

ID 10

SHROPSHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Representor unique Part A Ref *	A0609
Matter	1
Relevant questions nos	3, 4

Stage 1 Hearing Statement

*Your unique reference can be found in the Schedule of Respondents (Schedule 3 of document SD014.01) at:

<https://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-planning/local-plan-review/draft-shropshire-local-plan-2016-2038-examination/examination-library/earlier-regulation-18-plan-making-stages-of-consultation/regulation-19-pre-submission-draft-of-the-shropshire-local-plan-consultation/>

Hearing Statement – Matter 1 Legal/Procedural Requirements (Policy SP3)

Pegasus Group on behalf of Taylor Wimpey (UK) Limited.
Tasley Garden Village, Bridgnorth

Date: June 2022 | Rep ID: A0609 | Pegasus Ref: P20_1800_R007v1_PL_MAN_KR_JB

Author: Kate Roberts and Jonathan Burns





Contents.

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Matter 1: Questions.....	2



1. Introduction

- 1.1. Pegasus Group have been instructed on behalf of their client, Taylor Wimpey (UK) Limited, to prepare Statements in respect of their land interests at Tasley Garden Village, Bridgnorth. Tasley Garden Village is identified as an allocation with the draft Shropshire Local Plan as a comprehensive mixed use sustainable urban extension (BRDO30), identified under Policy S3 – Bridgnorth Place Plan Area.
- 1.2. This Statement deals with Matter 1 Legal/Procedural Requirements which addresses the following issue:

Issue – Whether the Council has complied with the relevant procedural and legal requirements?

2. Matter 1: Questions – Sustainability Appraisal

2.1. The following provides a response to some of those questions identified in the Stage 1 Matters, Issues and Questions document (ID7). These are dealt with in the order that they appear within ID7.

3. Does the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) test the Local Plan against the preferred options chosen and all reasonable alternatives?

2.2. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) tests the Local Plan against the preferred options chosen and all reasonable alternatives. We had previously raised concerns that some sites, such as the Stanmore Garden Village omission site, were considered in the SA site assessments as separate parcels. However, this is no longer the case, and this matter has been appropriately addressed and resolved through later iterations of the SA as the plan has evolved.

4. Have any concerns been raised with the SA methodology and what is the Council's response to these?

2.3. As noted in Paragraph 17 of the Council's response to ID1 and ID2 (Examination Ref. GC4), concerns have been raised relating to the SA scoring of sites set out in the SA. We welcome the confirmation from the Council that they have reviewed these comments and concluded that the corrections/changes would not alter any site's overall rating (i.e., whether they were considered as Poor, Fair or Good).

2.4. However, it is noted that as ratings were determined based on ranges for each settlement area (see Para 2.25–2.26 of SD006.01), it is unclear whether any corrections or changes made to the scoring would have affected the overall ranges for the relevant settlement area, and in turn would affect a specific site rating. As such, it would be useful for the Council to confirm the approach that they have taken when concluding that a site's overall rating would not be affected.

2.5. This is relevant as we have raised concerns regarding the scoring of some sites within the SA, within our regulation 19 representations (Chapter 8). To avoid unnecessary repetition, our concerns remain in respect of the following matters:

- Criterion 3 – tree preservation orders (TPO) – we have we have checked this with the relevant officers at Shropshire Council and can confirm that there are no TPO's within Tasley Garden Village or on the site boundary. As such, the site should have not been scored a minus for this criterion.
- Criterion 5 – children's playground (housing assessment only) – the site is within 480m of a children's playground.

2.6. Corrections made to these scorings would result in an overall sustainability score of –6 for housing, which remains in the 'fair' rating, and –5 for employment which would also still see it remain in the 'fair' rating.

2.7. To help resolve these matters it, or to make the process easier to understand, it would have been helpful for the mapping used for the site assessment process to be made available for each settlement area as part of the SA.



- 2.8. In addition to these concerns, there are some inconsistencies between the assessment matrix for the assessment of sites within the SA as set out at Table 10.1 (page 219) of the Sustainability Appraisal and Site Assessment Report (SDO06.01) and the actual site assessments contained within the SA Appendix D Bridgnorth Place Plan Site Assessment (SDO06.05). We briefly summarise these in the following text.
- 2.9. Firstly, Criterion 4 relates to services and facilities within the site. Table 10.1 of the SA contains the following services: primary school, GP surgery, community hall, leisure centre, children's playground, outdoor sports facility, amenity green space and accessible natural green space. However, this list is not replicated in Appendix D of the SA. Only the following services are listed in Appendix D: children's playground, outdoor sports facility, amenity green space and accessible natural green space.
- 2.10. The second inconsistency relates to Criterion 5. Table 10.1 of the SA includes a community hall as one of the services which could be within 480m of the site. In Appendix D however, a library is included instead of the community hall.
- 2.11. Thirdly, with regards to Criterion 6, Table 10.1 of the SA refers to the site boundary being within 480m of a bus stop however Appendix D considers the proximity of the site to a public transport node in general, as opposed to a bus stop specifically.
- 2.12. The final inconsistency between the Table 10.1 and Appendix D relates to Criterion 14. Table 10.1 sets the criteria of being within 100m of a Listed Building (either Grade I or Grade II). Appendix D however sets the criteria as being with 300m of a Listed Building.
- 2.13. We would ask that clarification is provided as to the correct site assessment criteria that has been used and whether or not the site assessments need to be updated. We raise these points to assist the Council.

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Manchester

Queens House, Queen Street,
Manchester, M2 5HT
T 0161 3933399
E Manchester@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Offices throughout the UK & Ireland

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE



All paper sources from sustainably managed forests

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: Querns Business Centre, Whitworth Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RT
We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001



[Pegasus_Group](#)



[pegasusgroup](#)



[Pegasus_Group](#)

PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK