

Month / Year	Shropshire Plan Stage	date	event	Comments and Observations	ABCA
2016					
Sep-16					
23/01/17 to 20/03/17	Shropshire Issues and Strategic Options Consultation				
May-17					
Jun-17					
27/10/17 to 22/12/17	Shropshire Preferred Scale and Distribution of Development Consultation				
Jan-18					
Feb-18		14/02/18	BC Core Strategy Review DIC meeting. Shropshire attendee: Adrian Cooper	meeting organised and chaired by Black Country. Agenda: BC key issues and options and feedback from their consultation; ongoing engagement by BC with their DIC partners. No record of discussions or actions	
Mar-18		13/03/18	WMCA Housing Deal meeting Shropshire attendees: Gemma Davies, Liam Cowden and Adrian Cooper	meeting arranged by Shropshire following BCCS meeting, to discuss the potential for any new settlement in Shropshire to contribute to housing or employment land shortfall for WMCA. No evidence of the scale of the shortfall being considered or the approach that Shropshire propose to take to consider the ability for any new settlement proposed to meet that need. From the email correspondence arranging the meeting (Adrian Cooper Shropshire 28/02/18) and calendar invitation from Shropshire, it appears that Shropshire is considering a new settlement regardless of need arising from the WMCA. It does not appear that it is the consideration of the unmet need which is driving the consideration of whether to consider a new settlement no notes of discussion or actions. No evidence of any process to be undertaken by Shropshire to assess what amount of WMCA housing and employment need it could accommodate with or without a new settlement.	
		12/07/18	Letter from ABCA to other LPA (unknown distribution) requesting if the receiving LPA can accommodate any amount of the 20,000 houses and 300ha employment land shortfall in the BC, and whether any sites due to their location and accessibility could be attributed to meeting BC need.	the request to Shropshire Council is twofold: to consider what amount of the shortfall it is able to accommodate taking account of the expected shortfall of 20,000 homes and 300ha of employment land. And to consider whether any of the sites which are being promoted to the Shropshire Plan are able to contribute to meeting BC needs due to their location and accessibility. There is no evidence in the following chronology of Shropshire ever considering what amount of the unmet BC need it could accommodate, or evidence of any methodology or undertaking to do so. Neither is there evidence of Shropshire specifically considering as a criteria of any assessment process whether any of the sites being promoted to the Shropshire Plan could have a role to play in meeting all or part of the BC need due to the location and accessibility. There is no evidence of such consideration being given any weight or being made at all in the chronology of evidence put forward by Shropshire.	
		13/07/18	BC Core Strategy Review Launch Event. Shropshire attendee: Dan Corden	event appears in summary table submitted by Shrsophire to the Examination, but not in the bundle. Attendance at the launch event of the BC Plan is not evidence of cooperation by any measure.	
Jul-18		27/07/18	email reply from Shropshire to ABCA letter of 12/07/18.	Shropshire note that they have adopted a new Economic Growth Strategy. That SEGS forms part of the evidence base to this Plan review which Bradford Estates has cross referenced in its representations and matter statements. SEGS has a first immediate action of Shropshire participating in the WMCA and focusing on the key areas of collaboration set out in the WMCA Strategic Economic Plan to 2030, to accelerate economic growth, employment and productivity and focus on mutual priority actions, including the Land Commission and Growth Company. The direct relevance of the newly adopted SEGS immediate actions was not highlighted or referenced in Shropshire's reply. That SEGS priority action is entirely aligned with responding to ABCA's request for consideration of housing and employment numbers and considering whether any sites being promoted to Shropshire could contribute to meeting BC need through location and accessibility. other objectives of the SEGS include prioritising future deliverable sites based upon return on investment (p8). There is no evidence of Shropshire considering individually or cumulatively the benefits of allocation of Bradford Estates J3 site to contribute towards BC needs and SEGS objectives. Shropshire states it will be bold, ambitious and forward thinking in its approach to prioritising sites in locations key to its growth strategy (p9) but there is no evidence it has acted upon its stated commitment, or that it has applied that commitment to the DIC request from ABCA. SEGS also states a commitment to ensure housing supply supports the SEGS including the allocation of strategic sites. These objectives and commitments from the SEGS which have direct synergy and mutual benefit with the DIC request from ABCA are not referenced in this reply or in any way pursued in the subsequent evidence, despite the Shrsophire letter acknowledging the functional economic relationship and having comissioned the M54 strategic options study.	
		04/09/18	GBHMA request of SC to confirm its previous statement that Shropshire's planned high growth strategy requires net in migration with the West Mids being the principal source of net migration (to Shropshire).	The Preferred High Growth strategy is expected to provide 3,350 homes above Shropshire's need to accept such migration.	
Sep-18		07/09/18	SC email response, SC do NOT support the text of the proposed GBBCHMA Housing Position Statement.	Shropshire amended text to state Shropshire is planning for housing above its local housing need but the amount of over provision and source of expected in migration deleted. SC state an agreement for SC to take part of GBBC HMA shortfall would need to be subject to a formal SoCG which also recognised the the implications of such growth for employment, facilities, services, and infrastructure. The email acknowledges that some housing growth will come from inward migration, but there is no proposal to quantify that or consider the effects of increasing or decreasing it. There is no subsequent evidence of such an assessment having been made.	
Oct-18		09/10/18	Shropshire catch-up meeting between Adrian Cooper (SC) and Ian Culey (Wolverhampton) to discuss issues of housing and employment land in the BC and cross boundary implications from growth options in the M54 corridor.	Actions for SC: to share MoD plans for Cosford; share SC position statement on development in the M54 corridor when available; share GVA M54 corridor study when available. There is no subsequent evidence of how any of these items was considered by SC together with ABCA or South Staffs. The approach appears to be that SC would undertake the M54 study with GVA, and reach its position statement on development proposals in the M54 corridor and then report the conclusions to ABCA. There is no suggestion in the actions that ABCA would be consulted and its views considered before the conclusions are drawn.	
		06/12/18	GBBCHMA meeting, agenda & summary notes provided.	SC planning for more than minimum housing due to armed forces & student need and to support higher levels of economic growth. M54 corridor study to report in new year. J3 employment proposal yet to be determined - focus on Cosford, possibly to be accompanied by some additional housing provision, which could address shortfall in GBBCHMA albeit to back end of plan period. Despite justifying over provision of housing for reasons including supporting higher levels of economic growth, there is nothing in the evidence to show how the effect on the economy of that additional housing provision has been assessed. There is no evidence of assessment of a different amount of additional housing provision to assess whether that would provide additional benefit for the economy, and no evidence of assessment of where that additional housing should be provided in order to generate benefit for the economy.	
29/11/18 to 08/02/19	Shropshire Preferred Sites Consultation				
		08/02/19	ABCA response to SC Preferred Sites Consultation (Reg 18).	ABCA reiterate the BC shortfall of 22,000 dwellings and 300ha employment land. ABCA support SC supporting growth of neighbouring areas specifically the BC because ABCA perceived this was acknowledgement by SC of the opportunity for it to accommodate mutually supportive cross boundary growth; seek findings of M54 corridor study strategic housing and employment opportunities; support growth in the M54 corridor around Cosford and the opportunity it affords to accommodate BC needs. there is no subsequent evidence that SC carried out any assessment of the mutual benefits of accommodating growth in the M54 corridor and no evidence of how such benefits might be influenced by the amount and locatio of growth that SC could accommodate in the M54 corridor.	
Mar-19		20/03/19	SC Cabinet. Consideration of Strategic Developmetn Sites.	Cabinet approved further engagement with stakeholders to develop proposals for Ironbridge Power Station and Clive Barracks strategic development sites; and approved in principle to explore benefits of SC accepting housing from ABCA and engage further with the promoter of land at M54 J3 and neighbouring Authorities to develop proposals to meet BCA needs. There is no evidence of any assessment by SC of the benefits of accepting housing to meet BCA needs, and no evidence of SC assessing what proportion of the BC unmet need it could accommodate, or what the mutual benefits of doing so would be, or where to do so and whether it would be better to identify specific sites for contributing to BCA needs. There is no evidence of how the evidence which the promoter of J3 provided to the SC has been considered prior to the rejection of the J3 site.	
		11/04/19	GBBCHMA meeting	Agenda includes GBBC HMA shortfall progress - Notes on which fully redacted. BC Plan to consider green belt assessment in June. SC Plan Strategic Sites consultation to be later in 2019. no other information. There is no evidence at this meeting of SC doing anything to further the resolution of SC Cabinet of 20/03/19 to engage with neighbouring Authorities to develop proposals to meet BCA needs	
Apr-19		26/04/19	SC letter of response to ABCA representations of 09/02/19.	Reports Cabinet decision of 20/03/19 to explore the benefits of accepting a proportion of unmet development needs from BCA,. Request for evidence to support case for allocation of land at J3. ABCA provided the requested evidence (and cross referenced the evidence provided by Bradford Estates) by letter dated 13/05/19. There is no subsequent evidence of SC considering that evidence or working with ABCA or Bradford Estates to consider how the J3 proposal (or any other proposal) could help to meet BCA needs.	
May-19		13/05/19	ABCA response providing evidence and further information.	ABCA identify the alignment of M54 potential with WMCA Strategic Investment and Delivery Plan. ABCA identify the additional need for strategic employment sites to serve BC identified by WMSESS.	
		11/07/19	SC officer update to councillor on meeting with ABCA the same day.	SC report that BCA shortfall set to increase to 25,000 homes and 380ha of employment land. BC keen to support SC in seeking investment for strategic infrastructure in M54 from WMCA but to manage the presentation of that position so that WMCA not seen to be supporting development in the green belt. There is no mention of any assessment to be undertaken by SC to consider how it should respond to the increased need that ABCA has identified or any other action for SC other than the intent to prepare a statement of common ground	
01/07/19 to 09/09/19	Shrosphire Strategic Sites Consultation				
		09/09/19	ABCA response to consultation.	M54 J3 site supported by ABCA for "game changing housing and economic development opportunity". Response provided by ABCA to each of the matters stated by SC to require resolution prior to SC selecting the site as a preferred location	
		19/09/19	GBBCHMA meeting, agenda only provided.	GBBCHMA position statement, SoCG scoping note, and local plan updates. Two different sets of notes for 5 November GBBCHMA meeting. Perhaps the first in the bundle is this meeting? Summary notes state BC expects reduced capacity for housing as a result of urban capacity review. BCA to provide update by end October. SC has completed strategic site consultation, the SC Reg 19 plan scheduled for March 2020. Meeting notes on statement of common ground scoping are redacted. The notes record no actions for SC to carry out any assessment or consideration of how it can contribute to meeting BCA needs, and report no output of any such assessment.	
		30/09/19	Letter from ABCA endorsing the response to Strategic Site consultation sent by Wolverhampton on behalf of ABCA dated 09/09/19.		
Oct-19					

[illegible]

Nov-19		05/11/19	GBBCHMA meeting.	<p>Summary action notes state: BC evidence on green belt and urban capacity will be published after general election. BC Reg 18 BCP Autumn 2020. SC Preferred Option may be delayed awaiting BCP evidence refresh. Decision on M54 J3 strategic proposal not yet reported to members for consideration.</p> <p>increase in BC shortfall of 6,500 dwellings due to employment land redevelopment previously expected now not expected to come forward. Discounting of SHLAA sites expected to reduce BC capacity by a further 5,000 dwellings. BC evidence critical to justify other LPA going beyond local housing need (South Staffs, Lichfield and Shropshire)</p> <p>the only action from the meeting is for the BCA to share its evidence of need. There are no actions for SC to consider that evidence once received. The evidence was presented by BCA to a meeting on 11/12/19</p>		
Dec-19		05/12/19	GBBCHMA Agenda dated Tuesday 5 December 2019	appears to be error and relate to Tuesday 5 November as provided with 5 November summary notes and 5 December 2019 was a Thursday		
		11/12/19	GBBCHMA meeting, summary action note:	Focus of the meeting to receive presentations on the BC Urban Capacity Refresh and Green Belt /Landscape Assessment. Position statement on that refresh redacted.		
Jan-20						
Feb-20		12/02/20	GBBCHMA meeting	Summary action note: BC figures require adjustment for net demolitions. Everything else redacted.		
					27/02/20	letter from SC requesting assistance with meeting need. Page 2 (p50 of bundle) acknowledges that the strategic importance of the east of the County and particularly the M54 corridor, justifies growth in the green belt. final decision on whether to include M54 J3 in the Plan to be made in May. Request from SC for assistance in meeting its development needs.
Mar-20					17/03/20	CEC reply to request. Decline to assist due to CEC being a self contained HMA and CEC not yet understanding its own needs
Apr-20		28/04/20	Eddie West and Ian Culley Catch-up.	No agenda or minutes provided		
May-20		21/05/20	Eddie West and Ian Culley Catch-up.	No agenda or minutes provided		
Jul-20		12/07/20	Letter from SC to ABCA (dated 12/07/22 sent by email 07/07/20).	<p>SC acknowledge significant proportion of BC housing and employment needs cannot be accommodated in BC. Functional linkages between Shropshire and BC recognised. SC propose to accept 1,500 of BC housing need within SC [existing] housing requirement and delivered in accordance with the overall strategic approach to distribution of growth. The additional housing [not additional] would not be accommodated on a single site and not anticip[ated] to require any further loss of green belt. Offer to formalise through SOCG.</p> <p>To this point there is no evidence of how the figure of 1,500 homes has been arrived at. The 1,500 homes are not additional provision to be made by SC, but instead offered as justification for provision which SC proposed to make in any event. The offer is made on the undersatnding that it will require no additional land to be released from the green belt and no specific site will be identified as contributing to the BCA need.</p>		
		20/07/20	SC Cabinet. Minutes provided.	<p>Cabinet accepted principles of SC accepting 1,500 dwellings from ABCA as part of the DIC and for these to be incorporated into Shropshire's overall housing requirement and distributed in accordance with the overall strategic approach to distribution of growth.</p> <p>There is no explanation of how the figure of 1,500 was arrived at.</p>		
		Jul-20	GBBCHMA Housing Need and Land Supply Position Statement.	No indication of how this was considered or by whom. Just included in bundle. 3.9 states the Shroshire Draft Plan Reg 18 July 2020 proposes a contribution of 1,500 dwellings towards BC shortfall. 4.3 acknowledges shortfalls have only been tested to 2031 but it is celar that there is further shortfall post 2031. How to meet that shortfall will be the subject of ongoing DTC discussions. 6.3 The BC shortfall alone is 28,260. Scope for contributions from Shropshire outside the HMA but with strong links to the GBBCHMA is noted. Appendix 2 states the BC Urban Capacity Review estimates that up to 2,370 homes could be brought forward in the urban area which is not reflected in the figures above.		
Aug-20	Shropshire Regulation 18: Pre-Submission Draft Consultation	04/08/20	ABCA letter to SC and others	Provides an update on strategic issues of housing and employment needs arising over the BC plan period and request SC to confirm if emerging LP is seeking to deliver levels of housing / employment in excess of local needs on non-GB and GB land. Mention of developing SoCG. BC housing shortfall 27,000 homes, employment shortfall 292ha - 570ha. Potential housing contributions from South Staffs, Lichfield, Cannock and Shropshire identified. Employment had only one potential contribution from West Midlands Interchange. response requested within 2 months		
		17/08/20	Edward West and Ian Culley DTC catch-up meeting following ABCA letter of 04/08/20 and Planning White paper	no notes of discussion		
		24/09/20	Edward West and Ian Culley DTC catch-up. No notes.	no notes of discussion		
		29/09/20	SC email to ABCA with draft of letter proposed to be issued by SC to ABCA.	draft letter confirms empployment land target of 300ha for SC does not include contribution to BC needs and has required SC to release land from green belt. That target of 300Ha and proposal to release green belt having been made ahead of consideration of providing any employment land towards BCA needs. SC willing to consider principle of contributing employment land provided it does not take provision above the already planned 300ha and does not compromise the urban focus strategy of the Shropshire Plan.		
		30/09/20	ABCA response to Shropshire LP Reg 18 Consultation.	ABCA object to the plan due to lack of provision of employment land to meet BC unmet need. ABCA note their previous support for M54 J3 has not been responded to by the draft plan. Support the housing figure of 30,800 incorporating 1,500 for the BC. Agreed as a positive approach to cross border cooperation. Allocations in principal settlements in the easetrn area closest to BC including Shifnal and Bridgnorth considered well placed to meet this need. However, concern at lack of trigger for review of plan in light of low rate of delivery or increased need. BC employment shortfall 263ha - 500ha. Evidence gap in how SC need and planned provision of 300ha calculated. Note information submitted by Bradford Estate in relation to M54 J3 and request further engagement with SC through DTC to explore employment land and J3.		
Oct-20		22/10/20	Ian Culley ABCA , Eddie West SC catch up meeting.	no notes of discussion		
Nov-20		13/11/20	Local Plan catch-up meeting.	no notes of discussion		
Dec-20		14/12/20	email exchange Ian Culley ABCA and Eddie West SC re Shropsire Reg 19 consultation date and diarising meeting to deal with SOCG.	the focus of dialgue now appears to be to put in place a statement of common ground.		
		07/12/20	SC Cabinet. Minutes provided.	<p>Cabinet agreed principle of SC accepting up to 30ha of employment need from ABCA and to distribute in accordance with draft policy SP2. 5.25 This acceptance of need will NOT require identification of additional land. 5.24 SC planned 300ha is beyond is baseline need which is deliberate to deliver a step change in economic growth as proposed by the Economic Growth Strategy. Reconsideration of M54 J3 Bradford Estates proposal for a strategic employmet site only with no housing, rejected on basis that there is insufficient justification to release this land from the green belt.</p> <p>There is no evidence of prior assessment of how much employment land SC could accommodate towards the BCA unmet need. The evidence confirms that no additional land is proposed to be allocated towards BCA needs beyond that which was already allocated for SC needs. The evidence confirms that no sites are proposed to be allocated specficially to meet BCA needs. There is therefore no evidence of response to the size or location requirements of BCA need, and no evidence of mutual benefits, or how accommodating BCA needs in Shropshire could benefit growth in Shropshire, growth in the BC or other mutual benefits as SC had undertaken to do in accordance with SEG5.</p> <p>The evidence states that SC considered there were not exceptional circumstances and insufficient need to remove land from the green belt as its justification for rejection of the opportunity promoted by Bradford Etsates at M54 J3. However, the evidence is that SC had already concluded that there were exceptional circumstances justifying the release of land from the green belt for employment and housing. There is no evidence of assessment of the relative benefits for either Shropshire or the BCA of the allocation of additional green belt land at J3 either instead of or in addition to allocations proposed elsewhere. Para 5.26 states that SC has weighed up the benefits of allocating J3, but there is no evidence of that assessment being presented to Cabinet for its consideration, and no evidence of that assessment of benefits at all.</p>		
18/12/20 to 06/02/21	Shropshire Regulation 19 Pre-Submission consultation	11/01/21	Local plan catch-up meeting.	no notes of discussion		
Feb-21						
Mar-21					18/03/21	SC forwarded draft SoCG to CEC. Email exchanges to agree scope and content of the SoCG
Apr-21						
May-21						
Jun-21		30/06/21	SC issued draft SoCG to ABCA	"setting out where we are with the process to now". SC seek ABCA officer support to defend BC evidence at Shropshire examination. SC reject any modifications in response to ABCA request for review trigger. SC suggest that programme of BC plan being 2 years behind Shropshire negates need for review trigger as Shropshire will have to review its plan in 2026.	24/06/21	Agreement of SoCG (signed by CEC Head of Planning)
Jul-21		15/07/21	email from SC to ABCA	confirmation that SC consider the DTC has been fulfilled and will be closed once ABCA board ratify the SOCG on 28/07/21.		
03/09/21 Sep-21	Shropshire Plan submission					
Apr-22		26/04/22	letter from ABCA providing update on unmet housing and employment land need and potential contributions from other LPA.	<p>None of the potential contributions which in total range from 3,500 to 10,000 are certain. ABCA estimates 8,000 of that number could be allocated to BC needs. Even with the potential contributions (including from SC) the unmet need remains over 18,000 - 24,500 homes. Additional earlier stage potential contributions add up to 8,700 homes. ABCA estimates upto 16,700 homes could be contributed which would still leave a shortfall of 11,500 homes. Employment contributions are the potenmtial 30ha from SC and an asserted 67ha from West Midlands Interchange [which has not been offered by South Staffs]. The outstanding shortfall after these potential contributions is 108ha. ABCA seek contributions to addressing its unmet need for housing and employment land, participation in work to address recommendations of WMSESS for strategic employment land; participation in SOCG, and early review mechanism in the Local Plan to enable consideration of additional requirements from the above requests.</p> <p>The evidence is that ABCA continues to have very substantial unmet needs for housing and employment and at the point of the submission of the Shropshire Plan there is no evidence of a joined up consideration by SC together with other LPA of how that BCA need could be met overall or how much of that need could be accommodated by Shropshire and the benefits of doing so.</p>		

[illegible]

[illegible]

Stafford		Telford and Wrekin		Wrexham		Wyre Forest	
date	event	date	event	date	event	date	event
		undated	DTC checklist for Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011 - 2031. Both SC and T&WC consider they are self contained HMA, but there is net migration each year from T&WC to SC. SC and T&WC agree no cross boundary issues for employment				
		06/09/16	DIC meeting, suggested agenda provided - identification of cross boundary issues.				
17/03/17	SBC response to Issues and Strategic Options Consultation, no proposals that will affect the Borough					23/02/17	DIC meeting, no agenda or meeting provided.
				19/05/17	DIC meeting. Notes provided. Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Pontcysyllte Aqueduct identified as matters of strategic cross border significance.		
		06/11/17	Shropshire preferred options consultation meeting, no agenda or minutes provided.				
08/12/17	SBC response to Consultation on Preferred Scale and Distribution of Development. SBC consider there are no strategic cross border issues.						
29/01/18	SC and SBC DIC meeting. No agenda or minutes.	30/01/18	T&WC response to SC Preferred Site Allocations Consultation. Cross boundary matters identified as being: highways M54 J4, increased flood risk, waste and water resources				
		24/07/18	Marches LEP Infrastructure meeting. Agenda includes housing and commercial land sites, energy, transport, broadband. No notes of meeting.				
						25/01/19	Letter from WFC to SC with comments on SC LP review. Comments on net additional housing of 10,250, Higleys allocation causing increased congestion, Cleobury Mortimer NP, welcome employment land and protection of GB
		09/09/19	Reg 18 Consultation Response. T&WC response to SC Strategic Site Allocations Consultation. Clarification requested on former Ironbridge power station, extent of GB release for RAF Cosford, long term use of airfield of Clive Barracks. T&WC oppose development of the land at M54 J3 individually and cumulatively with RAF Cosford.				
		19/09/19	GBBCHMA meeting, agenda only provided. GBBCHMA position statement. SoCG scoping note, and local plan updates. Two different sets of notes for 5 November GBBCHMA meeting. Perhaps the first in the bundle is this meeting? Summary notes state BC expects reduced capacity for housing as a result of urban capacity review. BCA to provide update by end October. SC has completed strategic site consultation. Reg 19 plan scheduled for March 2020.				
		24/09/19	DIC catch-up meeting between SC and T&WC.				
						15/10/19	DIC meeting, no agenda or minutes.

		11/12/19	GBBCHMA meeting. summary action note: Focus of the meeting to receive presentations on the BC Urban Capacity Refresh and Green Belt /Landscape Assessment. Position statement on that refresh redacted.				
		12/02/20	GBBCHMA meeting. Summary action note: BC figures require adjustment for net demolitions. Everything else redacted.				
27/02/20	letter from SC requesting assistance with meeting need. Page 2 (p50 of bundle) acknowledges that the strategic importance of the east of the County and particularly the M54 corridor, justifies growth in the green belt. final decision on whether to include M54 J3 in the Plan to be made in May. Request from SC for assistance in meeting its development needs.	27/02/20	letter from SC requesting assistance with meeting need. Page 2 (p50 of bundle) acknowledges that the strategic importance of the east of the County and particularly the M54 corridor, justifies growth in the green belt. final decision on whether to include M54 J3 in the Plan to be made in May. Request from SC for assistance in meeting its development needs.	27/02/20	letter from SC requesting assistance with meeting need. Page 2 (p50 of bundle) acknowledges that the strategic importance of the east of the County and particularly the M54 corridor, justifies growth in the green belt. final decision on whether to include M54 J3 in the Plan to be made in May. Request from SC for assistance in meeting its development needs.	27/02/20	letter from SC requesting assistance with meeting need. Page 2 (p50 of bundle) acknowledges that the strategic importance of the east of the County and particularly the M54 corridor, justifies growth in the green belt. final decision on whether to include M54 J3 in the Plan to be made in May. Request from SC for assistance in meeting its development needs.
16/03/20	SBC respond to letter dated 27/02/2020. SBC support development in the M54 corridor to strengthen links with West Midlands conurbation. Low levels of functional linkage between SBC and SC areas, therefore SBC decline to accept any Shropshire housing need	03/03/20	SC and T&WC DiC meeting, no agenda or minutes provided.				
		06/05/20	Email exchange between SC to T&WC regarding housing standard method calculations update as T&WC proposing a housing needs study.				
						29/09/20	Reg18 Pre-Submission Consultation response from WFC. Comments made on cross boundary issue. Concern about traffic impact from development near LPA boundary. WFC identify potential for further out migration of employemnt from Wyre Forest.
						13/11/20	Email correspondence. SC response to WTC concerns on boundary impact traffic. Arranging a meeting to discuss SoCG for wic 30/11/2020. No date finalised in emails but last proposal 04/12/20
		14/12/20	SC and T&WC meeting to discuss strategic matters including housing need, gypsy and traveller sites, GB review, M54/A5, Ironbridge Power Station.				
		18/12/20	Post 14/12/2020 meeting email requesting update on SoCG.				
				14/01/21	Draft of SoCG sent. Email reiterated that following previous discussions, there was no significant cross-boundary impacts and all matters were agreed		
		24/02/21	Reg 19 Consultation representation	19/02/21	SoCG signed off. SC amended following comments from WC towards removal of Gypsy and Traveller Site near Liay and Development Management Policy	11/02/21	Reg 19 Consultation representation
19/03/21	Email from SC to arrange discussion/meeting of SoCG						
22/03/21	SC and SBC DiC meeting. No agenda or minutes.						
25/05/21	SC sent signed SoCG to SBC			25/05/21	Agreement of the submitted SoCG		
28/05/12	Agreement of the submitted SoCG						
		19/07/21	Draft SoCG sent to T&WC				
		21/07/21	Draft SoCG catch up meeting with SC and T&WC. SC attendees: Edward West and Dan Corden			25/08/21	Draft SoCG sent to WFC. Included SC summary of WFC Reg 19 Reps and SC response
		27/07/21	email from T&WC with comments on draft SoCG and response from SC. SC state that 1,500 dwellings allocation for Shifnal is mainly existing completions and commitments with only 230 dwellings allocated and 92 windfalls allowed for. That with a single employment site of 39ha stated to be very moderate growth levels.				
		31/08/21	Agreement of the submitted SoCG				
						15/12/21	Agreement on the submitted SoCG