

For Shropshire Council use

Respondent no:

Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDEV) Plan

Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan) 17 March 2014 – 28 April 2014

Representations Form

Please note you can also make representations to the SAMDev Pre-Submission Draft using our online form via:

www.shropshire.gov.uk/samdev

This is a formal consultation on the legal compliance and soundness of the Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for examination by an Independent Planning Inspector. For advice on how to respond to the consultation and fill in this representations form please see the guidance notes available on the Council's website at www.shropshire.gov.uk/samdev.

Your details: Who is making this representation?

Name:	Joyce Jones
Organisation	
(if applicable):	
Address:	_
Email:	
Telephone:	

If you are acting as an Agent, please use the following box to tell us who you are acting for:

Name:	
Organisation (if applicable):	
Address:	
Email:	
Telephone:	

Your Representations

Please note, you must use a separate form for each representation you wish to make.

(Please refer to the accompanying Guidance Notes on Making Representations when completing this section)

In the box below please give the policy, paragraph or section of the Policies Map your representation relates to:

S17 – Wem		
Is your representation in	support or	objection? (please tick as appropriate)
Support Yes Object Yes		No O
In respect of your represe Policies Map, do you con		the policy, paragraph or section of the SAMDev Plan is:
Legally compliant Sound	Yes Yes	No No
AND THE RESERVE AND THE RESERV	2 6 99	

If your representation considers the SAMDev Plan is not sound, please say whether this is because it is not (*Please tick all that apply*):

Positively prepared	
Justified	
Effective	
Consistent with National Policy	

In the box below please specify your reason for supporting or objecting. If you are objecting, you should make clear why the document is unsound having regard to the issues of 'legal compliance' or whether the document is not positively prepared, justified, effective or not consistent with national policy (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary).

I object to the proposed housing requirement for Wem because it is too low.

At the Preferred Options stage the town was given a housing requirement of 800 dwellings, which was in line with the Town Council's aspirations. At the same time Whitchurch had a requirement of 1,000 dwellings, again to reflect the aspirations of their Town Council. However, by the time of the Revised Preferred Options the figure for Wem had been reduced to 500 dwellings and the figure for Whitchurch increased to 1,200 dwellings. According to the Revised Preferred Options document the Wem requirement again reflected the Town Council's aspirations (presumably they had a change of heart) but no such luck for Whitchurch Town Council and no reference is made to them having endorsing a higher housing requirement. If Whitchurch Town Council

had aspirations for 1,000 dwellings this was ignored by Shropshire Council, unlike their counterparts in Wem.

The Revised Preferred Options also noted that at the Preferred Options stage there were only 52 responses about the Wem requirement of 800 and 65% of those did not support it. Therefore it is apparent that just 34 respondents managed to get the housing requirement for Wem reduced, but not by a little bit but by a massive 38%. At the same time the requirement for Whitchurch went up by 20%. I assume that the two events are linked and Whitchurch had to take more housing because 34 people did not want Wem to have 800 new homes.

As it stands 500 dwellings over the 20 year Plan period is pitifully low for a town such as Wem. This works out at just 25 dwellings per annum on average. However what makes this requirement even more difficult to understand is that of the 500 dwellings, 372 have been built or are committed leaving just 128 left (or alternative just over 10 a year for the remainder of the Plan period). I am amazed that the SAMDev is genuinely suggesting that Wem, a settlement just 15 minutes away from Shrewsbury by train should have such a small residual housing requirement. The Revised Preferred Options SAMDev indicates that the reason for this is traffic but I cannot see how this can be such a constraint to development.

Wem is typical of a Shropshire market town in terms of its employment opportunities, shops, schools, services and facilities. However, it is better located than many to the main settlement of Shrewsbury, and as noted, just 15 minutes away by train. There is, therefore, a real opportunity for people to live in Wem and commute by sustainable means to Shrewsbury.

Shrewsbury is the economic focus for Shropshire and the driver of its economy. Unlike market towns it has a range of job opportunities including managerial, something that is not abundant elsewhere. By providing more housing in Wern there is the ability to attract managerial level employees who can live there and work in Shrewsbury. This has the ability to bring greater disposal income into the town.

In conclusion, the housing requirement of 500 dwellings for Wem is too low and needs to be increased. At 500 dwellings the Plan is not Justified as it does not provide the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. I have objected separately to the amount of housing proposed for Whitchurch and some of the overall Shropshire housing requirement should be redistributed from Whitchurch to Wem. I suggest the figures for both towns should revert back to the SAMDev Preferred Options stage. This level of increase for Wem would have no implications for the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal.

Please use the box below to explain the changes you think should be made to the SAMDev Plan in order to make it legally compliant or sound? You should explain your suggested revisions to the policy, paragraph or section of the Policies Map, and why this change would make

the plan legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

To make the Plan sound the housing requirement for Wem should be increased to 800 dwellings over the Plan period.

This increase means that the Plan would be sound because it provides a more robust strategy for the delivery of new housing.

Please be sure that you have provided all the information necessary to support your representations and any changes you are proposing. After this stage you will not be able to make any further representations about the SAMDev Plan to Shropshire Council. Any further submissions will only be possible at the invitation of the Inspector conducting the examination, who may seek additional information about the issues he/she has identified.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the examination?

Yes, I wish to give evidence about my representation at the examination.



No, I wish to pursue my representations through this written representation.



If you	ı wish	to	attend	the	examination,	please	explain	why	you	think	this	is
nece	ssary	in	the box	c be	low:							

Do you wish to be notified of any of the following? Please tick all that apply. We will contact you using the details you have given above.

When the SAMDev Plan has been submitted for examination	/	/
When the Inspector's Report is published	/	/
When the SAMDev Plan is adopted		

Please return this form by 5pm on Monday 28 April 2014

You can e-mail it to:

Planning.policy@shropshire.gov.uk

Or return it to: Planning Policy Team, Shropshire Council, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND