

BIRMINGHAM DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Duty to Co-operate

| |
|--|
| Local Planning Authorities and other bodies party to this agreement/ understanding: |
| A. Birmingham City Council (BCC) |
| B. Lichfield District Council (LDC) |

| |
|--|
| Development Plan Document(s) covered by this agreement / understanding: |
| Birmingham Development Plan |

| |
|--|
| Stage in the process forming part of this agreement: |
| Pre-Submission* |
| *NB: In the event of any changes to the plan prior to submission and/or as part of modifications proposed during the Examination process then updated versions of this document may be prepared. |

| Checklist criteria <small>NB: this is a starting point, list to be mutually agreed between the parties to this agreement.</small> Checklist discussed and agreed: Yes/ No | Summary status <small>E.g.: Full or partial agreement, / Shared understanding on area(s) of disagreement, or / Not applicable</small> <small>Delete as appropriate</small> | 1. Summary of the approach in the plan 2. Summary of agreed position and any outstanding concerns or other comments <small>NB: Refer to attachments and appendices if required</small> |
|---|---|---|
| a) Overall approach incl. relationship to urban and rural renaissance | Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not-Applicable | <p>1. The vision, strategic objectives and approach set out in the BDP envisages that by 2031 Birmingham will be renowned as an enterprising, innovative and green city that has delivered sustainable growth meeting the needs of its population and strengthening its global competitiveness.</p> <p>Following around half a century of decline in the latter half of the C20 the city's population is expected to grow rapidly extending and building on the success of the strategy for urban renaissance that has been the hallmark of planning in the city since the 1980's.</p> <p>2. Following abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy the City Council has worked and continues to work with adjoining authorities in the GBSLEP and West Midlands Metropolitan Area and beyond not only to ensure the continuing success of urban renaissance but also, through the GBSLEP</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>Strategic Spatial framework Plan, the Strategic Policy Framework for the West Midlands Metropolitan Area and local plans, to ensure that there remains an appropriate balance between growth and development to meet needs in both urban and rural areas. There are no outstanding issues in relation to the strategy set out in the BDP between the parties signatory to this document.</p> |
| <p>b) Estimation of housing requirements and the level and distribution of housing provision</p> | <p>Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not-Applicable</p> | <p>1. The Birmingham SHMA which underpins the BDP estimates a housing requirement of c80,000 net new dwellings in the period up to 2031. The 2012 SHLAA's best estimate of likely capacity without incursion into Green Belt (except at the site of the former Yardley Sewage Works) and including an allowance for c700 on land at Longbridge within Bromsgrove District is c45,000 dwellings, including allowance for windfalls. The Pre-submission version of the BDP proposes that 51,100 net new dwellings - should be provided including the removal of land from the Green Belt to increase capacity within Birmingham leaving a balance to be found outside the city's boundary of c29,000 dwellings.</p> <p>2. The major issues concern the scale of the housing requirement, the extent to which capacity exists or can be identified within Birmingham's boundary and then the scale and distribution of any resultant shortfall. The BDP sets out Birmingham City Council's position in respect of these matters and it is envisaged by the parties signatory to this document that the satisfactory resolution of these issues will be achieved through (1) completion of the GBSLEP Strategic Housing Needs Study (2) Distribution of the overall housing need and the resultant 'overspill' housing through the Second Iteration of the GBSLEP Strategic Spatial Framework Plan and through arrangements negotiated with other authorities beyond the GBSLEP as justified by the evidence and (3) Subsequent accommodation of the 'overspill' growth in the review of Local Plans in adjoining areas. This approach is accepted by the parties signatory to this document.</p> |
| <p>c) Appropriate provision made for migration</p> | <p>Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not-Applicable</p> | <p>1. The Birmingham SHMA takes account of migration in establishing the overall housing requirement and, broadly speaking, the effects of migration trends are then taken</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>into account in the estimation of housing requirements in adjoining areas through the preparation of local plans.</p> <p>2. The identification of a housing shortfall or 'overspill' requirement refers to potential additional housing over and above that included in population and household projections that is needed outside Birmingham's boundary in order that housing needs can be met. The process for resolution of this matter is as set out in b)2 above. This approach is accepted by the parties signatory to this document.</p> |
| d) Level and distribution of employment land provision | Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not-Applicable | <p>1. The BDP identifies a serious emerging shortfall of land to accommodate future employment growth and investment. The plan addresses this issue by protecting the city's core employment areas from competing uses so they offer a continuing supply of recycled land supplemented by the release of a major new employment site (80ha) at Peddimore. Proposals for six economic zones are primarily focussed within the existing employment areas and include two Regional Investment Sites. The possible longer-term need for further strategic employment sites is to be addressed by the GBSLEP Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth and associated technical work with adjoining LEPs.</p> <p>2. This approach is accepted by the parties signatory to this document.</p> |
| e) Hierarchy of centres and the level and distribution of retail provision | Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not-Applicable | <p>1. The BDP defines a retail hierarchy of centres in Birmingham. The approach in the BDP is to make provision for a net increase of 270,000 m² in comparison retail floorspace concentrated in the City Centre, Sutton Coldfield town centre and three District Growth Points. Growth elsewhere will be small scale.</p> <p>2. This approach is accepted by the parties signatory to this document, on the basis that policies and plans within the Birmingham DP do not adversely impact on the ability of Lichfield City, Burntwood and other smaller centres in Lichfield District to bring forward an appropriate scale and nature of retail and commercial floorspace to meet recognised needs.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>f) Level and distribution of office provision</p> | <p>Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not-Applicable</p> | <p>1. The approach in the BDP is to encourage 745,000 m² gross of new office development in the network of centres primarily focussed in the city centre including a substantial proportion of the new office floorspace expected to be provided within the Enterprise Zone.</p> <p>2. This approach is accepted by the parties signatory to this document.</p> |
| <p>g) Appropriate provision made for public and private transport including Park & Ride and commuting patterns</p> | <p>Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not-Applicable</p> | <p>1. The BDP incorporates a range of transport polices and proposals across all modes. These are consistent with the extant Local Transport Plan and emerging Birmingham Mobility Action Plan (BMAP). There are proposals to improve networks both within and beyond the boundary which will impact, for example, on modal choice for commuters. Major development proposals close to the city boundary have impacts that can extend across the administrative boundary. Close cross-boundary co-operation on transportation matters continues through both West Midlands Shadow ITA and the associated Local Transport Boards (LTB).</p> <p>2. There is no desire to increase the levels of in-commuting across the city boundary so there is an expectation that there will be a broad balance between the levels of housing and employment growth taking place in areas beyond the city boundary which is a matter to be addressed in the relevant local plans of adjacent authorities. This approach is accepted by the parties signatory to this document, on the basis that it is fully recognised that Lichfield District seeks to provide within its administrative area a level of housing and employment growth which is sustainable, provides for access to services, facilities and jobs and in doing so reduces the need for residents to have to travel cross boundary to meet their needs in this respect.</p> |
| <p>h) Consistency of planning policy and proposals across common boundaries such as transport links and green infrastructure</p> | <p>Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not-Applicable</p> | <p>1. To be identified and discussed as appropriate across common boundaries but would include matters such as landscape, designations of natural areas, river basin management and transport networks.</p> <p>2.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>i) Green Belt matters</p> | <p>Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not-Applicable</p> | <p>1. Significant changes to the Green Belt are proposed in association with major development proposals at Langley and Peddimore to the north-east of Birmingham and at the site of the former Yardley sewage works. The changes to the Green Belt boundary have been made in such a way as to identify new boundaries that will endure in the long-term and allow for development to be accommodated that will not undermine the essential purposes or integrity of the wider West Midlands Green Belt. The City Council acknowledge that additional land which is currently designated as Green Belt in adjoining areas may need to be identified for development – as a consequence of the process to determine the level and distribution of future growth set out under b)2 above - but the responsibility for those proposals, should they arise, will lie with the respective local planning authority (working collaboratively with other relevant authorities) to be determined through a review of the relevant local plan(s).</p> <p>2. This approach is accepted by the parties signatory to this document.</p> |
| <p>j) Minerals, waste and water resources including flooding</p> | <p>Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not-Applicable</p> | <p>1. As a major city Birmingham is reliant on minerals predominantly produced in adjoining shire areas to help facilitate its growth and development. The City Council recognises that it can reduce the demand for mineral extraction through effective recycling and reuse of building materials and aggregates. Similarly the City Council recognises that its 'footprint' can be reduced through self-sufficiency and vigorous adoption of the waste hierarchy. The City Council is an active member of both the West Midlands Aggregates Working Party (AWP) and the Regional Technical Advisory Body (RTAB) covering waste. Both groupings help ensure discharge of the DfC. In respect of water resources and flooding the City Council is fully aware of its responsibilities and will vigorously pursue the principles of sustainable drainage to reduce the risks of flooding both within the city and beyond its boundaries.</p> <p>2. This approach is accepted by the parties signatory to this document, on the basis that plan policies and their implementation will serve to limit where possible the need for</p> |


| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | significant new mineral extraction to provide for building aggregate and in all other matters resource demands and use of are carefully monitored and controlled in line with good sustainable development principles. |
| k) Air quality matters | Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not Applicable | <p>1. The City Council is committed to the improvement of air quality for its residents and those in surrounding areas. It is, and will remain an active participant in initiatives to address these matters jointly with adjoining authorities and other agencies subject to the nature of actions being consistent with the city's aspirations for growth. Detailed policies on air quality and noise matters will be set out in a separate Development Management DPD.</p> <p>2. This approach is accepted by the parties signatory to this document.</p> |
| l) Any other matters that might reasonably be identified under the Duty to Co-operate | Agreed/ Shared Understanding/ Not Applicable | <p>1. No other matters identified.</p> <p>2.</p> |

Log of meetings, reports and other records to substantiate the collaborative working:

| | Details: |
|--|---|
| Meetings | Meetings on the Birmingham Development Plan held on 31/10/12 and 18/02/14. |
| Groups | Regular meetings: (1) GBSLEP Planning Sub-Group (2) GBSLEP Spatial Planning Group (3) Development Management Group (4) West Midlands Planning Officers Group – Staffordshire LPAs connect to the group through the Staffordshire Planning Officers Group |
| Responses to consultation and correspondence | <p>28/02/14 – LDC response to the Birmingham Development Plan 2031 Pre Submission version</p> <p>20/02/14 – BCC response to Lichfield Local Plan Proposed Modifications</p> <p>25/02/14 – LDC response to the Birmingham Development Plan 2031 Pre Submission version</p> <p>17/05/13 – Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy – Public Examination – Hearing Statement by Birmingham City Council</p> <p>April 2013 - Statement of Common Ground between</p> |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| | <p>Birmingham City Council and Lichfield District Council (April 2013)</p> <p>18/01/13 – BCC letter to RBC on Birmingham's Future Growth requirements</p> <p>11/01/13 – LDC response the Birmingham Development Plan – Planning for Birmingham's Growing Population Options Consultation</p> <p>06/11/12 – BCC letter to LDC confirming Cabinet Member approval of the earlier officer response on the emerging local plan.</p> <p>26/10/12 - Report of: Director of Planning and Regeneration to the Strategic Director of Development and Culture in Consultation with Cabinet Member for Development, Jobs And Skills - Emerging Development Plans in areas around Birmingham: Consultation with Neighbouring Authorities</p> <p>10/09/2012 - BCC response to the Lichfield Local Plan - Pre-Submission Plan Document</p> <p>10/09/12 - West Midlands Joint Committee response to the Lichfield District Council Local Plan</p> <p>08/08/12 – BCC letter to RBC on Birmingham's Future Growth requirements</p> |
| Additional points | |

We, the undersigned, agree that the above statements and information truly represent the joint working that has and will continue to take place under the 'Duty to Co-operate'.



Waheed Nazir
Director of Planning & Regeneration

Birmingham City Council*

Date:




Richard King
Strategic Director Democratic,
Development and Legal Services
Lichfield District Council

Date: 12/09/14

* Must be signed by either Council Leader or responsible Cabinet Member or responsible Chief Executive or Chief Officer only. For non-local authority organisations signatory should be at equivalent level.