

## Shropshire Local Plan Review - Issues and Strategic Options

### Introduction

We advise you read through all the information provided in support of this consultation prior to starting your response. We would also advise you to have a copy of the Issues and Strategic Options Consultation Document available to refer to as you work through the questions.

The questions are included within the Issues and Strategic Options Consultation Document to allow you to start thinking about them as you go. This response form is broken down into the same 3 sections as the Issues and Strategic Options Consultation Document to try and help you simultaneously navigate the information and response form.

All questions marked with a red asterisk\* require an answer to be provided.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information legislation (primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

## Shropshire Local Plan Review - Issues and Strategic Options

### Respondent information

\*1. Please provide the following information.

*Please note: we cannot accept anonymous responses.*

Your name:	<input type="text" value="Baschurch Parish Council"/>
Company name (if relevant):	<input type="text"/>
Position (if relevant):	<input type="text"/>
Address:	<input type="text" value="The Newlands&lt;br/&gt;Cross Cut Lane, Baschurch"/>
Postcode:	<input type="text" value="SY4 2DD"/>
Phone Number:	<input type="text" value="01939 260442"/>
Email Address:	<input type="text" value="baschurchpc@newlandscl.com"/>

2. If you are responding on behalf of a client, please provide the following information.

Client name:	<input type="text"/>
Client address:	<input type="text"/>
Client postcode:	<input type="text"/>
Client phone number:	<input type="text"/>
Client email address:	<input type="text"/>

# Shropshire Local Plan Review - Issues and Strategic Options

## Housing requirement and strategic distribution options

\*3. Do you consider the housing need identified in Shropshire between 2016 and 2036 within the Full Objectively Assessed Housing Need (FOAHN) is appropriate and in line with national guidance?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

We consider the housing need is in line with national guidance, but feel that in some areas of Shropshire, the numbers the FOAHN will generate will be in excess of what is actually appropriate.

\*4. Which housing requirement option would you prefer to see used for the Local Plan Review?

- Housing Requirement Option 1: 'Moderate Growth'
- Housing Requirement Option 2: 'Significant Growth'
- Housing Requirement Option 3: 'High Growth'
- Don't know / no opinion

Please use the space below to explain your reasons for your choice.

You can also use this space to let us know if you think there are any other housing requirement options that the Council should consider.

Would prefer to stipulate 'moderate growth' as experience shows this is always exceeded; stipulating 'moderate growth' allows for some control over housing numbers. In our experience, we stipulated 150-200 dwellings, we are currently running at 65% above the maximum level stated in SAMDev.

Shropshire Council must consider mechanisms to ensure PROPER phasing of development to prevent the free for all that existed at the beginning of the SAMDev plan. The attitude that market forces will regulate development has been proven to be incorrect, to the detriment of some areas that have seen their full allocation for 15 years hitting them within two - the infrastructure has not and does not keep up with that.

\*5. Which strategic distribution option would you prefer to see used for the Local Plan Review?

- Strategic Distribution Option A: 'Current Policy - Rural Rebalance'
- Strategic Distribution Option B: 'Urban Focus'
- Strategic Distribution Option C: 'Balanced Growth'
- Don't know / no opinion

Please use the space below to explain your reasons for your choice.

You can also use this space to let us know if you think there are any other strategic distribution options that the Council should consider.

We do feel that the market towns and key service centres should be where the majority of growth should be focused - maybe even consider reducing the allocations for Shrewsbury and rural. The market towns etc are already loaded with infrastructure that is not being fully utilised - this gives an opportunity to reinvigorate these areas. These market towns and key service centres have already seen a number of regeneration initiatives and adding housing to that mix underpins the sustainability of these areas.

## Shropshire Local Plan Review - Issues and Strategic Options

### Economic growth and employment

#### Strategic Options for Economic Growth

6. How might Shropshire best exploit these new investment opportunities to improve the economic performance of the County and what challenges might be encountered when seeking to achieve this?

Need to consider the requirements for all business types - not just for larger/more financially robust employers. There needs to be a good mix of small (budget) employment opportunities (reuse of old airfield sites etc) all the way up to space for very large employers and retail opportunities. Spread of employment land needs to be distributed across smaller communities as well as co-located on the outskirts of the large settlements. Baschurch is rapidly becoming a dormitory settlement, with large increases in the number of residential dwellings, sometimes with the loss of employment land. The PC has been trying to secure this employment land, but land owners are keen to maximise the financial return on their land, hence it is only being offered for residential devt. With brownfield land being certain to receive permission for residential devt the likelihood of keeping employment land is disappointingly low.

7. What other opportunities / challenges for economic growth might be encountered in the County over the period to 2036?

Shropshire needs to consider its tourism opportunities and put effort into raising the positive aspects of developing tourism opportunities, including tourist attractions and accommodation facilities. We live in the middle of a lot of exception tourist attractions, but don't fully capitalise on the potential. Also need to consider the impact of HS2 and the extension of the employment corridor, bringing further opportunities as we are likely to be a cost effective option on the edge of the Birmingham belt.

\*8. Which of the following Strategic Options would provide the most appropriate level of aspiration for the growth of the Shropshire economy?

- Option 1: Significant Growth
- Option 2: High Growth
- Option 3: Productivity Growth
- Don't know / no opinion

Please set out the reasons for your choice and outline the opportunities and challenges for the Shropshire economy.

Or, set out an alternative Strategic Option outlining the key characteristics of this option for the growth of the Shropshire economy.

We see the need for high growth for the reasons given in 7, but also we believe that an optimistic attitude for growth needs to be adopted to encourage opportunities to retain talent in the county, encouraging the younger generation to live, study, work and build a career in their home county, without the need to always move away for progression.

### **Economic Objectives for Shropshire**

\*9. Do you agree that these strategic objectives should continue to influence the economic strategy in the Local Plan for the period to 2036?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion

Please consider whether:

Any of these strategic objectives might be amended to better address the needs of the Shropshire economy;

Other strategic objectives might be identified in the Local Plan.

Agree wholeheartedly with the objectives. Specific investment needs to be put into further education (including meaningful apprenticeships), communications (the telephone and internet service outside of urban areas is pitiful), transportation (including public transport and road network enhancements).

## Range and Choice of Remaining Allocations

\*10. Do each of the 19 sites detailed make a positive contribution to the employment land supply in the County?

- Yes - all sites
- Yes - some sites
- No
- Don't know / no opinion

Might some, or all of these sites be used in other ways to make a more positive contribution to the Local Plan strategy over the period to 2036?

No, but we do feel that a wider range of sites needs to be identified, including small, rural sites with employment potential. This would help to support the housing that is planned and has already been delivered.

## Protecting existing employment land

\*11. Does the protection provided to existing employment areas as a source of serviced and readily available land make a positive contribution to the supply of employment land and premises in Shropshire?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion

Please consider whether:

The level of protection provided to existing employment areas shown in the Authority Monitoring Report is appropriate.

The approach to protecting existing employment areas might be changed or improved in the partial review of the Local Plan.

We do not feel that there is enough protection for employment land, far too much is being taken away as residential development land without securing appropriate replacement. It is accepted that some sites are now not suitable for employment and it is better to reuse them for residential use in these circumstances. However, particularly in rural areas, a number of sites are taken out of employment use without any consideration for the future impact on the area. These sites should be afforded much more protection and should be subject to more consultation with local communities before being approved for change of use.

Baschurch Parish Council has battled to keep employment land, but has been overruled and the land and employment opportunities lost. We are currently fighting to retain one such site, our view is that we will not be successful.

## Rural policy

### Identification of Community Hubs

\*12. Do you agree with the approach and/or the methodology proposed to identify Community Hubs?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know / no opinion

Please use the space below to explain your reasons for your choice.

It is a sensible approach for a rural county.

### Identification of Community Clusters

\*13. Do you think any of the existing Community Clusters identified in Appendix 3 should no longer have Community Cluster status?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please specify the community cluster(s) and any community support you are aware of for this proposal:

Weston Lullingfields should be removed as a community cluster. Community representations within the cluster support this view. Recent development has been too rapid and some developments have seen what could be considered as intensive development when considered in the context of the rest of the settlements.

\*14. Do you think any additional Community Clusters should be formed?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please specify the community cluster(s) and any community support you are aware of for this proposal:

If individual parish councils decide that they would like to be included, then they should have the option. However, the sustainability of the existing services needs to be properly evaluated to see if they are future proofed enough to continue to offer community benefits for the existing and new developments.

### Criteria for the Community Hub Policy

\*15. The table below provides a summary of some of the criteria which may be included within the Community Hub policy.

Please provide your opinion on the importance of each criteria, using the following ranking scale:

(1) Unimportant; (2) Neutral; (3) Important; or (4) Very Important

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Don't know / no opinion
1. Development proposals must have regard to relevant policies on Sustainable Design and Development Principles.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Development should be of a scale and design that is sympathetic to the character of the settlement and its environs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Development should be well and clearly related to the existing built form of a settlement and not result in an isolated form of development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Development should reflect design criteria and policies identified within relevant Neighbourhood Plans and Community Led Plans.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5a. Development proposals to extend a Community Hub beyond its natural built form will normally consist of a small group of dwellings and include a range of housing sizes, types and tenures.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5b. Development proposals should protect the integrity of any strategically important gaps between settlements.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. There should be sufficient infrastructure capacity, or scope to address or alleviate any infrastructure constraints to appropriately meet development needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Sites of five or more dwellings should include an appropriate mix* of types and sizes of housing; and meet local needs for affordable and family housing based on any local evidence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Non-residential sites should be designed to complement their setting and meet the needs of their intended occupiers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9a. The cumulative impact of residential development proposals is a significant policy consideration. Cumulatively, residential development proposals** must complement the nature, character and size of a settlement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9b. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the cumulative increase to the size of the settlement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9c. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the number of other development proposals in close proximity or adjacent to the proposal site, in seeking to avoid the over-development of settlements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9d. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the benefits arising from the development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. The cumulative impact of non- residential development is also a significant policy consideration. Cumulatively, non-residential development** must complement the nature, character and size of a settlement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Don't know / no opinion
11. Allocations made within Community Hub settlements in the SAMDev Plan are considered appropriate sites for development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Development within the Green Belt is generally considered inappropriate, apart from the specific exceptions referenced within national policy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Development should respect the qualities of the local landscape and be sympathetic to its character and visual quality.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Development should have a positive effect on any relevant heritage designations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Development should have a positive effect on any relevant environmental designations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

\* When determining an appropriate mix of types, sizes, and tenures, regard should be given to the need to provide appropriate family accommodation, available local evidence, and the outcomes of community consultation.

\*\* In combination with any existing commitments, allocations or completions since the 31 March 2016.

16. Use this space to identify any additional criteria you consider would be beneficial for community hubs:

We disagree that development boundaries should be removed for community hubs - many of these are in place for very specific reasons. Also, community hubs should be able to identify sites if they wish to, restricting development on sites considered undesirable within the hub and preventing a free for all from developers, as has been seen prior to the approval of SAMDev. When considering community hubs, the reliance on infrastructure outside of the settlement must be considered - our experience is that our medical practice is overloaded from adjoining parishes and we cannot affect or plan for that. Also, cumulative impact on public transport is vital.

### Criteria for the Community Clusters

\*17. The table below provides a summary of some of the criteria which may be included within the Community Cluster policy.

Please provide your opinion on the importance of each criteria, using the following ranking scale:

(1) Unimportant; (2) Neutral; (3) Important; or (4) Very Important.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Don't know / no opinion
1. Development proposals must have regard to relevant policies on Sustainable Design and Development Principles.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Development should be of a scale and design that is sympathetic to the character of the settlement and its environs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Development should be well and clearly related to the existing built form of a settlement and not result in an isolated form of development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Development should reflect design criteria and policies identified within relevant Neighbourhood Plans and Community Led Plans.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Don't know / no opinion
5. There should be sufficient infrastructure capacity, or scope to address or alleviate any infrastructure constraints to appropriately meet development needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6a. Development should either be located on small scale infill sites or represent conversions of existing buildings within or adjoining the settlement. Infill sites will consist of land usually with built development on adjacent land on three sides.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6b. The rural area between Community Clusters is considered countryside. The integrity of any strategically important gaps between settlements will be protected.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. When considering the size, type and tenure of housing, all residential development should have regard to the need to provide appropriate family accommodation; available local evidence; and the outcomes of community consultation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Non-residential sites should be designed to complement their setting and meet the needs of their intended occupiers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9a. The cumulative impact of residential development proposals is a significant policy consideration. Cumulatively, residential development proposals* must complement the nature, character and size of a settlement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9b. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the cumulative increase to the size of the settlement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9c. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the number of other development proposals in close proximity or adjacent to the proposal site, in seeking to avoid the over-development of settlements.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9d. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the benefits arising from the development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. The cumulative impact of non- residential development is also a significant policy consideration. Cumulatively, non- residential development* must complement the nature, character and size of a settlement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Allocations made within a Community Cluster settlement in the SAMDev Plan are considered appropriate sites for development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Development within the Green Belt is generally considered inappropriate, apart from the specific exceptions referenced within national policy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Development should respect the qualities of the local landscape and be sympathetic to its character and visual quality.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Development should have a positive effect on any relevant heritage designations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Development should have a positive effect on any relevant environmental designations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* In combination with any existing commitments, allocations or completions since the 31 March 2016.					

18. Use this space to identify any additional criteria you consider would be beneficial for community clusters:

The sustainability of existing infrastructure needs to be considered very carefully to ensure it is viable and robust - for example, Weston Lullingfields has infrastructure (church, village hall, school), but the viability of these continues to diminish, despite 20% additional development across the cluster. The level of development to make existing infrastructure sustainable is unrealistic and adding further development in this instance should be considered unsustainable unless existing infrastructure is given guaranteed support to continue to be viable. The addition of new development in some clusters will never enable the addition of infrastructure (eg shops, medical).

\*19. Do you think that criteria based policies for Community Hubs and Community Clusters will strike an appropriate balance between providing certainty on the types and levels of development whilst also maintaining choice and competition?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

Yes, as long as the community/neighbourhood plans are given the credibility and weight that they deserve. Where Parish Councils offer well considered and credible views, planners should negotiate and discuss options more frequently with Parish Councils to better understand their perspective, needs and aspirations.

\*20. Do you agree that a consistent approach of identifying no development boundaries within Community Hub and Community Cluster settlements is appropriate?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

For many hubs and clusters, development boundaries are essential to protect against expansion and sometimes elongation of a settlement. Many sites may meet planning criteria, but that doesn't mean that a site should be developed. Without boundaries, it will encourage developers to 'try it on', by pushing for sites that would normally be deemed unacceptable. If there is no boundary, how can this be defended/challenged if an unsuccessful application is taken to appeal?

**Residential Development in the wider Countryside**

21. What local criteria, if any, do you consider should be applied in addition to those produced at the national level for residential development in the wider countryside?

None, support the existing criteria.

**Non-Residential Development in the wider Countryside**

22. What local criteria, if any, do you consider should be applied in addition to those produced at the national level for non-residential development in the wider countryside?

None, support the existing criteria. However, meaningful consultation with Parish Councils should be carried out to ensure that applications are not determined without considering the local view - it is possible that local feeling supports a project that planning policy does not.