



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:	Sean McGrath
Organisation (if applicable):	Indigo Planning
Address:	Swan Court, 11 Worple Road, Wimbledon, SW19 4JS
Email:	sean.mcgrath@indigoplanning.com
Telephone:	020 8605 9400

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

Name:	Mrs D Prosser
Organisation (if applicable):	N/A
Address:	C/O Agent
Email:	C/O Agent
Telephone:	C/O Agent

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:

Please see attached letter dated 28 April 2014.

Is your representation in support or objection? (please tick as appropriate)

Support	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Object	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

In respect of your representation on the policy, paragraph or section of the Policies Map, do you consider the SAMDev Plan is:

Legally compliant	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Consistent with National Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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).

Please see attached letter dated 28 April 2014.

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)

Please see attached letter dated 28 April 2014.

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 wish to attend the examination, please explain why you think this is necessary in the box below:

We wish to reserve our right to appear at the examination.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
When the Inspector's Report is published	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
When the SAMDev Plan is adopted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Please note, we will acknowledge receipt of representations made by e-mail.

Data Protection Act 1998 and Freedom of Information Act 2000

Representations cannot be treated in confidence. Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires copies of all representations to be made publically available. The Council will place all the representations and the names of those who made them on its website, but will not publish personal information such as telephone numbers, emails or private addresses. By submitting a representation on the Pre-Submission SAMDev Plan you confirm that you agree to this.



Strategic Planning
Shropshire Council
Shirehall
Abbey Foregate
Shrewsbury
SY2 6ND

By email and post
planning.policy@shropshire.gov.uk
let.006.BF.DH.02850013

28 April 2014

Dear Sir / Madam

**SITE ALLOCATIONS AND MANAGEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT (SAMDEV)
PLAN: CONSULTATION ON PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT
REPRESENTATIONS SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF MRS D PROSSER**

We act on behalf of Mrs D Prosser and write further to the Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev) consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft (Final Draft).

We have previously submitted representations on the SAMDev Revised Preferred Options (July 2013) dated 23 August 2013 and these should be read alongside our comments below.

The Requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out clear advice on how Local Plans should be prepared. The following key statements from the NPPF provide the framework for how council's should approach the preparation of Local Plans, particularly with reference to housing targets and retail provision.

- Paragraph 23 states that planning policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period. It also stresses the importance of meeting retail needs in full, and that this should not be compromised by limited site availability;
- Paragraph 47 confirms the need for local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing by using their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period;
- Paragraph 156 states that strategic priorities and policies within Local Plans should deliver the homes and jobs needed in an area; and

- Paragraph 159 states that LPAs should 'prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to identify and meet the housing need over the plan period'.

It is clear that the NPPF promotes the preparation of flexible and positive Local Plans, which respond to the needs of the particular area and which are based on robust evidence.

In this regard, we have a number of concerns with the strategy for Ludlow as set out in the SAMDev Pre-Submission. The fundamental issue relates to the ability of the strategy for Ludlow and by consequence, the SAMDev document, to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing within Ludlow along with the provision of accompanying services and infrastructure to support housing growth in the town, including retail floorspace. Further, the allocation of the sites identified is insufficient to provide the flexibility required in the document to adapt to rapid change throughout its lifetime.

Shropshire Core Strategy DPD (March 2011)

Our previous representations outlined the key policies included in the Core Strategy (March 2011) which should be delivered through the SAMDev document. These include:

- Policy CS1: sets a district housing target of at least 27,500 homes between 2006 and 2026;
- Policy CS1: sets a housing target of 3,575 to 4,125 dwellings for South Shropshire (which includes Ludlow);
- Policy CS3: relates to the Market Towns and Other Key Centres and identifies that Ludlow will provide the focus for development in South Shropshire. The policy sets out an indicative level of housing growth of 2,500 to 3,000 dwellings including up to 1,000 dwellings in Ludlow; and
- Policy CS15: identifies that the market towns (including Ludlow) will act as principal centres to serve local needs and the wider service and employment needs of communities within their respective spatial zones. Appropriate convenience and comparison retail and other town centre uses will be permitted to support these roles.

SAMDev Pre-Submission (March 2014)

The SAMDev is intended to set out proposals for the use of land and policies to guide future development in order to help to deliver the vision and objectives of the adopted Core Strategy (CS) for the period up to 2026.

The document recognises that the amount of development in Shropshire up to 2026 has already been established by the CS. The SAMDev Plan will set out further detailed policies for the management of new development across

Shropshire to complement the policies already adopted in the Shropshire Core Strategy, and to provide a greater level of detail on a number of planning issues.

In this context we set out below our key concerns with the SAMDev Pre-Submission.

Housing Growth

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) published in June 2008 informed the preparation of the CS and identified an objectively assessed need for 28,000 new homes in Shropshire, 5,300 of which were identified for South Shropshire.

The CS subsequently identified that South Shropshire will accommodate 3,575 to 4,125 new homes with Policy CS3 identifying an indicative level of housing growth of 2,500 to 3,000 new homes in the market towns and key centres in South Shropshire.

Following a review of the level of housing growth identified in the SAMDev Pre-Submission for each of the market towns and key centres in South Shropshire only 2,245 dwellings are being proposed (as outlined in policies S2, S5, S6, S7 and S10).

Against the indicative level of housing growth identified in Policy CS3 of the CS, the SAMDev proposes 755 fewer homes. When assessed against the target of 3,575 to 4,125 identified in Policy CS1, the SAMDev proposes a reduction of 1,330 to 1,880 new homes. Against the objectively assessed need target of 5,300 dwellings identified in the SHMA 2008, this equates to a reduction of 2,300 dwellings.

We consider that the level of housing proposed by the council for Ludlow and the other centres in South Shropshire is still too low and not only fails to deliver the quantum of housing required by the CS, but also fails to meet the full need for market and affordable housing provision as outlined in the SHMA (total of 5,300 for South Shropshire). As a consequence, the SAMDev fails the NPPF tests of soundness.

The housing target should be increased further in order to meet the district's own objectively assessed needs and to plan to meet the aspirations of the adopted CS. The Inspector for the CS examination noted that there is sufficient "headroom" for the market towns to accommodate greater levels of growth. In proposing a lower housing target, particularly for Ludlow, the council is failing to plan positively as required by the NPPF.

Ludlow Area

Policy S10 'Ludlow Area' identifies that, as the largest market town in South Shropshire, Ludlow will be a focus for development. The policy states that the town will accommodate around 875 new dwellings. This represents a shortfall of

125 against the target for Ludlow set out in CS Policy CS3.

In light of our views on the level of housing being proposed, we consider that the identified sites are insufficient to accommodate the level of growth required in Ludlow. Therefore, additional sites need to be identified for residential, employment and other types of development such as retail in the document.

Following a review of the council's background evidence to the Revised Preferred Options (Ludlow Housing Site Assessment), it is clear that there are a number of sites that were considered to be 'realistic' for housing. Site reference LUD019 was assessed as a Stage 2 site and received an identical score to the council's preferred option at South of Rocks Green (Ref: LUD017). Further, the council's full assessment of the site raised no insurmountable issues and is a more appropriate site than the council's preferred option.

In order to meet the level of housing required in Ludlow, we consider that land at Rocks Green (LUD019) should also be allocated for housing in the SAMDev. As part of this allocation, a mix of uses including retail should be incorporated in order to serve both existing and the proposed new residential development in the area.

Core Strategy Policy CS15 states that the market towns, including Ludlow, will act as principal centres to serve local needs and the wider service and employment needs of communities within their respective spatial zones. Appropriate convenience and comparison retail, office, and other town centre uses will be permitted to support these roles.

SAMDev Policy S10 states that in order to support Ludlow's role as a Principal Centre, new main town centre uses will be focussed within the defined town centre area and Primary Shopping Area identified on the Policies Map, and will be subject to Policies CS15 and MD10. However, no sites are identified for new retail floorspace in the centre, because of the constrained nature of the centre and the limited opportunity sites available. Given that no sites are identified it is unclear where Ludlow's retail needs will be met. Due to the town centre constraints sites outside of the town centre should be considered as suitable alternatives to provide additional retail floorspace to meet the increasing need.

Managing Town Centre Development

The CS Inspector identified that along with the site allocations for retail floorspace, the SAMDev will define the extent of town centres and definitions of the shopping areas and retail frontages. We note that policies MD10a and MD10b now refer to the Primary Shopping Areas and Primary and Secondary Frontages which have been identified on the Proposals Map.

It is correct to identify a Primary Shopping Area for Ludlow in Policy S10 Inset 1. We agree with the council that the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) should be concentrated on Broad Street, King Street, Market Street, High Street and Castle Square as areas beyond this become more mixed in nature with a greater proportion of residential and office use.

We do not agree that the proposed PSA should extend as far along as Upper Galdeford as shown on the Policy Map Inset for Ludlow. This area is secondary in nature. There is a break in the retail uses along Tower Street from the rest of the PSA before they continue again with the One Stop and Co-op. It would be more appropriate for the PSA to be focused on the retail core of the town centre which is predominantly in A1 use such as Broad Street, King Street, Market Street, High Street and Castle Square and not extend down Tower Street.

By focusing the retail protection policies as outlined in policies MD10a and MD10b on the retail core, the policies will be more applicable and enforceable. Including areas which are not characterised by A1 uses at ground floor level, will dilute the ability of the policy to protect the retail core.

To ensure that the retail protection policies remain applicable and enforceable we consider that the PSA should be amended to exclude Tower Street and Upper Galdeford.

Development Boundary

In light of the proposed site allocations identified in the Pre-Submission document, and any subsequent allocations that are required in order to meet the housing and other need in Ludlow / South Shropshire, the development boundary of Ludlow should be revised to include the Identified Sites.

It should also include the recent affordable housing development at Rocks Green and housing along the A4117 and the site identified in LUD019. This area is appropriate for development to meet the needs of Ludlow and should be included to ensure consistency with Policy CS3 of the CS.

We enclose a Plan showing our suggested amendments to the extent of the development boundary around Rocks Green.

Conclusion

The housing provision proposed by the council for Ludlow and South Shropshire does not and will not meet the full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing. Further, the level of housing proposed is not in accordance with the adopted CS. As a consequence, the SAMDev as currently drafted is not sound because it is not consistent with paragraph 182 of the NPPF (March 2012) in that it has not been positively prepared, is not justified and effective.

In order to comply with the requirements of the CS, the SAMDev will need to identify additional sites to accommodate higher levels of housing growth and other uses including retail.

Furthermore, the PSA should be amended to exclude Tower Street and focus on the retail core where A1 uses are the predominate use.

Finally, the development boundary of Ludlow needs to be amended to take



account of recent and proposed development in the town.

We trust that these representations will be fully considered in the preparation of the SAMDev. If you wish to discuss any of the above please do not hesitate to contact Ben Frodsham or me.

Sean McGrath

Enc: Proposed amendments to Ludlow boundary
cc: Mrs D Prosser

Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan: Consultation on Pre-Submission Draft

Suggested Development Boundary Amendment

