

**ID28**

**Shropshire Council. Examination of Shropshire Local Plan 2016-2038**

**Inspectors:** Louise Crosby MA MRTPI, Carole Dillon BA (Hons) MRTPI and Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

**Programme Officer:** Kerry Trueman

Tel: 07582 310364, email: [programme.officer@shropshire.gov.uk](mailto:programme.officer@shropshire.gov.uk)

---

Mr West  
Planning Policy  
Shropshire Council  
PO BOX 4826  
Shrewsbury  
SY1 9LJ

15 February 2023

Dear Mr West

**Inspectors' Interim Findings following stage 1 hearings sessions**

1. Set out below are our interim findings in relation to a number of matters following the stage 1 hearing sessions in July last year and January this year. Some of these findings require the Council to do additional work and some are just confirming Main Modifications (MMs) that were agreed at the hearings and other matters that were discussed, such as updating the evidence base.

*Duty to Cooperate (DtC)*

2. Following the hearing sessions, we wrote to you on 26 July 2022 (ID17) asking for you to provide more information in relation to the DtC and the activities that took place in relation to this prior to the submission of the Plan for examination.
3. We have now received this and had a chance to consider it and hear from the Council and representors on the matter at a further hearing session on 17 January 2023. Consequently, we can confirm that we are satisfied that the Council has met the legal duty set out in Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), in so far as it imposes a duty on a local planning authority to co-operate with other local planning authorities, the County Council and prescribed bodies or other persons by engaging constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in relation to the preparation of a development plan document so far as relating to a strategic matter to maximise the effectiveness of the activity of plan preparation. Therefore, the examination can proceed.

## Next Steps

4. Before we proceed to stage 2 hearing sessions there are a number of matters where we consider more work is necessary to make the plan sound and these are set out below. We have also taken this opportunity to set out our thoughts on other matters which we said we would give further thought to at stage 2 of the examination.

## *Plan Period*

5. During the matter 1 hearing session the Council agreed to consider whether the Plan period and Local Housing Needs Assessment should be aligned along with any implications of doing so, including those relating to the Housing Requirement set out in policy SP2 and the supply of sites identified in Policies S1 to S21. Please advise what stage the Council have reached with this.

## *Saved Policies*

6. During the matter 3 hearing session the Council agreed to review the means by which the necessary SAMDev policies would be “saved” to ensure that they will, as intended, remain extant for Development Management purposes should the Plan be adopted. Can you please provide further information on how the Council intends to do this, along with any necessary MMs.

## *Gypsy and Traveller Transit Site Provision*

7. During the matter 5 hearing session the Council agreed to provide a cabinet report and minutes regarding new transit site provision for the Gypsy and Travelling community. Can this please be placed on the examination website.
8. Also, as part of the matter 5 hearing session, the Council provided an updated position in respect of the need and supply of pitches. Using this data can the Council please update Table 7.9 and the GTAA conclusion and executive summary as an addendum to the 2019 GTAA Update – Final Report. The Plan’s relevant supporting text should be reviewed in view of this.
9. The Council will be aware of the judgment *Lisa Smith v SSLUHC* [2022] EWCA Civ 1391 of 31st October 2022, regarding the interpretation of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and the application of that policy to Gypsies and Travellers who have ceased to pursue nomadic lifestyles. Can the council please consider whether, in light of this judgment, they wish to review the traveller site needs in the GTAA, and if not, the justification for this?

## *Unmet Housing and Employment Land Needs of the Association of Black Country Authorities (ABCA) and Policy SP2*

10. The Council has identified the need for housing in the County as being 28,750 homes (1430 dwellings per annum) over the Plan period, based on the ‘high growth scenario’ and 300 ha of employment land based on a ‘balanced employment growth scenario’, as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal and Site Assessment Environmental Report, dated December 2020 (SA). The housing

requirement figure in policy SP2 is around 30,800 homes (1400 dwellings per annum) and the employment land requirement is around 300ha. The increase in the total quantum of housing is to take account of the different time period. The annual requirement is virtually the same. However, it is the Council's intention that the Plan should provide 1,500 new homes and 30ha of employment land over the plan period in order to help address a need for housing and employment land in the Black Country, that would otherwise not be met. We consider the question of this unmet need further below.

11. At the hearings, the Council suggested that these 1,500 new homes and 30ha of employment land is accounted for within the aforementioned housing and employment land requirement in policy SP2. We cannot see how. They are not mentioned in the SA and form no part of the growth scenarios considered therein. Consequently, we are concerned that there has been a conflation of housing need and housing requirement and also employment land need and employment land requirement – but these are two distinctly different things.
12. You will appreciate that we need clarity on this point, and the Plan itself must also be equally clear. We therefore ask that the Council provides us with a Topic Paper that unambiguously sets out the need for housing over the plan period and the local plan's housing requirement and the same for employment land. On the face of it, it seems to us that the latter is likely to be the sum of Shropshire's housing/employment need plus the 1,500/30ha homes/employment land relating to unmet need in the Black Country – whatever the case may be, these requirement figures should be made clear in the Plan, through a main modification to policy SP2.
13. This strategic issue crosscuts a number of important matters, including the Plan's development requirements, spatial distribution, Green Belt release and site allocations. As such, it has resulted in a great deal of discussion during the hearing sessions to date. The Council's approach to identifying the housing and employment land needs derived within Shropshire itself is sound. In principle, the Council's intention to address some of the Association of Black Country Authorities (ABCA) unmet needs (1500 homes and 30ha of employment land), aligns with the spirit of the DtC. It is clear that the Council and the ABCA authorities are all content with this contribution and this is set out in a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG), signed prior to the submission of the Plan for examination. We recognise that there is a lack of any prescribed formula in national planning policy for calculating any uplift to Shropshire's housing need to meet some of this externally derived unmet need.
14. Since the initial stage 1 hearings the joint plan making arrangements for the ABCA Councils have materially changed as these four separate councils are now preparing individual plans. The councils are all individually preparing their respective evidence bases, but utilising some of the existing joint evidence that has already been prepared. As a consequence, their anticipated adoption dates will be later than that of the previously proposed joint plan. Despite this new plan making context, there is no reason before us to find that the identified unmet needs in the Black Country area will disappear.

15. However, we are mindful that confirmation of the exact quantum requires the examination of these plans which is some time away and other councils will also be assisting in meeting some of the unmet needs since it is not and should not be the sole responsibility of Shropshire Council to meet all of ABCAs unmet needs for housing and employment land. This would be highly unlikely in any event given the emerging scale of unmet need, the Green Belt constraint within Shropshire, particularly in the part closest to the boundary with ABCA areas and also the AONB constraint in the southern part of the plan area. Nonetheless it remains an important strategic cross boundary matter that should not be deferred.
16. It is clear is that the unmet housing and employment needs being accommodated in Shropshire is the starting point as there is agreement to revisit the unmet need with a view to providing further assistance once the local plans for the ABCA councils have been examined and adopted. As set out above this is likely to be a number of years away given the stage they are currently at.
17. However, it was not until a point between the Regulation 18 and 19 stages of the plan making process that the Council agreed to accommodate 1500 dwellings and 30ha of employment land to support the unmet needs emerging in the ABCA area. This was after most of the evidence base had been completed, including the SA.
18. Regulation 12 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 requires that an environmental report for the purpose of the regulations must identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan policies and of the reasonable alternatives, taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan. The SA will need to show how these requirements have been met as well as recording the wider assessment of social and economic effects.
19. We are concerned that the objectives and geographical scope of the Plan changed when the Council agreed to accommodate some of the unmet needs of the Black Country, but unfortunately the SA was not revisited. The SA is based on meeting only the needs of Shropshire. It tested different housing and economic growth options as well as different distribution options, but these were all based on just meeting the needs of Shropshire.
20. Further SA work therefore needs to be undertaken to assess the likely effects of the proposed strategy – which is based on meeting Shropshire’s housing and employment needs and contributing towards unmet needs from the Black Country. In carrying out this work, consideration also needs to be given to the selection of the preferred strategy when judged against reasonable alternatives. For example, by testing a scenario which includes the originally envisaged ‘high growth scenario’ and a contribution towards unmet housing needs.
21. If the intention is to contribute towards the unmet need from the Black Country, then for effectiveness this distinction needs to be set out in the housing and employment land requirements in the Plan. In doing so the Council will also

need to consider which site or sites in the Plan will be identified to meet that need. This also needs to be subject to sustainability appraisal to reflect the objectives and geographical scope of the Plan.

22. If, following the additional SA work, the Council chooses to pursue the same growth option as before then it follows that the housing and employment land requirements will increase, and more sites will be required. Consideration will also need to be given to the distribution of development since accommodating some of the unmet needs may result in more sites being required in the part of Shropshire nearest the Black Country. It would therefore be helpful if, once the Council has carried out the additional SA work, the proposed strategy in relation to the housing and employment land requirement is set out in the topic paper requested at paragraph 12 above. The Plan should also make clear what the Council's strategy is, through main modifications.
23. Given the Council were planning on releasing Green Belt land to meet its own needs, it seems unlikely that the unmet needs of the Black Country could be met without the release of Green Belt land. Can the Council please provide a revised Green Belt Topic Paper setting out the exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt land to meet its own needs and as a separate exercise the exceptional circumstances for releasing land to meet the unmet needs of the Black Country.
24. Great importance is placed on Council's having up to date plans by national planning policy. As set out above there is a requirement to carry out additional work on the SA and to produce topic papers and some main modifications to the Plan once the SA work is complete and there a clear way forward. This is likely to require a pause in the examination whilst the work is undertaken. Once the work has been undertaken, we will take a view on whether we consider further public consultation is required. The need to carry out this additional work will delay the examination and adoption of this Plan. However, we are unable to identify an alternative remedy that would avoid such a delay unfortunately. The additional work we have identified is necessary for us to find that the Plan is sound.
25. Regardless of the outcome of this work, it is likely that there will be a further request from the individual Black Country authorities in the future to meet some more of the unmet needs, but this could be dealt with by way of an early review trigger built into policy SP2 or by relying on the statutory 5-year review process set out in the Framework. We would welcome the Council's formal views on these alternative approaches.
26. Furthermore, we note that the related indicators and targets set out in the Plan's monitoring framework only focus on delivery within the Plan area against the Plan's overall proposed development requirements. In addressing some of the unmet needs of ABCA then the Plan's performance in doing so needs to be monitored. A failure to do this would undermine the effectiveness and therefore soundness of the Plan's approach to meeting housing and employment needs. The monitoring framework will need to be reviewed in light of this concern.

27. Any changes to the Plan as a result of the above will need to form the basis of Main Modifications which should be submitted to the examination.

#### *Habitat Regulations Assessment*

28. The matter of the River Clun and nutrient neutrality was discussed at the hearings in July. Shortly after the hearings the Government issued a Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) entitled '*Statement on improving water quality and tackling nutrient pollution*'. The Council's letter of 16<sup>th</sup> September 2022 (GC16) addresses the WMS. This suggests that the WMS may alter the position of Natural England and the Environment Agency on this matter. Can the Council please approach these organisations with a view to preparing updated SoCG. Once this is done can the Council advise on the implication of the latest position for the Plan and whether any outstanding issues could be dealt with by MMs.

#### *Green Belt – RAF Cosford*

29. The Council's Green Belt Topic Paper sets out the exceptional circumstances for the release of land from the Green Belt. This includes 214.2 ha of land at RAF Cosford which is a strategic site in the Plan (policy S21). The Council proposes to inset RAF Cosford in the Green Belt, in recognition of its existing and future operational areas and requirements. Para 7.18 of the Plan says that this will enable numerous and complementary development opportunities and that in turn these will complement and facilitate delivery of the Economic Growth Strategy for Shropshire and the objectives of the Plan.
30. One of these development opportunities is the development of the Midlands Air Ambulance Charity headquarters, however we understand that this now has planning permission despite it being in the Green Belt, demonstrating that this was not a barrier to development. The RAF base has grown and developed over many years and is now also home to the RAF Museum Cosford. There is no evidence before us to demonstrate that the site's Green Belt status has in anyway prevented it being developed in a manner consistent with its use as an RAF base or indeed related activities such as training facilities and domestic accommodation.
31. Paragraph 143(b) of the Framework which advises that when defining Green Belt boundaries, plans should not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. However, it seems that the site has large areas of undeveloped land which, if developed, could harm openness of the surrounding Green Belt land. It would also make it more difficult for the Council to control future non-military related development on the site as other general development management policies would apply.
32. To summarise, we find that exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt. Consequently, the Council will need to draft a MM to ensure that this site remains within the Green Belt and make any necessary map changes.

### *Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Strategic Funding Statement (SFS)*

33. We still have some concerns about the gaps in the IDP and would urge the Council to treat this as a living document and aim to keep populating it when new figures become available.
34. In terms of the SFS, as set out at the hearings this should be forward facing rather than backward looking. The PPG advises that *“this should set out the anticipated funding from developer contributions, and the choices local authorities have made about how these contributions will be used. At examination this can be used to demonstrate the delivery of infrastructure throughout the Plan-period”*<sup>1</sup>. Can the Council please provide a timescale for updating the SFS.

### *Five-year Housing Land Supply*

35. The Council has requested that we confirm their 5-year housing land supply as part of the examination of the Plan policies. However, the PPG<sup>2</sup> advises that, among other things, *“when confirming their supply through this process, local planning authorities will need to be clear that they are seeking to confirm the existence of a 5-year supply as part of the plan-making process and engage with developers and others with an interest in housing delivery”*. Crucially, the Council have confirmed that they did not do this and therefore we cannot confirm the 5-year housing land supply through the local plan examination process.
36. In addition, the matter of 5-year housing land supply will be considered at stage 2 of the examination once we have examined the site allocations in the Plan. We still have serious doubts over whether we can fully consider this matter and come to a conclusion on whether the Council have a 5-year supply of housing land given that many of the sites the Council are relying on are allocated in the SAMDev plan and therefore are not before us.

### *Housing Requirement*

37. The housing requirement in the Plan is expressed as ‘around’ 30,800 new homes and the employment land as ‘around’ 300ha. In our view these development requirements should be expressed as definitive minimum figures for both monitoring and effectiveness.

### *Specialist Housing/Older Persons Housing*

38. Paragraph 62 of the Framework requires that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies, including older people. The Council’s evidence shows that there is a much higher number of older people residing in the Plan area than the national average.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph: 059 Reference ID: 61-059-20190315

<sup>2</sup> Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 68-010-20190722

39. Whilst there is a requirement within policy DP1 to provide older persons housing on sites of 50 dwellings or more, the amount that will need to be provided is not quantified and it is also not clear why the threshold of 50 dwellings has been chosen. The PPG advises that “*plan-making authorities should set clear policies to address the housing needs of groups with particular needs, such as older and disabled people. These policies can set out how the plan-making authority will consider proposals for the different types of housing that these groups are likely to require. They could also provide indicative figures or a range for the number of units of specialist housing for older people needed across the plan area throughout the plan period (our emphasis)*”<sup>3</sup>.
40. Whilst the PPG advises that Council’s ‘could’ provide indicative figures, we consider that as there is clear evidence of a higher-than-average need for such accommodation in this particular instance, either the policy should include indicative figures, or the Plan should contain a specific policy to deal with specialist housing.
41. Also, neither this Plan, nor the SAMDev plan appear to make any provision for this sector of the community, by allocating land for specialist housing or requiring it to be provided in some of the larger allocations. This would be another positive way in which the Council could address this matter. Please can the Council give some further consideration to this important matter.

#### *Policy SP4 – Sustainable Development*

42. The Council agreed during the hearings that they would introduce a MM to delete policy SP4 from the Plan and instead rely on national planning policy to ensure that development in the district is sustainable. This needs to be included in the list of MMs.

#### *Policy SP5 – High-Quality Design*

43. The Council agreed to look at the wording of policy SP5 and whether it should contain a reference to the National Design Guidance. Can the Council please confirm if they have done this and what the outcome was. Any changes will need to be set out as a MM.

#### *Policy SP6 – Health and Wellbeing*

44. A discussion took place at the hearings regarding criterion 5a. of this policy and whether it should refer to ‘improved’ health facilities and criterion 10 and its requirement for a Health Impact Assessment for all major development proposals. The Council agreed to give the wording in these 2 criteria further consideration. Can you please confirm the outcome of this and whether any MMs are being advanced as a result.

---

<sup>3</sup> Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 63-006-20190626

### *Policy SP10 – Managing Development in the Countryside*

45. It was agreed during the hearings that this policy wording needs to clarify that it does not apply to sites in the countryside that are allocated for development in this Plan or any other adopted development plan. This revised policy wording will need to be set out in as a MM.

### *Policy SP12 Shropshire Economic Growth Strategy*

46. We do have some concerns about the effectiveness of this policy as a great deal of it seems to be more of a vision rather than a strategic policy. Can the Council please review this policy in the context of the advice in relation to strategic policies set out in paragraphs 20 to 23 of the Framework. Proposed changes will need to be set out as MMs.

### *Policy SP13 – Delivering Sustainable Economic Growth and Enterprise*

47. It was agreed at the hearings that the text box 'Figure SP13.1', should be incorporated into policy SP13. This will need to be included as a MM.

### *Strategic Settlements and Sites*

48. We have set out our concerns above regarding the removal of the RAF Cosford site from the Green Belt. We have no further comments to make on policy S21 or policy S20 which relate to the former Ironbridge Power Station site.
49. Turning to Tern Hill and policy S19, we have concerns about the deliverability of the affordable housing that would be required in connection with the development of this proposed site allocation given the evidence set out in the Council's Viability Study 2020 (EV115.01) and the fact that the trajectory shows that 400 of the 750 proposed dwellings will be delivered after the Plan period.
50. This also leads us to find that there is a lack of evidence to demonstrate that this proposed allocation will be capable of supporting the necessary infrastructure and services planned. Given the site's location away from any main settlements, it is important that it contains a range of services to limit trips by private car. Therefore, we require evidence which demonstrates that the appropriate necessary infrastructure would be delivered at the appropriate stages in the delivery of this site to serve its occupants.
51. Finally, as discussed in detail at the relevant hearing session we have some concerns about the vagueness of some of the policy wording in policy S19. The Council agreed it would look at this with a view to improving its precision and certainty for the benefit of developers and local residents. These changes should be advanced as MMs.

### *Strategic Flood Risk Assessment*

52. The issue of whether the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) was up to date in terms of hydraulic modelling and fluvial flood risk was raised at the relevant hearing session. It was agreed that the Council would provide a note of clarification regarding the methodology and data relied upon and whether any updating is necessary. Also, the Council should review whether the SoCG with the Environment Agency needs to be updated in view of this.

### *Local Development Scheme*

53. During the matter 1 hearing session the out of datedness of the Local Development Scheme (LDS) and the reasons for that were discussed. We would be obliged if the Council would keep the LDS under review and arrange an update. A note to this effect should be placed on the Council's examination website to inform web users of this.

### *Overall Conclusions*

54. For the reasons set out above, as things stand, the development strategy set out in the Plan is unsound and further work and main modifications will be required to progress the examination. We appreciate that there is a lot in our letter for the Council to consider. Therefore, we have not set a deadline for a response. However, it would be helpful if you could provide an indicative timescale for a response. When you respond in full to our letter can you please also provide a timetable for the additional work that is required for soundness.
55. Once we have a timescale for any additional work, we can then agree some provisional dates for the stage 2 hearings. At these hearings it is likely we will first need to re-consider some of the stage 1 matters as then the development management policies in the plan and the site allocations.
56. The Council and participants should be aware that the above comments do not represent our full findings on these matters, which shall be set out in our final report having considered any representations made in response to further public consultation and/or further hearing sessions which may be required in due course.
57. We are not inviting comments to this letter from representors, they will be given an opportunity to comment on the above matters in due course, either through representations to consultation organised by the Council, through hearing statements, appearing at hearing sessions or through the opportunity to comment on MMs.
58. Should the Council require any further clarification on any of the above matters you can contact us through the Programme Officer.

*Louise Crosby, Carole Dillon and Nick Palmer*

Examining Inspectors