

From: progofficer <progofficer@aol.com>  
To: neil.cox  
CC: ashley.baldwin  
Sent: Fri, 3 Aug 2018 10:01  
Subject: Re: Lichfield District Local Plan Allocations EiP

Neil

Thank you for your email, which I have discussed with the Inspector, he has responded as follows -

*In response to the e-mail from Neil Cox of Pegasus, the Framework (we are still working to the March 2012 version for the purposes of the Lichfield Plan), NPPF 47 draws a distinction between the need to demonstrate the first 5 years of specific, deliverable sites, which are available now (my underlining) (with additional information provided in footnote 11), and the remaining periods of the Plan, i.e. for years 6-10 and 11-15, where there needs to be at least the prospect of the sites being available. Footnote 12 gives additional information, but it is clear that an Inspector needs to be convinced that a sufficient quantity of developable housing sites needs to be included with a reasonable prospect of these sites or broad locations for growth included in the later years of the plan period becoming available for development.*

*I hope that the paragraph above has drawn the distinction between matter 3.3 and matter 3.4 in my discussion note.*

The Inspector has asked that this email exchange be added to the Examination website.

Kind regards

Helen

Helen Wilson  
Programme Officer

0151 352 3863  
07879 443035  
[www.hwa.uk.com](http://www.hwa.uk.com)

From: Neil Cox  
To: progofficer  
Sent: Thu, 2 Aug 2018 17:17  
Subject: Lichfield District Local Plan Allocations EiP

Afternoon Helen,

For information I am representing a number of clients in respect of the Local Plan Allocations EiP and I am in the process of preparing Hearing Statements.

With regards to Matter 3 I have noted that further information has been published, including a 5YHLS Paper and 2018 SHLAA.

In respect of the 5YHLS Paper I believe there are a number of typographic errors within the document which relate to supply years within Table B.2. I have raised this issue with the District Council directly. This document however only provides site specific housing delivery information for the first five years.

I would like to understand whether the Inspector has requested site specific information in respect of the remaining years within the Plan period as it is difficult to provide a considered response to the Inspector's Matter 3 questions without it. For example, I cannot see where the Council identifies the delivery assumptions for Watery Lane, Rugeley Power Station or North of Tamworth. I may have overlooked such information, but I cannot see any site specific information that sites behind the comprehensive housing trajectory contained at Appendix D to the submitted Local Plan Allocations document.

I am conscious that hearing statements need to be submitted two weeks tomorrow.

Please feel free to give me a call to discuss.

Kind regards

**Neil Cox**  
Director

**Pegasus Group**