

Shropshire Local Plan Review - Issues and Strategic Options

Introduction

We advise you read through all the information provided in support of this consultation prior to starting your response. We would also advise you to have a copy of the Issues and Strategic Options Consultation Document available to refer to as you work through the questions.

The questions are included within the Issues and Strategic Options Consultation Document to allow you to start thinking about them as you go. This response form is broken down into the same 3 sections as the Issues and Strategic Options Consultation Document to try and help you simultaneously navigate the information and response form.

All questions marked with a red asterisk* require an answer to be provided.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information legislation (primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

Shropshire Local Plan Review - Issues and Strategic Options

Respondent information

*1. Please provide the following information.

Please note: we cannot accept anonymous responses.

Your name:

Company name (if relevant):

Position (if relevant):

Address:

Postcode:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

2. If you are responding on behalf of a client, please provide the following information.

Client name:

Client address:

Client postcode:

Client phone number:

Client email address:

Shropshire Local Plan Review - Issues and Strategic Options

Housing requirement and strategic distribution options

*3. Do you consider the housing need identified in Shropshire between 2016 and 2036 within the Full Objectively Assessed Housing Need (FOAHN) is appropriate and in line with national guidance?

Yes

No

Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

*4. Which housing requirement option would you prefer to see used for the Local Plan Review?

Housing Requirement Option 1: 'Moderate Growth'

Housing Requirement Option 2: 'Significant Growth'

Housing Requirement Option 3: 'High Growth'

Don't know / no opinion

Please use the space below to explain your reasons for your choice.

You can also use this space to let us know if you think there are any other housing requirement options that the Council should consider.

*5. Which strategic distribution option would you prefer to see used for the Local Plan Review?

Strategic Distribution Option A: 'Current Policy - Rural Rebalance'

Strategic Distribution Option B: 'Urban Focus'

Strategic Distribution Option C: 'Balanced Growth'

Don't know / no opinion

Please use the space below to explain your reasons for your choice.

You can also use this space to let us know if you think there are any other strategic distribution options that the Council should consider.

Shropshire Local Plan Review - Issues and Strategic Options

Economic growth and employment

Strategic Options for Economic Growth

6. How might Shropshire best exploit these new investment opportunities to improve the economic performance of the County and what challenges might be encountered when seeking to achieve this?

7. What other opportunities / challenges for economic growth might be encountered in the County over the period to 2036?

*8. Which of the following Strategic Options would provide the most appropriate level of aspiration for the growth of the Shropshire economy?

Option 1: Significant Growth

Option 2: High Growth

Option 3: Productivity Growth

Don't know / no opinion

Please set out the reasons for your choice and outline the opportunities and challenges for the Shropshire economy.

Or, set out an alternative Strategic Option outlining the key characteristics of this option for the growth of the Shropshire economy.

Economic Objectives for Shropshire

*9. Do you agree that these strategic objectives should continue to influence the economic strategy in the Local Plan for the period to 2036?

Yes

No

Don't know / no opinion

Please consider whether:

Any of these strategic objectives might be amended to better address the needs of the Shropshire economy;

Other strategic objectives might be identified in the Local Plan.

Range and Choice of Remaining Allocations

*10. Do each of the 19 sites detailed make a positive contribution to the employment land supply in the County?

Yes - all sites

Yes - some sites

No

Don't know / no opinion

Might some, or all of these sites be used in other ways to make a more positive contribution to the Local Plan strategy over the period to 2036?

Protecting existing employment land

*11. Does the protection provided to existing employment areas as a source of serviced and readily available land make a positive contribution to the supply of employment land and premises in Shropshire?

Yes

No

Don't know / no opinion

Please consider whether:

The level of protection provided to existing employment areas shown in the Authority Monitoring Report is appropriate.

The approach to protecting existing employment areas might be changed or improved in the partial review of the Local Plan.

Shropshire Local Plan Review - Issues and Strategic Options

Rural policy

Identification of Community Hubs

*12. Do you agree with the approach and/or the methodology proposed to identify Community Hubs?

Yes

No

Don't know / no opinion

Please use the space below to explain your reasons for your choice.

Identification of Community Clusters

*13. Do you think any of the existing Community Clusters identified in Appendix 3 should no longer have Community Cluster status?

Yes

No

Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please specify the community cluster(s) and any community support you are aware of for this proposal:

*14. Do you think any additional Community Clusters should be formed?

Yes

No

Don't know / no opinion

If yes, please specify the community cluster(s) and any community support you are aware of for this proposal:

Criteria for the Community Hub Policy

*15. The table below provides a summary of some of the criteria which may be included within the Community Hub policy.

Please provide your opinion on the importance of each criteria, using the following ranking scale:

(1) Unimportant; (2) Neutral; (3) Important; or (4) Very Important

Don't know /
no opinion

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Don't know / no opinion
1. Development proposals must have regard to relevant policies on Sustainable Design and Development Principles.					
2. Development should be of a scale and design that is sympathetic to the character of the settlement and its environs.					
3. Development should be well and clearly related to the existing built form of a settlement and not result in an isolated form of development.					
4. Development should reflect design criteria and policies identified within relevant Neighbourhood Plans and Community Led Plans.					
5a. Development proposals to extend a Community Hub beyond its natural built form will normally consist of a small group of dwellings and include a range of housing sizes, types and tenures.					
5b. Development proposals should protect the integrity of any strategically important gaps between settlements.					
6. There should be sufficient infrastructure capacity, or scope to address or alleviate any infrastructure constraints to appropriately meet development needs.					
7. Sites of five or more dwellings should include an appropriate mix* of types and sizes of housing; and meet local needs for affordable and family housing based on any local evidence					
8. Non-residential sites should be designed to complement their setting and meet the needs of their intended occupiers.					
9a. The cumulative impact of residential development proposals is a significant policy consideration. Cumulatively, residential development proposals** must complement the nature, character and size of a settlement.					
9b. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the cumulative increase to the size of the settlement.					
9c. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the number of other development proposals in close proximity or adjacent to the proposal site, in seeking to avoid the over-development of settlements					
9d. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the benefits arising from the development.					
10. The cumulative impact of non- residential development is also a significant policy consideration. Cumulatively, non-residential development** must complement the nature, character and size of a settlement.					

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Don't know / no opinion
11. Allocations made within Community Hub settlements in the SAMDev Plan are considered appropriate sites for development.					
12. Development within the Green Belt is generally considered inappropriate, apart from the specific exceptions referenced within national policy.					
13. Development should respect the qualities of the local landscape and be sympathetic to its character and visual quality.					
14. Development should have a positive effect on any relevant heritage designations.					
15. Development should have a positive effect on any relevant environmental designations.					

* When determining an appropriate mix of types, sizes, and tenures, regard should be given to the need to provide appropriate family accommodation, available local evidence, and the outcomes of community consultation.

** In combination with any existing commitments, allocations or completions since the 31 March 2016.

16. Use this space to identify any additional criteria you consider would be beneficial for community hubs:

Criteria for the Community Clusters

*17. The table below provides a summary of some of the criteria which may be included within the Community Cluster policy.

Please provide your opinion on the importance of each criteria, using the following ranking scale:

(1) Unimportant; (2) Neutral; (3) Important; or (4) Very Important.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Don't know / no opinion
1. Development proposals must have regard to relevant policies on Sustainable Design and Development Principles.					
2. Development should be of a scale and design that is sympathetic to the character of the settlement and its environs.					
3. Development should be well and clearly related to the existing built form of a settlement and not result in an isolated form of development.					
4. Development should reflect design criteria and policies identified within relevant Neighbourhood Plans and Community Led Plans.					

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Don't know / no opinion
5. There should be sufficient infrastructure capacity, or scope to address or alleviate any infrastructure constraints to appropriately meet development needs.					
6a. Development should either be located on small scale infill sites or represent conversions of existing buildings within or adjoining the settlement. Infill sites will consist of land usually with built development on adjacent land on three sides.					
6b. The rural area between Community Clusters is considered countryside. The integrity of any strategically important gaps between settlements will be protected.					
7. When considering the size, type and tenure of housing, all residential development should have regard to the need to provide appropriate family accommodation; available local evidence; and the outcomes of community consultation.					
8. Non-residential sites should be designed to complement their setting and meet the needs of their intended occupiers.					
9a. The cumulative impact of residential development proposals is a significant policy consideration. Cumulatively, residential development proposals* must complement the nature, character and size of a settlement.					
9b. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the cumulative increase to the size of the settlement.					
9c. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the number of other development proposals in close proximity or adjacent to the proposal site, in seeking to avoid the over-development of settlements.					
9d. Decisions on cumulative impact will have regard to the benefits arising from the development.					
10. The cumulative impact of non- residential development is also a significant policy consideration. Cumulatively, non- residential development* must complement the nature, character and size of a settlement.					
11. Allocations made within a Community Cluster settlement in the SAMDev Plan are considered appropriate sites for development.					
12. Development within the Green Belt is generally considered inappropriate, apart from the specific exceptions referenced within national policy.					
13. Development should respect the qualities of the local landscape and be sympathetic to its character and visual quality.					
14. Development should have a positive effect on any relevant heritage designations.					
15. Development should have a positive effect on any relevant environmental designations.					
* In combination with any existing commitments, allocations or completions since the 31 March 2016.					

18. Use this space to identify any additional criteria you consider would be beneficial for community clusters:

*19. Do you think that criteria based policies for Community Hubs and Community Clusters will strike an appropriate balance between providing certainty on the types and levels of development whilst also maintaining choice and competition?

Yes

No

Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

*20. Do you agree that a consistent approach of identifying no development boundaries within Community Hub and Community Cluster settlements is appropriate?

Yes

No

Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

Residential Development in the wider Countryside

21. What local criteria, if any, do you consider should be applied in addition to those produced at the national level for residential development in the wider countryside?

Non-Residential Development in the wider Countryside

22. What local criteria, if any, do you consider should be applied in addition to those produced at the national level for non-residential development in the wider countryside?