

Representation Form

Please complete a separate **Part B Representation Form** (this part) for each representation that you would like to make. One **Part A Representation Form** must be enclosed with your **Part B Representation Form(s)**.

We have also published a separate **Guidance Note** to explain the terms used and to assist in making effective representations.

Part B: Representation

Name and Organisation:	Rebecca McAlster – Concept Town Planning Ltd.
------------------------	---

Q1. To which document does this representation relate?

- Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan
- Sustainability Appraisal of the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan
- Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan
- (Please tick one box)

Q2. To which part of the document does this representation relate?

Paragraph:	<input type="text"/>	Policy:	<input type="text" value="S18"/>	Site:	<input type="text"/>	Policies Map:	<input type="text"/>
------------	----------------------	---------	----------------------------------	-------	----------------------	---------------	----------------------

Q3. Do you consider the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan is:

- | | | | | |
|--|------|--------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|
| A. Legally compliant | Yes: | <input type="checkbox"/> | No: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Sound | Yes: | <input type="checkbox"/> | No: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate | Yes: | <input type="checkbox"/> | No: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
- (Please tick as appropriate).

Q4. Please give details of why you consider the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The Local Plan has not changed in relation to the promoted housing sites and we continue to oppose those favoured by the Council, when more appropriate alternative provision, such as the site referenced as WHT035, exists. This site continues to be overlooked under the current Local Plan review and, therefore, for the reasons defined in our previous representations, the plan is not considered sound.

Accordingly, we consider that our previous representations remain entirely applicable and so these are attached for ease and represent our position in relation to Policy S18.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Q5. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at Q4 above.

Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination. You will need to say why each modification will make the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Please see Previous Representations – attached for ease.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please note: In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.

Q6. If your representation is seeking a modification to the Regulation 19: Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

(Please tick one box)

Q7. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

To date, the Council have failed to support the most appropriate or sustainable options for meeting the future housing needs of Whitchurch. The hearing sessions will enable us to further explain this position and allow for a more balanced examination of the housing allocations and the supporting justification to be undertaken. It will also allow us the opportunity to address any queries raised by the Inspector.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please note: The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

Signature:

Concept Town Planning Ltd

 Date:

25/02/2021

Office Use Only	Part A Reference:
	Part B Reference:



Chartered Town Planners

Planning Policy Team
Shropshire Council
Shirehall,
Abbey Foregate
Shrewsbury
SY2 6ND

CONCEPT TOWN PLANNING LTD
CONCEPT HOUSE
7 SCOTLAND STREET
ELLESMERE
SY12 0DG
Tel: 01691 622500
mail@concepttownplanning.com

Dear Sirs

Shropshire Council Local Plan Review -Reg 18 Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan Consultation -Sept 2020

This submission forms a representation to the above document and is submitted on behalf of the owner of the promoted site WHT035. The Council has received our comments to the previous round of consultation so we do not propose to repeat this detail here but which we would stress remain applicable.

The land remains a viable and available option for helping to deliver the future housing needs of Whitchurch and we consider the sites' suitability has been unduly overlooked in the latest round of consultation. Under the Preferred Sites Consultation carried out in 2018 / 2019, detailed evidence was presented to the Council in support of the subject land, demonstrating how the site performs better in terms of its sustainability credentials, compared to the preferred allocation sites.

Despite this the Council continue to favour the allocation of four alternative sites, namely WHT014, WHT037, WHT042 and WHT044 and have rejected the allocation of WHT035. Ultimately, the Council conclude in their Stage 3 assessment that WHT035 is somewhat divorced from the heart of the town and does not promote the greater use of sustainable transport. The summary then, however, goes on to explain how the land has more potential as a future employment site but that the current allocation requirement is met.

Given the conclusions reached we again write to address the Council's failings in examining the available sites and to re-iterate the suitability of the subject land for meeting the future housing needs of Whitchurch, as below.

In the first instance, we cannot agree that the site is divorced from the town since it sits alongside the existing and well-established development of The Grove. Furthermore, recent housing allocation have been constructed within close proximity and the Council's own preferred site are also within the vicinity. Secondly, given the relationship with the exiting development of the town and those presently being promoted by the Council, it clearly represents a sustainable location and so would help to promote the use of sustainable transport. Indeed, the sustainability of the site is confirmed in the Council's 'sustainability assessment' which recognises the site as being 'fair' in the conclusion, with a better sustainability score than the preferred sites located along Chester Road.

In the context of the above and our previous representation, we would consider that the Council's summary is, therefore, flawed and that the land has future potential for housing since it is readily available now and performs better than the Council's preferred sites. Accordingly, it should come forward under the current plan review.

Given the foregoing we consider that latest consultation document cannot be regarded as sound and the plan must be redrafted before examination by an independent Inspector. We would also propose to further such comments to any forthcoming examination.

Finally, it is noted that a local Councillor has written to local residents raising significant infrastructure concerns in relation to the proposed allocations of WHT037 and WHT044. Given the nature of the concerns raised and the matters at hand, which are based on previous issues experienced resulting from the implementation of other large housing sites in the immediate location, it is evident that there are underlying concerns which have not been properly considered in relation to these preferred sites. Until a thorough examination of the matters raised by the local Councillor is undertaken, it would be wrong for the Council to continue to support these sites.

I trust the detail above to be in order and I shall look forward to confirmation that our representation has been received and duly considered. Should the Council require any further information then I request that you do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely,

Adrian Burn

Adrian Burn
Concept Town Planning Ltd.

cc P. Chapman

Planning Policy Team
Shropshire Council
Shirehall,
Abbey Foregate
Shrewsbury
SY2 6ND



Chartered Town Planners

CONCEPT TOWN PLANNING LTD
CONCEPT HOUSE
7 SCOTLAND STREET
ELLESMERE
SY12 0DG
Tel: 01691 622500
mail@concepttownplanning.com

Dear Sirs

Re: Shropshire Council's Site Allocations and Management of Development – Preferred Option document 2018

This submission forms a representation to the above documents on behalf of the land owner in respect of the development potential of land to the north of The Grove, Whitchurch, for accommodating the future housing needs of Whitchurch. The site was promoted under the previous round of consultation and assessed with the Council reference WHIT035.

In November 2018 Shropshire Council issued their 'Site Allocations and Management of Development – Preferred Option' document in which it is identified that the Council favour the allocation of 4 sites referenced as WHIT014, WHIT037, WHIT042 and WHIT044. It is noted that WHIT037 and WHIT044 are promoted as conjoined sites with both reliant upon each other to overcome their individual identified deficiencies. In considering the preferred options against the land promoted on behalf of my client, we have examined the full evidence base accompanying the consultation document and associated appendices. Ultimately, I set out below the reasons and justification as to why the site WHIT035 should be considered to be a more favourable and sustainable option than those preferred by the Council and offers an entirely sustainable housing option for meeting the future housing needs of Whitchurch.

In considering the sustainability of the proposed site, the identified land is located adjacent to, and enjoys direct access onto, Tarporley Road, to the immediate north of The Grove. As evident from the development boundary plan for Whitchurch, would represent a natural expansion to the built form north of the town. Further, as stated in previous consultation, due to its prime location on the edge of the established built up area, the land also enjoys direct and convenient access to the services and amenities within Whitchurch Town Centre, including the public transport services provided at the Grove and London Road to the south. Given its location on one of the main arterial routes into Whitchurch, it is considered to be a highly sustainable and entirely sensible and logical location for new housing, in line with the aims and requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

In respect of the physical characteristics of the land, the site enjoys an extensive frontage onto Tarporley Road with ability to accommodate a fully compliant vehicular and pedestrian



Chartered Town Planners

access and it is considered that there would be no sustainable reasons why access would present an issue to the development of the land. In the context of identifiable site boundaries, the land has clearly definable boundaries in the form of established hedge and tree planting along the western and northern boundary. The southern boundary is formed by the historic railway line, beyond which are the residential properties of The Grove. The eastern boundary is defined by the carriageway with an existing residential property forming the northern boundary where the site fronts the road. Overall, it is evident that the land is well defined on all sides and thus, it is considered that the site can readily be developed in a manner which is consistent with the surrounding character and residential properties to the south, whilst also maintaining a defensible boundary to the open land to the north.

The land is also generally level in nature with no features, designations or overriding constraints to development, which cannot be appropriately safeguarded through the design of any built form on the site.

In examining the Council Strategic Land Availability Assessment (November 2018) (SLAA), which forms part of the evidence based to the Site Allocations Preferred Options documents, it is stated that the site is not currently considered suitable for development on the grounds that it is located in open countryside and contrary to planning policy. Whilst it is accepted that the site is presently in open countryside, we would contend that it is an entirely irrelevant comment since the review being undertaken comprises a reassessment of policy and its development boundaries. Further, 3 of the Council's preferred options are located outside of the development boundary, and so this cannot be seen as a sustainable or justifiable reason to not consider the subject site further.

The site is, however, recognised as having long term potential, subject to changes in policy and further detailed assessments/management of the physical, heritage and the environmental constraints present. It is also suggested that a visual impact landscape sensitivity assessment would be required for the site. Notwithstanding the long-term support stated, we would argue that there are justifiable reasons as to why the site should come forward as an allocation in the current review and within the current plan period, since the site is considered to represent a better alternative to the current sites preferred by the Council. This will be examined below.

In relation to the constraints reference above and in the Council's summary of the suitability of the site, these are all matters which would form standard design considerations as part of any future planning application, master plan or layout prepared for the site, and would be applicable considerations to any site, including the Council's preferred options. It is, therefore, unreasonable to identify these as potential constraints specific to the subject's site. There is also further reference to the need to provide evidence of an appropriate access to and into the site, and again this is something which would be required as a more detailed design stage and also applicable to all sites, including those preferred by the Council. However, what is evident is the fact that the site has a continuous frontage onto Tarporley Road with clear opportunity to attain access, whilst the site is also entirely open and free from any features or constraints and so, subject to appropriate safeguarding through

assessment and design considerations, at the appropriate time, the site can readily be considered suitable and an appropriate option under the current plan review.

In addition to the above, we have also considered the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and it is evident that the site performs better than those presently being favoured by the Council. The various criteria by which all sites have been assessed defines that the subject site has an overall score of -4 and the overall sustainability conclusion is that the site is a 'fair' option for meeting the housing needs of Whitchurch. The 3 main preferred housing allocations favoured by the Council each attain a sustainability score of -6 and so clearly all are less sustainable options than the subject site.

In the absence of any other identified constraint to WHIT035, which we would argue clearly do not exist, it is difficult to then understand why the site is only considered to only have long term potential and is not one of the Council's preferred options. Looking at matters very simply, the site is recognised by the Council as a more sustainable option under their own criteria and, since WHIT035 is available for development immediately with no identifiable constraints, it is a straight forward determination that the land should be included as part of the preferred option allocations.

Given the foregoing we consider that the preferred options document cannot be regarded as sound and a further review is required in order to more appropriately assess the preferred options and advance. Under a further a review it should be concluded that the land referenced as WHIT035 should form part of the Council's housing allocations for the period of the 2036.

Finally, in terms of the detail relating to the preferred options, it is interesting to note that WHIT044 was identified as a 'rejected site', in the SLAA yet somehow it has been advanced as a preferred housing option. Furthermore, it is identified that it is outside of and separated from the development boundary with a poor relationship to surrounding built form, hence it being considered not suitable. Whilst it is noted that the site has been conjoined with WHIT037 it is difficult to see how this makes the suitability of WHIT044 any better or better related to surrounding built form since this site is also an extension to the development boundary.

In addition, WHIT037 is dependent upon WHIT044 for appropriate access arrangements given that any additional housing traffic through the minor estate roads and onto Haroldgate would not be considered appropriate in light of the volume of homes now served. Given the significant individual failings it is not considered a reasonable proposition for both sites to be advanced.

With regards WHIT042, this site is landlocked as recognised in the SLAA and requires the full realisation of a previously allocated housing site to be developed first, before this site can be considered "available". As such, there are clear question marks over the deliverability of this allocation, in the defined plan period, and we would argue that it cannot be considered

a reasonable or deliverable option at this stage, particularly when other more available options exist.

I trust the detail above to be in order I shall look forward to confirmation that our representation has been received and duly considered. Should the Council require any further information then I request that you do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely,

R McAlder

Rebecca McAlder
Concept Town Planning Ltd.

Cc P. Chapman