a Do you agree with the objectively assessed housing need for Tamworth?	6	17	
12b Do you agree that Tamworth cannot meet this housing need in full?	16	5	
12c Do you agree that this housing need should be met outside of the borough, in which locations or authorities do you think it should be met in?	17	6	
12d If yes please say in which locations or authorities you think it should be met			12
12e Do you agree with the annual housing requirement for Tamworth?	5	17	
12f Please explain further			23
13a Do you agree with policy SP5 Housing?	10	62	
13b Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	64	6	
13c Do you agree with the proposed housing allocations?	6	63	
13d Please explain further			74
14a Do you agree with policy SP6 Strategic Urban Extensions?	6	73	
14b Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	79	2	
14c Do you agree with the proposed strategic housing allocations?	5	72	

14d Please explain further			88
15a Do you agree with policy SP7 Regeneration Priority Areas?	13	2	
15b Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	5	9	
15c Do you agree with the proposed areas?	12	2	
15d Please explain further			11
16a Do you agree with policy CP4 Affordable Housing?	8	11	
16b Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	13	6	
16c Do you agree with the proposed level of affordable housing?	6	13	
16d Please explain further			16
17a Do you agree with policy CP5 Housing Types?	10	58	
17b Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	61	6	
17c Do you agree with the proposed housing mix?	7	60	
17d Please explain further			62
18a Do you agree with policy CP6 Housing Density?	7	11	
18b Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	14	3	
18c Do you agree with the proposed densities?	5	11	
18d Please explain further			14
19a Do you agree with policy CP7	12	2	

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?			
19b Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	2	11	
19c Do you agree with the proposed level of need?	9	4	
19d Please explain further:			3

- Housing outside borough should be in Lichfield – Arkall Farm, Mile Oak, Browns Lane, North Warwickshire, both adjoining authorities, on borders with Lichfield or North Warks, not necessarily adjoining, South Staffordshire, Leicestershire or Derbyshire. It should be assessed with neighbours, where there is appropriate highway infrastructure or where infrastructure is improved or should be assessed after changes to housing numbers (LP004, 035, 054, 078, 093, 094, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 109, 117, 113, 119)
- Development land should be identified for housing outside borough in other local plans or amounts in each location/borough (and be consulted upon) (LP004, 103, 054, 105)
- Memorandum of understanding should be updated with earlier delivery (LP104)
- Not clear Lichfield or North Warks will plan for further housing (LP043)
- Calculation of housing need and supply not clear (LP004, 044, 056, 058)
- Housing need should be higher or does not express full need (LP036, 054, 060)
- Housing need should be expressed as a minimum, and amount provided in other boroughs increased for flexibility (LP054)
- Not demonstrated need cannot be met in borough (LP036, 056, 058, 060)
- BWB report not detailed enough to rule out further Anker Valley growth and policy should support Lichfield broad development area (LP036, 044, 105)
- Plan period should be different (LP056, 058, 060)
- Plan should take account of Birmingham's unmet needs (LP056, 058, 123)
- Housing need should be lower (LP025, 030, 044, 077, 078, 093, 102, 109, 112, 119)
- Less housing should be delivered in borough (LP033)
- Less housing should be delivered outside the borough (LP044)
- Housing need should only serve target groups (e.g. OAPs) (LP040, 109, 119)
- Urban extensions too large (LP030)
- Early housing delivery will lead to in-migration (LP035, 102)
- Assessment of housing supply not clear, SHLAA update required (LP044)
- Green belt review out of date, sites should be considered (LP044, 056, 058)
- Housing growth may require new post delivery office to be allocated/funded (LP006)
- Alternative sites should be included (LP011, 056, 058)
- Housing delivery should be restricted in Amington/Bolehall and location the of affordable housing specified (LP010, 014, 015, 016, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 017, 025, 027, 031, 032, 034, 035, 040, 045, 047, 072, 073, 074, 075, 076, 079, 081, 082, 083, 084, 085, 088, 089, 090, 091, 092, 095, 096, 097, 098, 099, 100, 101, 102, 111, 114)
- Mechanism required to protect adjacent sports facilities and replace direct losses where necessary (LP029)
- Concerns about impact on road infrastructure (LP028, 030, 035, 040, 050, 061, 078, 102, 109, 117, 118)
- Concerns about loss of green space (LP050)
- Town centre should meet housing need (LP035, 050, 102)

- Questions over various sites' deliverability, including Golf Course and Anker Valley SUEs (LP010, 040, 056, 093, 113, 118)
- Policies should set out how impacts arising from allocations will be mitigated and not be vague (LP051, 117, 122)
- New housing should contribute to environmental enhancement including access to woodland (LP110)
- Further heritage impact assessment required, especially on scheduled monuments (LP051)
- Objections to Golf Course SUE – open space, leisure, ecology, canal, traffic, not meeting local need, distance from town centre, health issues and infrastructure, impact on local residents, insufficient local amenities (LP010, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 027, 031, 032, 033, 034, 033, 035, 038, 040, 045, 047, 050, 056, 058, 059, 071, 072, 073, 074, 075, 076, 078, 079, 080, 081, 082, 083, 084, 085, 086, 087, 088, 089, 090, 091, 092, 093, 094, 095, 096, 097, 098, 099, 100, 101, 102, 111, 112, 118, 119)
- Golf course SUE issues - design should protect privacy of existing residents in area, local character, Hodge Lane and Alvecote Pools, Canal Corridor (contribution to connection), environmental statement/sustainability appraisal before allocation, hydrological and ecological investigation, sustainable drainage, open space not to be sold, protection of environmental infrastructure, canal, no time for residents to produce neighbourhood plan, power lines (LP010, 013, 025, 035, 040, 046, 102, 114, 116, 122, 124)
- Updated sports strategy should address loss of golf course (LP029)
- Anker Valley SUE issues – Gungate capacity and relation to Lichfield sites, traffic, sequential approach to flooding on site, sustainable drainage, easement to river, protection of soil resources, hedgerows, green links and buffers to wildlife designations, environmental infrastructure, heritage, masterplan needed (LP051, 058, 093, 113, 122, 124)
- Objections to Dunstall Lane SUE – traffic, flood risk, accessed via employment area, landscape, biodiversity, heritage and amenity value of canal (LP005, 046, 049, 056, 058)
- Dunstall Lane SUE issues – green links, native planting, flood risk, hydrological and ecological investigation, sustainable drainage, traffic, easement to river, protection of wildlife designations, hedgerows, canal corridor (contribution to connection), heritage, environmental infrastructure (could link with TVWLPS Programme C) (LP051, 58, 093, 122, 124)
- Coton Lane SUE issues – protection of hedgerows, green links, power lines (LP003, 122)
- Dunstall lane and Anker Valley infrastructure requirements should be refined with developers to ensure viable (LP039, 106)
- Concern about loss of agricultural land (LP109, 122)
- SUEs should provide sports facilities and school expansions should retain or improve sports facilities (LP029)
- Secondary school catchment areas should be redrawn (LP120)
- SUE / Allocations policy text should contain mitigation measures and generic text – sustainable drainage, flood defence maintenance, easements to flood defences, contribute to Water Framework Directive objectives, link to heritage policy (LP051, 062, 122, 124)
- Energy efficiency measures should be supported in new as well as existing housing (LP108)
- Neighbourhood centres should be improved in regeneration areas (LP112)
- Kerria centre development boundary should expand (not in plan) and early delivery of housing for existing residents; should be identified in plan (LP112, 121)
- Garden grabbing policy needed (LP042)
- Regeneration requires community consultation and decision making (LP117)
- Traffic and public transport issues with Wilnecote regeneration corridor (LP093)
- Regeneration policy should make regard to heritage (LP051)
- Affordable housing issues – needs to be carefully monitored, should be on-site over 5 units, depends on density, future regeneration issues, proportion rented at odds with

some vicinities how will it be delivered outside borough?, need should be re-appraised, won't be delivered by plan, targets should be a minimum with higher aspirations, detail for commuted sums, review, changes in legislation, won't always be viable (LP30, 043, 044, 050, 060, 078, 093, 103, 112, 113, 117)

- Objection to affordable housing on small sites (056, 058)
- Types of housing important (LP030)
- Housing mix issues – recent downward trend in need with austerity, bungalows for older people rather than flats, need to cater for needs of older people, how to be delivered out of borough, exception to be made for self-build(LP030, 043, 113, 121)
- Objections to housing mix – not flexible, not supported by SHMA, should be specific to different areas, survey of needs unreasonable policy requirement; not wanted on golf course SUE, sizes too low, should not be applied to small sites, doesn't respect market trends (LP010, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 025, 027, 031, 032, 034, 036, 039, 040, 045, 047, 056, 058, 072, 073, 074, 075, 076, 078, 079, 081, 082, 083, 084, 085, 088, 089, 090, 091, 092, 093, 095, 097, 096, 098, 099, 100, 101, 111, 114, 116, 117, 119)
- Density issues – should be more flexible, similar to surrounding area, respect heritage assets , could be higher in areas, proximity to centres not explained (LP044, 051, 055, 057, 078, 093, 114, 117, 119)
- Objections to density – overcrowding, pollution, antisocial behaviour and crime, insufficient infrastructure (LP030, 033, 050 112)
- Need for gypsies and travellers underestimated (LP012)

Chapter 6

Question 20a	Yes	No	Comments
Do you agree with Policy SP8 Environmental Assets?	9	55	
Question 20b			
Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	58	5	
Question 20c			
Please explain further			66
Question 21a			
Do you agree with Policy CP8 Sport and Recreation?	11	54	
Question 21b			
Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	62	5	
Question 21c			
Please explain further			59
Question 22a			
Do you agree with Policy CP9 Open Space?	10	52	
Question 22b			
Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	57	6	
Question 22c			
Please explain further			55
Question 23a			
Do you agree with Policy CP10 Design	12	2	

of New Development?			
Question 23b			
Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	11	4	
Question 23c			
Please explain further			3
Question 24a			
Do you agree with Policy CP11 Protecting the Historic Environment?	12	1	
Question 24b			
Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	4	11	
Question 24c			
Please explain further			4
Question 25a			
Do you agree with Policy CP12 Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity?	15	3	
Question 25b			
Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	9	8	
Question 25c			
Please explain further			13

- It is important to protect and enhance public open spaces, green links and corridors (LP038, LP093)
- New urban park should be created on the eastern side of the borough on the golf course (LP010, LP014, LP015, LP016, LP017, LP018, LP019, LP020, LP021, LP022, LP023, LP024, LP025, LP027, LP031, LP032, LP034, LP035, LP040, LP045, LP047, LP059, LP072, LP073, LP074, LP081, LP082, LP083, LP084, LP085, LP088, LP089, LP090, LP091, LP092, LP093, LP095, LP096, LP097, LP098, LP099, LP100, LP101, LP102, LP111, LP114, LP119)
- Policy CP8 is contradicted by SP6. Loss of the golf course cannot be compensated for by new provision elsewhere (LP114)
- Golf Course should be used for accessible green open space or community leisure facilities not housing (LP010, LP014, LP015, LP016, LP017, LP018, LP019, LP020, LP021, LP022, LP023, LP024, LP025, LP027, LP031, LP033, LP035, LP040, LP045, LP047, LP071, LP072, LP073, LP074, LP078, LP079, LP080, LP081, LP082, LP083, LP084, LP085, LP086, LP087, LP088, LP089, LP090, LP091, LP092, LP095, LP096, LP097, LP098, LP099, LP100, LP101, LP111, LP112, LP116, LP117, LP118, LP119,)
- Keep affordable golf in Tamworth, it is much cheaper than Drayton Manor or the Belfry (LP050)
- Community use leisure centre should be built and functioning before any new housing development is undertaken. How will it be built and financed? (LP030, LP102)
- Wildlife on the golf course will be directly affected by development, including protected species, foraging territories and links between them; SSSI and other wildlife diversity (LP010, LP014, LP015, LP016, LP017, LP018, LP019, LP020, LP021, LP022, LP023, LP024, LP027, LP040, LP031, LP032, LP033, LP034, LP035, LP045, LP072, LP073, LP076, LP074, LP075, LP078, LP079, LP081, LP082, LP083, LP084, LP085, LP088, LP089, LP090, LP091, LP092, LP095, LP096, LP097, LP098, LP099, LP100, LP101, LP102, LP111, LP114, LP116, LP117, LP119)

- Produce updated open space standards and consult on them (LP093)
- Link open space in Dosthill to Middleton Lakes RSPB reserve (LP004)
- Priority should be given to supporting the vision, aims and objectives of the Tame Valley Wetlands Partnership and delivering its biodiversity and heritage projects (LP046)
- Development schemes should incorporate well designed and connected blue and green infrastructure (LP046)
- Improve access between the canal and River Tame, cycle and walking routes between the countryside and town centre (LP046)
- Supports preservation and management of open space and sites of biodiversity importance (LP001)
- Council to work with the Canal and River Trust to fully realise the potential of the canal as a multi-functional resource (LP068)
- Identify sources of funding to ensure canal and towpath can cope with increased use (LP068)
- There are better brownfield sites in the south of the borough that could be allocated for housing rather than the golf course and land in the Green Belt should be released for housing. (LP118)
- Are areas of countryside south of Ashby Road also designated as open space? If so, it should be protected from development. This policy gives more protection to open space than green belt which is unjustified. This area should not be designated as open space (LP044)
- Policy SP8 should clarify acceptable development within the countryside (LP044)
- Plan is contradictory in that it refers to creating open space but allocates open space at the golf course for development (LP117)
- Plan should place greater emphasis on tree planting (LP110)
- Current green belt is not required, boundary should be reviewed and sites within the green belt should be allocated for housing (LP056, LP058)
- Policy SP8 should refer to the statutory wildlife designations in the borough, particularly to the SSSI and aims and aspirations of the green infrastructure strategy (LP122)
- Council should consider how policies SP8, CP10 and CP11 will operate together
- Lack of reference to the significance of heritage assets
- Policy CP8 is weak in detail and how it will deliver, it needs to be informed by the Sport Strategy which will confirm what facilities are required, where they should be located, type and cost. It does not say what is needed (LP029)
- Lack of reference to tree planting, particularly with regard to informal play spaces under Policy CP8
- Policy CP8 should refer to quiet recreation activities which have less impact on the natural environment than active sports and recreation (LP046)
- Policy CP9 should refer to Humber River Basin Management Plan to identify opportunities (LP124)
- 2 and 3 bedroom houses on the golf course is not in keeping with the requirement that developments should be appropriate to the local context (LP117)
- Policy CP10 does not fully support contemporary design and low energy buildings (LP109)
- Policy CP10 should mitigate environmental impacts such as noise, pollution and flooding and consider the impact of waste facilities close to housing and businesses, waste crime and efficient use of resources (LP124)
- Local Plan should address mining legacy with specific reference to land instability and the need for remedial measures (LP041)
- New development should contribute to the public realm through signage, furniture or surface treatments and reference the area's historic character (LP062)
- Policies should consider the significance of historic assets and how they will be protected, enhanced and conserved (LP051)
- Historic assets in the town centre would be better dealt with in the town centre policy (LP051)

- Refer to the conservation area appraisals and extensive urban survey form the basis for understanding Tamworth's historic character (LP062)
- Relevant historic environment stakeholders including English Heritage and Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Team are not referenced (LP062)
- Lack of reference to the need for heritage statements/statements of significance, particularly for the town centre and conservation areas for planning applications (LP062)
- Canal network is a valuable non designated heritage asset and should be mentioned under Policy CP10
- Strongly resist removal of trees to maintain current biodiversity (LP112)
- Policy should cater for the situation where sites have been cleared of vegetation before an application is submitted (LP093)
- Development should demonstrate no adverse impact on interest features of the designated site (LP122)
- Sometimes tree removal is necessary to facilitate energy efficient buildings; Policy CP12 should not be so hostile toward such situations especially if net gain is achieved (CP108)
- Policy CP12 should refer to the EU Water Framework Directive and Humber River Basin Management Plan and seek developer contributions to remedy failing water bodies (LP124)
- Non statutory sites need more protection in the plan (LP046)
- Aim for no loss of biodiversity, mitigation work to recreate natural habitats (LP046)
- Habitat connectivity, watercourses and wetland habitats restoration must be considered and integrated into development (LP046)
- Lack of reference to ancient woodlands in Policy CP12 (CP110)
- Lack of reference to the canal network as an important ecological resource (LP068)

Chapter 7

Question	Yes	No	Comments
26a Do you agree with policy SP9 Sustainable Tamworth?	17	7	
26b Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	13	10	
26c Please explain further:			19
27a Do you agree with policy CP13 Delivering Sustainable Transport?	13	2	
27b Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	4	12	
27c Please explain further:			4
28a Do you agree with policy CP14 Sustainable Development and Climate Change Mitigation?	14	2	
28b Do you think anything should be	4	12	

added, removed or changed?			
28c Please explain further:			4
29a Do you agree with policy CP15 Flood Risk and Water Management?	15	4	
29b Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	7	12	
29c Please explain further:			8
30a Do you agree with policy CP16 Community Facilities?	13	3	
30b Do you think anything should be added, removed or changed?	4	11	
30c Please explain further:			4

- 'Sustainable Tamworth' issues - Make clear spatial policy applies to all development; Home working should be encouraged, fabric first energy efficiency should be encouraged with embodied energy of materials more relevant to commercial development; reference to Central Rivers Initiative, Catchment Based Approach hosts and the Humber River Basin Management Plan; Minerals and waste references should be updated to match emerging minerals plan, national policy and waste plan; consider prior extraction of minerals; revise supporting text based on 2014 Revised Draft Transport Strategy; Include A5 junction references and more local highway improvements/management; Role of canal network should be considered; minerals requirements should have heritage assessment/regard (LP041, 051, 061, 063, 068 108, 124)
- Concerns traffic already not being dealt with; reasoning behind specific junction improvements and safety measures should be explained; opportunity for road/cycle route adjacent HS2 not considered or pedestrian and cycle path around Borrowpit Lake and a cycle/footpath bridge over the narrow part of the River Tame; Bus services should be improved; Safety and congestion problems at Ventura should be looked at (LP004, 009, 050, 093, 117)
- Golf course SUE would undermine encourage unsustainable migration to Tamworth (LP033)
- Anker Valley transport package should be included in policy and with other measures and strategic approach with developers could help deliver Arkall Farm and Browns Lane without link road (LP105)
- Anker Valley still requires road infrastructure removed since withdrawn plan and such infrastructure is unacceptable (LP103)
- Anker Valley link road is needed and should be publicly funded (LP093)
- Sustainable transport issues - Parking standards – 'off street' or 'on site'? should be flexible, take into account existing lawful uses; highways safety and sustainable transport mode improvements should be 'appropriate' to development (LP004, 052)
- Consider more riverside development in the flood plain (LP078)
- No development in flood zones/plain and any nearby to defend properties upstream (LP109, 113)
- Allocations fail flood risk sequential test (LP056, 058)
- Climate change mitigation issues - Traffic emissions are a health problem in Tamworth; Water courses and blue-green infrastructure important for climate change mitigation – link with Tame Valley Wetlands; River Basin Management Plan

references in supporting text; protection of blue green corridors and habitats, aquifers, consider land stability, ground contamination and risk assessments (LP046, 093, 124)

- Water management policy - Add flexibility to last paragraph; streams should not be culverted, SUDS design at start of process with hydrological study, discharge rates to greenfield, river and flood defence easements, development to open up culverted watercourses where feasible, no impact to groundwater quality, sustainable water management, SUDS to take into account preliminary risk assessments, adequate wastewater infrastructure in place (LP046, 093)
- Community facilities - What is the alternative sports provision for golf course? Could cross-reference to sport and other policies; new healthcare facilities needed (LP029, 056, 058, 112)

Chapter 8

	Yes	No	Comments
31: Do you agree with Policy CP17 (Infrastructure and Developer Contributions)?	10	3	
Do you think anything should be added removed or changed?	5	8	
Please explain further			7

- More community involvement needed for developments over a certain size (LP078)
- CP17 should mention renewable energy infrastructure in line with CP14 (LP044)
- No references to GI and Flood Defences in policy CP17 (LP0124)
- Canal infrastructure not referred to in CP17 (LP068)
- CP8 not clear as what needs to be provided so CP17 needs to add locally specific sports infrastructure requirements to this policy as well as reference to CP8 (LP029)
- Text of first paragraph not clear (LP004)

Appendices, maps and evidence base documents

	Yes	No	Comments
32. Do you have any comments on the draft Local Plan appendices?			69

- Appendix A Housing Trajectory – include all site areas, ensure site/street references accurate throughout document; does not take account of social housing regeneration programme; this years delivery will be lower, outline permissions may expire (LP093, 113)
- Appendix B Proposed Housing Allocations – only those sites which fall within the Development High Risk Area need to be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment; further heritage references required on certain sites and heritage statement/statement of significance; preliminary risk assessment on all sites and refer to guidance; need heritage assessments (LP041, 051, 062, 124)
- Appendix C Proposed Employment Allocations - only those sites which fall within the Development High Risk Area need to be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment; transport requirements not included, detailed mitigation measures to be set in transport assessments; detail for EMP1 mitigation to canal; preliminary risk assessment on all sites and refer to guidance; need heritage assessments (LP041, 051,061, 062, 068, 124)
- Appendix D Infrastructure Delivery Plan – priorities and costs unclear, Camp Hill Chord Line not forthcoming; recognise heritage importance of canal in strategic

spatial priorities column; update in line with draft integrated transport plan; British Waterways' should be amended to read 'Canal & River Trust'; Anker Valley transport package could support further development; may need to be reviewed following Anker Valley application; include heritage at risk including Deanery Wall, Lower Gungate and Saxon defences, reference education (LP039, 051, 061, 062, 068, 093, 105, 128, 131)

- Appendix E Parking Standards – Theatres are sui generis (LP007)
- Appendix F Monitoring and Implementation Framework – discuss with English Heritage (LP051)
- Concern plan overall not viable or deliverable (LP026, 030)
- General concern over environmental effect of plan (LP077)
- Lack of consultation around Kerria Centre regeneration (LP121)
- Dissatisfaction with access to consultation materials, information on response form (LP014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 027, 031, 032, 033, 034, 035, 040, 045, 072, 073, 074, 075, 076, 079, 081, 082, 083, 084, 085, 088, 089, 090, 091, 092, 095, 096, 097, 098, 099, 100, 101, 102)
- Sports strategy required (LP029)
- Soil protection and landscape have not been given enough consideration, more detail required at application (LP122)
- SA objectives should be expanded to include geodiversity, soil, landscape, protected species and public rights of way (LP122)
- Habitats Regulations Assessment – wording change, further screening required for housing outside borough (LP122)
- Duty to Cooperate work – should address environmental challenges water quality/quantity issues climate change adaptation, and the delivery of green infrastructure and ecological networks, which do not necessarily fit administrative boundaries (LP122)
- Policies map – green colours hard to distinguish, objections to sites not allocated, Lack of urban green in Amington and Stoneydelph, No indicative route shown for HS2 (LP026, 056, 058)
- Make more reference to Tame Valley Wetlands Partnership (LP047)
- Work with environmental bodies to improve design of development in landscape (LP046)
- No reference to highway hierarchy (LP118)
- Growth outside borough should be in SUEs to Tamworth (LP104)
- Include telecommunications policy with suggested text (008)

Overly aspirational, unclear how plan can be brought forward, particularly the town centre (LP133)