

# SHROPSHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

## Stage 1 Hearing Statement

<b>Representor unique Part A Ref *</b>	<b>A0118</b>
<b>Matter</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Relevant questions nos</b>	<b>29</b>

\*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/>

# Shropshire Local Plan 2016-2038 Hearing Statement

## Matter 4 – Housing and Employment Land Needs (Policy SP2)

Land at Boraston Drive and A456, Burford

Prepared by Fisher German LLP on behalf of Barratt Homes (West Midlands)

## Project Title

Land adjoining Boraston Drive and north of A456, Burford

## Agent

Fisher German LLP

## Contact details

The Estates Office

Norman Court

Ashby de la Zouch

LE65 2UZ

# Contents

1. Introduction .....	4
2. Question 29 .....	5

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Hearing Statement has been prepared by Fisher German on behalf of Barratt Homes (West Midlands) regarding land in their control, adjoining Boraston Drive and north of A456, Burford as illustrated at Figure 1 below.
- 1.2 At Regulation 19 stage, the site was previously promoted by Lone Star Land (a land promotion company). However, we wish to make the Inspector’s aware that Barratt Homes West Midlands are now promoting the site and will be the developer of the proposed dwellings.
- 1.3 The land is a proposed housing allocation within the emerging Local Plan under Reference BUR004, within Schedule S10.2(i) – Residential Site Allocations: Community Hubs in the Ludlow Place Plan Area.



Figure 1: Land adjacent to Boraston Drive and the A456, Burford

- 1.4 The proposed allocation is supported and Barratt Homes West Midlands are fully committed to the delivery of housing at BUR004.
- 1.5 We note from correspondence with the Programme Officer that we are not eligible to appear at the Stage 1 Hearings. Nevertheless, we wish to highlight that we would welcome an opportunity to appear at any subsequent Further Hearings, should the Inspectors deem it appropriate.

## 2. Question 1

Is the preferred approach to housing growth and the housing requirement set out in Policy SP2 of 30,800 dwellings (1,400 dwellings per annum) over the plan period of 2016 to 2038, justified, positively prepared and consistent with national policy?

- 2.1 The preferred approach to housing growth and the housing requirement in Policy SP2 is justified, positively prepared and consistent with national policy.
- 2.2 In determining the minimum number of homes needed, paragraph 61 of the NPPF states that strategic policies should be informed by Local Housing Need (LHN) as derived from the Standard Methodology. In addition, to the local housing need figure, paragraph 61 of the Framework is clear that any needs that cannot be met in neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.
- 2.3 The PPG is clear that when establishing a housing requirement “*the standard method for assessing local housing need provides a **minimum starting point** in determining the number of homes needed in an area... Therefore, there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates*” [our emphasis] (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 2a-010-20201216). Examples of scenarios which may justify an increase of housing requirement include growth strategies, the delivery strategic infrastructure improvements or the requirement of an authority to take on unmet need from a neighbouring authority.
- 2.4 The 30,800 dwelling requirement proposed by the Plan represents a ‘high growth scenario’, above the 25,894 dwelling Local Housing Need figure derived from the Standard Methodology. This higher housing figure is supported and will provide flexibility in the supply and ensure sufficient homes can be provided to support the Council’s wider aim of increased economic growth and productivity during the plan period (which is also complemented by the Council’s overprovision of employment land).
- 2.5 The housing requirement also delivers 1,500 dwellings to support the housing needs of the Black Country. This contribution has been agreed in a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between the Black Country Authorities and Shropshire Council. This approach of planning for the Black Country’s unmet needs is wholly in accordance with paragraph 61 of the NPPF.

- 2.6 Moreover, paragraph 35 of the NPPF outlines that in order for plans to be ‘positively prepared’ they must as a minimum seek to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs; but also be “*informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated **where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development***” [added emphasis]. The Council’s approach of integrating the additional 1,500 homes to their wider housing requirements for Shropshire is consistent with achieving sustainable development, as it ensures that the additional homes will be delivered and distributed in accordance with the proposed spatial strategy. As outlined within our response to Matter 3, Question 3, the distribution of growth outlined in Policy SP2 is both ‘Urban Focused’ but also allows the rural areas to accommodate a not insignificant level of growth.
- 2.7 Regarding the Council’s preferred approach to housing growth, we support that Policy SP2 recognises the importance of ensuring the long-term sustainability of rural communities. As such, growth in urban areas will be complemented by appropriate new development within Community Hubs, (such as Burford) which are considered “significant rural service centres”. This is fully in accordance with paragraph 79 of the NPPF which encourages new homes to be located where they will “*enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities*”. Moreover, this paragraph also requires planning policies to “*identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services*” (emphasis added).
- 2.8 Policy SP2 identifies Burford as a Community Hub Settlement. However, as the Council have set out within the Hierarchy of Settlements Assessment (2020), Burford is a very sustainable rural settlement; indeed, it achieves a score that would enable it to be scored as a Key Centre. Within Burford there are a wide range of existing services and facilities, including a primary school, pre-school, sports club, pub, a petrol station with shop and a community hospital. Moreover, there are significant existing employment opportunities within Burford at the Upper and Lower Teme Business Parks, including the Kerry Foods Factory.
- 2.9 However, because many of the services attributed to Burford’s score are located within adjoining Tenbury Wells, it was considered appropriate to identify the settlement as a Community Hub rather than a Key Centre. For example, within Tenbury, there are a wide range of shops (including a supermarket) available on Teme Street/Market Street. Moreover, there are other services, such as a further primary school, a secondary school, library, doctors, dentists, a cinema/theatre and a swimming pool. In combination with the services available in adjoining Tenbury, Burford is therefore a highly sustainable location for development. We accept this rationale behind the identification of Burford as a Community Hub and consider this to be a justified approach. However, we do consider that the immediate proximity of services and facilities in Tenbury Wells **should not be forgotten** in

recognising the sustainability of Burford, as it is more sustainable than a typical Community Hub Settlement.

- 2.10 Burford has been attributed 190 dwellings which is the highest 'Residential Guideline' attributed to Community Hubs in the Ludlow Place Plan Area. Given the range of facilities and services in Burford and its close proximity to Tenbury, this higher residential guideline is considered fully appropriate and justified.