which sets out how the Council will be seeking consultation standards above minimum regulatory requirements. It is therefore <u>not</u> considered consultations held after 6th April are invalid.

4. Question from Susan Howle

I was pleased to note that item 108 in "Summary of the Assessment of Garden Village Proposals in Bridgnorth to inform the 'Regulation 19' Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan" acknowledges that there is a conflict of interest between an IPU and TGV going ahead on the same site. Before putting TGV forward as the preferred option in the R19 SLP cabinet need to be certain that this conflict can be resolved. Planning Permission cannot be granted on a temporary basis revokable on a specific future event. Do cabinet agree that without an enforceable legal position to protect the preferred site for residential housing they must reject Tasley as the preferred option; unless they are prepared to first insist that the promoter withdraw their Planning Application for an IPU and second guarantee that should Planning Permission for an IPU be sought within the TGV site, once included in the SLP, it will be rejected?

The current planning application for poultry units (17/01033/EIA) is being considered separate from the emerging Local Plan process, and is being considered against its compliance with the current Local Plan and any other material planning considerations. However, it is appropriate for the Local Plan to take into account the potential consequences of a grant of approval for the Poultry units in or surrounding the proposed Tasley Garden Village site where the site assessment process has identified a potential conflict with the these uses. On this basis it has been considered appropriate to include specific reference within the developer guidelines of the site that any before occupation of the first dwelling on the site, any poultry units operating on the site or indeed land within the wider site promotion will cease operation.

5. Question from Lydia Bardsley, Clerk to Clive Parish Council

Clive Parish Council would like to highlight that the current points total for the hierarchy of settlements for Clive is based on facilities that do not exist and will not open again.

The bowling green listed was in a privately-owned garden that is no longer open to the public since a change in ownership two years ago. The village shop was in a privately-owned building and after the tenant surrendered the tenancy in October 2020 the premises will no longer be let as a shop, and will revert to private use by the owner.

Is Shropshire Council cabinet aware that the points allocation is based on historic information that is inaccurate? The Parish Council were consistently assured by Shropshire Planning Officers that if Clive fell below the points threshold, we would drop out of Community Hub status. Can the Cabinet explain why Clive is still allocated as a Community Hub in this version of the Local Plan?

The Parish Council are concerned that the consistent methodology is not being adopted across Shropshire and wonders how many other settlements are affected across the county.

The Council's approach to the identification of Community Hubs is guided by the application of a methodology contained in the 'Hierarchy of Settlements' document, which assessed the level of available services and facilities in an area. This has been applied on a consistent basis, and where appropriate has responded to changing levels of provision locally.

The current scoring for Clive includes the bowling green as an outdoor sports facility and the convenience store.

With regard to the bowling green, whilst it is recognised there is no active club currently using this space, this facility remains included within the Council's published Open Space Needs Assessment, and the removal of this facility will therefore need to be tested against either current or emerging Local Plan policy which, amongst other things, needs to show this facility is surplus to requirements. This is in line with general advice from Sport England. To this end, officers feel it continues to be appropriate to include this facility in the assessment.

With regard to the convenience store, whilst officers have received recent correspondence from the owner that he is not seeking to re-le following the recent departure of his tenant in October 2021, this has only very recently become the case, and indeed he has also confirmed that until October he was actively seeking to let the facility. Without further evidence of marketing more widely or suitable assurances about the potential future uses for the facility, on the balance of judgement it is felt it would therefore be premature to delete this facility from the assessment.

Whilst this is the current position of officers, it is recognised that the Council's methodology does require continued review, especially in light of any potential change to service provision resulting from the Covid 19 pandemic. The proposed consultation on the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan will allow parish councils to indicate if they consider the Council's approach to the

identification of Community Hubs is 'sound'. If there are concerns expressed, the Council has the ability to propose minor modifications to the Plan before submitting for Examination in March 2021. More substantial changes to the Plan (known as Main Modifications) can then be considered by the appointed Inspector, who as part of this process will be considering all representations made to the Plan at Regulation 19. It is therefore considered there continues to be suitable opportunities for the Plan to be reviewed in light of any updated evidence before it is adopted – likely to mid-2022. In the case of Clive, until the point of adoption, the settlement continues to be classified as 'Countryside' for the purposes of decision taking.

6. Question from Les Berryman

re Shropshire Local Plan : Tasley Garden Village

Taylor Wimpey has estimated an additional 600-700 vehicle movements per hour on the A458 Bridgnorth bypass during peak periods. This is a doubling of vehicle movements based on the latest published traffic survey data. Their estimate does not take into account the additional vehicle movements from the planned 500 dwelling SAMDEV development in Tasley.

The assessment of the garden village options for Bridgnorth states that the Tasley Garden Village development "***would have a significant impact on the surrounding highway network and mitigation measures would be required to manage this growth***."

What mitigation measures are planned and how much will they cost?

Will Shropshire Council be liable for the cost of these mitigation measures?

What are the traffic mitigation measure costs for the Stanmore Garden Village option that was originally Shropshire Councils preferred option?

As part of the Regulation 18 stage of plan preparation both Taylor Wimpy and the Stanmore Consortium have provided strategic Transport Assessments to support their respective site promotions. Due to the scale of both developments, it is likely that both would have a significant impact on the surrounding highway network and mitigation measures would be required to manage this growth. The conclusions of both proposals' Transport Assessments would support this conclusion, although it is also considered that either proposal is likely to have the ability to mitigate these impacts.

In proposing the Tasley Garden Village proposal for inclusion as an allocation within the Local Plan Review it is accepted that further assessment will be required to identity more precisely specific highway mitigation measures, and this requirement is included within the developer guidelines proposed for the