Conformity of the adopted Shropshire Council Core Strategy with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012. The NPPF replaced the pre-existing national policy guidance set out in a number of Planning Policy Statements (PPS) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG).

2. In light of these changes to national planning policy the Shropshire Core Strategy (www.shropshire.gov.uk/corestrategy), adopted in 2011, has been assessed against the new requirements in the NPPF. The Core Strategy has been found to be in conformity with the NPPF.

3. The Planning Advisory Service (PAS) has published a checklist to help Planning Authorities check the conformity of their adopted Plans with the NPPF. The following checklist shows the assessment of the Core Strategy against the new requirements in the NPPF, and any requirements that are significantly different to those contained in the PPS/PPGs.

4. A Soundness Self-Assessment was submitted as part of the independent examination into the Core Strategy to show how it complied with the requirements of the pre-exisitng PPS/PPGs. This can be found via: http://www.shropshire.gov.uk/planningpolicy.nsf/viewAttachments/AWIN-92NKAU/$file/shropsCD16-core-strategy-soundness-self-assessment.pdf

Saved policies:

5. The remaining 'saved policies' of the Local Plans of the former district and borough authorities (www.shropshire.gov.uk/savedpolicies) are also in general conformity with the NPPF. The Core Strategy and, where appropriate, saved policies together form the basis for making decisions on planning applications. The saved policies of the former district and borough Local Plans are due to be replaced by adoption of the Shropshire wide Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev Plan) (www.shropshire.gov.uk/samdev) in 2014. On adoption, the SAMDev Plan will complete the new 'Local Plan' for Shropshire alongside the Core Strategy.

Planning Policy for Gypsy and Travellers

6. The checklist also contains an assessment of the Core Strategy against the requirements in the new 'Planning policy for traveller sites' which came into effect alongside the NPPF on 27 March 2012. The document 'Planning policy for traveller sites' replaced the previous national policy and guidance on planning for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

1.

Local Plans
and the
National Planning Policy Framework

Compatibility Self-Assessment Checklist

This checklist which will help you assess the content of your new or emerging local plan[1] against requirements in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that are new or significantly different from national policy set out in PPGs and PPSs.

These elements are highlighted in red and in italics.

---

[1] We use the term "local plan" throughout this document. However, adopted plans may comprise a number of development plan documents prepared under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, in which case it may be all of those documents that a local planning authority may wish to consider in the context of the NPPF using this document.

1A: Achieving sustainable development

The presumption in favour of sustainable development and core planning principles (para 6-17)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects**	**Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
Policies in local plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and guide how it should be applied locally (15).	*Does the plan positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area?* *Does the plan meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, (subject to the caveats set out in para14)?* *Do you have a policy or policies which reflect the principles of the presumption in favour of sustainable development? A model policy is provided on the Planning Portal in the Local Plans section, as a suggestion (but this isn't prescriptive).*	This is demonstrated by the locally distinctive Core Strategy Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives, which are in line with the Sustainable Community Strategy. Objectively assessed needs, including employment, housing and other needs have been assessed through a robust and thorough evidence base. The Core Strategy sets the strategic context for future development in Shropshire and policies are flexible and resilient to adapt to the changes that may occur through the Plan Period. The strategic approach set out within Policies CS1, CS2, CS3, CS4, and CS5 sets out an overall presumption in favour of sustainable development within Shropshire ensuring development takes place in the most sustainable places and is balanced with environmental constraints. The SAMDev will identify sufficient housing land to meet the objectively assessed needs in the Core Strategy. The	No significant differences. No changes.

		importance of the deliverability of development is reflected in SAMDev draft Policy MD3.	
The NPPF sets out a set of 12 core land-use principles which should underpin plan-making (and decision-making) (17)	1. Be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings 2. Not simply about scrutiny 3. Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development 4. Always seek to secure high quality design and	The subject core principles are generally reflected throughout the Core Strategy in the Vision, Strategic Objectives and policies. 1. The Core Strategy has been prepared in consultation with the local community at each key stage of the development and reflects the Sustainable Community Strategy. Policy CS4 not only identifies how development will be allocated in rural areas, but identifies a mechanism for using Parish Plans and local engagement exercises, to identify development needs and potential community benefits. 2. The Core Strategy enables a pro-active approach through the Development Management process. 3. Policy CS1, CS2, CS3, CS4, CS5, CS7, CS13, CS14, CS15, CS16 provide a supportive approach to sustainable economic growth within the urban and rural areas. 4. Policies CS6 and CS8 seek to ensure high quality development proposals with associated infrastructure and facilities. CS17 provides explicit reference to the role of the environmental network in protecting and enhancing the qualities of Shropshire.	

	good standard of amenity 5. Take account of the different roles and character of different areas, and recognizing the intrinsic character 6. Support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate 7. Contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment 8. Encourage the effective use of brownfield lands 9. Promote mixed use developments 10. Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance 11. Actively manage patterns of growth 12. Take account of and support local strategies to improve health.	5. CS2 sets policy on Shrewsbury as the largest town in Shropshire. CS3 sets high level policy for each of the market towns and key centres. CS4 identifies the role of Hubs and Clusters in rural areas. CS5 sets out the approach to countryside and Green Belt. CS6 and CS17 ensure distinctive character and local context are considered in proposals. 6. CS6 focusses on design and seeks to ensure development responds to the challenge of climate. CS18 focusses on flood and water management. 7. CS6 and CS17 ensure environmental assets are preserved, protected and enhanced. 8. CS11 sets an overall aim of achieving 60% of development on brownfield land in sustainable locations. 9. Mixed developments are supported within the Core Strategy. Particularly in the three sustainable urban extensions identified in CS2 and CS3. 10. CS17 and CS6 provide the basis to conserve and enhance heritage assets and for ensuring development proposals are appropriate for their context. 11. CS10 sets out the housing trajectory for the release of land for housing development over the Plan Period. CS9 sets out the approach for contribution to identified infrastructure requirements. CS14 sets out the strategic approach to managing the release of employment land.	

		12. The Core Strategy was prepared in line with the Sustainable Community Strategy. CS8 provides policy on supporting facilities and services that contribute to healthy communities.	

1B: Delivering sustainable development

1. Building a strong, competitive economy (paras 18-22)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects**	**Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
Set out a clear economic vision for the area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth (21).	*Is there an up to date assessment of the deliverability of allocated employment sites, to meet local needs, to justify their long-term protection (taking into account that LPAs should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of an allocated site being used for that purpose) para (22)?*	The Spatial Vision and Strategic Objective 6 set out a clear vision for economic development in Shropshire. Policies CS1, CS13 and CS14 articulate the approach in Policy. CS14 states the portfolio of strategic employment land will be delivered through a rolling 5 year land supply of 72 hectares comprising readily available employment commitments and allocations. The Shropshire Employment Land Review 2011 assesses the demand and supply of employment land and premises up to 2026. The SAMDev, supported by further evidence of employment land provision, will provide further policy on new employment sites and safeguarding existing strategic sites and delivering a managed supply. The Core Strategy anticipates the possibility of changing economic circumstances in Shropshire. Policies are flexible enough to accommodate	No significant differences. No changes.

		requirements and allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.	

2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres (paras 23-27)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects**	**Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
Set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period (23).	*Have you undertaken an assessment of the need to expand your town centre, considering the needs of town centre uses? Have you identified primary and secondary shopping frontages?*	CS15 sets out the approach to protecting and enhancing town centres and supporting their viability and vitality. Retail Capacity Studies were conducted for each town centre as part of the saved District Plans. An update for Shrewsbury was prepared for the Core Strategy examination. The SAMDev will define the town centres and the primary and secondary frontages where appropriate.	No significant differences. No changes.

3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy (para 28)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects**	**Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
Policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development (28).	*Do your policies align with the objectives of para 28?*	The importance of supporting the rural economy is set out in the Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives. CS5 supports development which maintains and enhances the sustainability of rural communities by bringing local economic benefits. CS4 promotes development in Community Hubs and Community Clusters that helps rebalance rural communities by providing housing, facilities and economic development. CS13 supports sustainable growth of rural enterprise and the diversification of the economy; and economic activity associated with agriculture diversification, green tourism and leisure. CS5 supports sustainable rural tourism and leisure proposals which require a countryside location, in accordance with CS16 and CS17. CS16 supports sustainable tourism, and cultural and leisure development, which enhances the vital role that these sectors play for the local economy and recognises the importance to the rural economy. A rural proofing exercise was carried out to support the Core Strategy. This can be found in the evidence base.	No significant differences. No changes.

10

4. Promoting sustainable transport (paras 29-41)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects**	**Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
Policies that facilitate sustainable development but also contribute to wider sustainability and health objectives (29). Different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas (29).	*If local (car parking) standards have been prepared, are they justified and necessary? (39) (The cancellation of PPG13 removes the maximum standards for major non-residential development set out in Annex D. PPS4 allowed for non-residential standards to be set locally with Annex D being the default position. There is no longer a requirement to set non-residential parking standards as a maximum but that does not preclude lpas from doing so if justified by local circumstances).* *Has it taken into account how this relates to other policies set out elsewhere in the Framework, particularly in rural areas? (34).* *Have you worked with adjoining authorities and transport providers on the provision of viable infrastructure?*	The core strategy provides no policies relating to car parking standards. CS7 complies with paragraph 40 of NPPF relating to town centre car parking, as CS7 seeks to improve the safety, accessibility and attractiveness of transport infrastructure. CS7 ensures that transport policy is geared towards the creation of sustainable development, with policies CS7 and CS8 promoting the development of infrastructure which contributes to healthy and sustainable communities. Policy CS7 ensures that policy is in place to promote a balanced and sustainable transport system, with policy aimed towards providing choice in travel modes and to meet different needs. Policy CS7 does encourage a number of transport and infrastructure solutions to support a sustainable pattern of development to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and congestion. CS1, CS2, CS3, CS4, CS5 and CS6 with CS7 ensure that development which creates significant movement is focused in locations that offer the ability to minimise	No significant differences. No changes.

| | | the need to travel, and maximise the use sustainable transport modes.

Polices CS2, CS3 and CS4 ensure that policy is geared towards providing a balanced and sustainable mixture of land uses in settlements. Policies CS2, CS3 promote a balanced and sustainable mixture of uses in large developments.

The Core Strategy was prepared in consultation with adjoining authorities and transport providers. | |

5.Supporting high quality communications infrastructure (paras 42-46)			
There are no new or significantly different requirements for the policy content of local plans in this section of the NPPF.		n/a	n/a

6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes (paras 47-55)

What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements; this should include an additional buffer of *5% or 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land (47).*	*What is your record of housing delivery?* *Have you identified:* *a) five years or more supply of specific deliverable sites;* *b) an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period), or* *c) If there has been a record of persistent under delivery have you identified a buffer of 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period)? [Para 47].* *Does this element of housing supply include windfall sites; if so, to what extent is there 'compelling evidence' to justify their inclusion (48)?*	Policy CS1 makes provision for around 27,500 new homes over 2006-2026. The SAMDev Plan is currently in preparation and will identify settlement targets, specific sites for development and define the Community Hubs and Clusters. The Core Strategy identifies the broad locations for the growth of Shrewsbury and Oswestry in three sustainable urban extensions, contained in policies CS2 and CS3. The Shropshire 5 Year Supply Statement is published annually on the Council's website. The latest 5 Year Land Supply Statement (Feb 2013) demonstrates that the Council currently only has a 4.1 year supply of housing land as at April 2012. This includes a 20% buffer due to delivery being significantly below target in recent years. Although consistent with the NPPF, policies relating to the supply of housing should not be considered 'up to date' without a five year supply (according to NPPF para 49). The second part of the new Shropshire Local Plan, the SAMDev	No significant differences. No changes

13

		Plan, will identify specific sites for the delivery of housing.	
Illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a trajectory and set out a housing implementation strategy describing how a five year supply will be maintained (47).	*To what extent does the removal of national and regional brownfield targets have an impact on housing land supply?*	Core Strategy policy CS10 aims to achieve 60% of overall development on brownfield land, so the removal of national targets has no effect.	No significant differences. No changes.
Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends, and needs of different groups (50), and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply to meet this demand (para 159)	*Does the plan include policies requiring affordable housing? Do these need to be reviewed in the light of removal of the national minimum threshold? Is your evidence for housing provision based on up to date, objectively assessed needs*	CS11 and chapter 2 of the accompanying Type and Affordability of Housing SPD seek a suitable mix of housing. The Local Housing Market Assessment 2010 is currently being updated to provide more detail for each town. This will be reported in the Place Plans 2013. Evidence for housing provision is based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2008 and the Local Housing Market Assessment 2010, and is reflected in the CS1 requirement for around 27,500 new homes of which 9,000 should be affordable. CS11 requires affordable housing on all developments, with an effective threshold of 1 dwelling, so the removal of the national minimum has no effect. CS11 requires on-site contributions where the requirement results in whole dwellings. The Type and Affordability of Housing SPD details how financial	No significant differences. No changes.

		contributions will operate for fractions of affordable dwellings. The SPD also details how financial contributions will be used, in consultation with Town and Parish Councils, to create sustainable communities (paragraphs 4.21-4.23). The rate of contribution is set annually based on evidence of viability.	
In rural areas be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate (54).	*Have you considered whether your plan needs a policy which allows some market housing to facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs?*	Policies CS11 and CS5 allow for rural exception sites and housing to meet rural needs. This is elaborated in the Type and Affordability of Housing SPD, in chapter 3 (Occupational Dwellings in rural areas) and chapter 5 (Exception sites).	No significant differences. No changes.
	Have you considered the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens? (This is discretionary)(para 53)	Not covered in the Core Strategy.	No significant differences. No changes.
In rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.	*Examples of special circumstances to allow new isolated homes listed at para 55 (note, previous requirement about requiring economic use first has gone).*	Covered in CS4 and CS5 and in the Type and Affordability of Housing SPD (paragraphs 5.13-5.18 and chapters 2 & 6).	No significant differences. No changes.

7. Requiring good design (paras 56-68)

15

There are no new or significantly different requirements for the policy content of local plans in this section of the NPPF.		n/a	n/a

8. Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-78)

What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities and other local services (70).	*Does the plan include a policy or policies addressing community facilities and local services?* *To what extent do policies plan positively for the provision and integration of community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; safeguard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services; ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernize; and ensure that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and good access to key services and infrastructure?*	Policy CS8 ensures that policy is in place to address community facilities and local services, with CS9 helping to deliver developer contributions to increase facilities and services in areas where development is taking place. CS8 also aims to protect facilities from unnecessary loss of facilities or services, and states that existing facilities, services and amenities could be enhanced to improve quality of life. CS1, CS2, CS3, CS4 and CS5 with CS8 aim to ensure that development takes place in a sustainable manner in locations that offer a range of community facilities and access to services and infrastructure. CS15 also provides protection for day to day services and facilities and positively encourages the development of appropriate facilities. The Shropshire Council Place Plans identify local infrastructure requirements and are annually updated to reflect changing local circumstances.	No significant differences. No changes.

17

Enable local communities, through local and neighbourhood plans, to identify special protection green areas of particular importance to them – 'Local Green Space' (76-78).	*Do you have a policy which would enable the protection of Local Green Spaces and manage any development within it in a manner consistent with policy for Green Belts? (Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. The designation should only be used when it accords with the criteria in para 77).*	CS17 could strategically allow protection of assets which contribute to local distinctiveness if a community wished to consider designating a Local Green Space. CS6 also cross references to protecting and enhancing the natural environment.	No significant differences. No changes.

9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)

What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established. New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances (82) Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy (83). Boundaries should be set using 'physical features likely to be permanent' *amongst other things* (85)	If you are including Green Belt policies in your plan, do they accurately reflect the NPPF policy? For example: Lpas should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt. *Beneficial uses are listed in para 81.* PPG2 set out that 'Green Belts have a positive role to play in fulfilling objectives. Para 1.6 of PPG2 set out the objectives – some of these have been rephrased/ amended and 'to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses' has been omitted. Ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development (85). Does it allow for the extension or alteration of a *building*, provided that it does not result	CS5 sets out plans to not amend the boundaries of the Green Belt as established. It meets the expectations of the NPPF. The SAMDev will provide further policy on the appropriate protection of the Green Belt, set out the approach to Community Hubs and Community Clusters where they are identified in the Green Belt and safeguarded land, and provide policy on redevelopment of previously developed sites within the Green Belt. This is currently set out in Draft SAMDev policy MD6. CS5 does not preclude the replacement or alteration of any building in the Green Belt. The accompanying SPD on Type and Affordability of Housing provide guidance on extensions and alterations to dwellings in countryside locations. CS5 makes reference to required community uses and infrastructure that cannot be accommodated elsewhere.	No significant differences. No changes.

19

in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building? (89). *PPG2 previously referred to dwelling. Original building is defined in the Glossary.*

Does it allow for the replacement of *a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces? (89)* PPG2 did not have a separate bullet point – *replacement related to dwellings rather than buildings.*

Does it allow for limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development? (89)
(PPG2 referred to 'major existing developed sites')

Change from 'Park and Ride' in PPG2 to *local transport infrastructure* and the inclusion of *'development brought forward*

	under a Community Right to Build Order' in relation to other forms of development that are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. (90).		

10. Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding and coastal change (paras 93-108)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects**	**Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
Adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations (94).	*Have you planned new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions?* *Does your plan actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings?* *When setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, have you done so in a way that is consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards? (95)*	The Spatial Vision and Strategic Objective 9 outline the importance of mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change. The Strategic Approach guides development to the most sustainable locations. CS6 ensures development is designed to respond to the challenge of climate change and located in accessible locations. The Core Strategy does not set local building sustainability standards within policy. Standards, other than national minimum requirements, are sought where the evidence base establishes the need for a requirement (ie. water use) within the Sustainability Checklist which supports CS6.	No significant differences. No changes.
Help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy (97).	*Do you have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources?* *Have you considered identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources (see also NPPF footnote 17)*	CS6 promotes the use of renewable energy and energy efficiency in new development. CS8 encourages the development of renewable energy generation and infrastructure. The SAMDev sets further criteria for assessing applications for renewable energy infrastructure currently within draft Policy MD8. This supports the approach in CS8.	No significant differences. No changes.

22

11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paras 109-125)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects**	**Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
Planning policies should minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity (para 117). Planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries (117).	*If you have identified Nature Improvement Areas, have you considered specifying the types of development that may be appropriate in these areas (para 117)?*	The importance of biodiversity and geodiversity is clearly established in the Spatial Vision and Strategic Objective 11 of the Core Strategy. CS17 and CS6 articulate the importance placed on protecting, conserving and enhancing the environmental network and the features that contribute to the network. The SAMDev will provide further detail. Draft Policy MD12 clearly sets the hierarchy of assets in line with the NPPF approach. Nature improvement Areas have not been identified in the Core Strategy.	No significant differences. No changes.

12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paras 126 – 141)			
There are no new or significantly different requirements for the policy content of local plans in this section of the NPPF.		N/A	N/A

23

13. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (paras 142-149)

What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
It is important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long-term conservation (142).	*Does the plan have policies for the selection of sites for future peat extraction? (143) (NPPF removes the requirement to have a criteria based policy as peat extraction is not supported nationally over the longer term).*	The Core strategy sets out the strategic framework for minerals planning which balances environmental considerations against the need to maintain an adequate supply of minerals. The policy provides appropriate protection for Mineral Safeguarding Areas and maintains a suitable Landbank of permitted reserves. The Core Strategy is compliant as there are no policies or sites for peat extraction. Former Minerals Local Plan Policy M23 was not saved.	No significant differences. No changes.

Plan-making

Local Plans (paras 150-157)			
What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects**	**Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)**	**Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?**
Each local planning authority should produce a Local Plan for its area. Any additional DPDs should only be used where clearly justified. SPDs should be used where they help applicants make successful applications/aid infrastructure delivery/not be used to add unnecessarily to financial burdens on development (153)	*Are you able to clearly justify the use of additional DPDs if this is the approach that you are pursuing?*	The Core Strategy is a high level document which sets out the strategic approach to development in Shropshire. The SAMDev DPD and Gypsy and Traveller DPD will set out detailed and settlement specific policy to support and implement the Core Strategy.	No significant differences. No changes.

Local Plans should:
    ☐ Plan positively
  (para 157)
	Have you objectively assessed development needs and planned for them?
	If you can't meet them in your area, have you co-operated with others on meeting them elsewhere? (para 182)
		The Core Strategy sets out the strategic approach to development in Shropshire within policies CS1-CS5. The Core Strategy is based on a robust evidence base. Infrastructure requirements are outlined in the annually updated Implementation Plan and Place Plans.
		
		The Core Strategy was prepared in co-operation with adjoining authorities. Informal cross boundary discussions with neighbouring authorities supplemented the formal processes in place at the time within the regional tier of plan making.
			No significant differences. No changes.

Using a proportionate evidence base (paras 158-177)			
What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)	Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?
Defence, national security, counter-terrorism and resilience	See para 163	The Ministry of Defence were engaged during the production of the Core Strategy and are fully engaged in the emerging SAMDev Plan.	No significant differences. No changes.
Ensuring viability and deliverability The sites and scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened (173)	*To what extent has your plan been assessed to ensure viability, taking into account the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements?* *In so doing to what extent has it taken into account the normal cost of development and on-site mitigation and provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable (173)?* *To what extent have the likely cumulative impacts on development in your area of all existing and proposed local standards, supplementary planning documents and policies that support the development plan, when added to nationally required standards been assessed to ensure that*	The Core Strategy proposals were accompanied by a full Affordable Housing Viability Study, published in August 2010. Rather than set affordable housing contribution rates in the Core Strategy the rate is set each year to reflect viability following the approach in CS11. Infrastructure contributions through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) were accompanied by a CIL viability study published in February 2011. Both the Core Strategy and CIL were approved by independent examiners as viable. An updated viability study to accompany the SAMDev Plan is due to be published in 2013. Draft Policy MD3 examines issues of deliverability.	No significant differences. No changes.

	the cumulative impact of these standards and policies do not put implementation of the development plan at serious risk, and facilitate development throughout the economic cycle (174)?		

Examining Local Plans (para 182)

What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)	Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?
Authorities should submit a plan for examination which it considers is sound, including being ….	*Positively prepared*	The Core Strategy sets out a strategic policy approach to meet objectively assessed development needs based on a robust evidence base. The infrastructure requirements to deliver the strategy are identified in the accompanying Implementation Plan which is updated annually.	No significant differences. No changes.

23

Planning policy for traveller sites

The CLG 'Planning policy for traveller sites' was published in 23 March 2012 and came into effect on 27 March 2012. Circular 01/06: Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and Circular 04/07: Planning for Travelling Showpeople have been cancelled. 'Planning policy for travellers sites' should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework, including the implementation policies of that document.

The government's aim in relation to planning for traveller sites is:

> 'To ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic life of travellers which respecting the interests of the settled community'.

Government's aims in respect of traveller sites are:

☐ That local planning authorities (lpas) make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning

☐ That lpas work collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites

☐ Plan for sites over a reasonable timescale

☐ Plan-making should protect green Belt land from inappropriate development

☐ Promote more private traveller site provision whilst recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites

☐ Aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective.

In addition local planning authorities should:

- Include fair, realistic and inclusive policies
- Increase the number of traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply
- Reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan-making and decision-taking
- Enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure
- Have due regard to protection of local amenity and local environment

Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development (para 6)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects**	**Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences?** **Do they affect your overall strategy?**
Early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities.	Has your evidence been developed having undertaken early and effective engagement including discussing travellers accommodation needs with travellers themselves, their representative bodies and local support groups?	The GTAA 2008 included early and effective engagement, as did the policy team's consultations with the travelling community in 2009 and 2010.	No significant differences. No changes.
Co-operate with travellers, their representative bodies and local support groups, other local authorities and relevant interest groups to prepare and maintain an up-to-date understanding of likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of their areas.	Can you demonstrate that you have a clear understanding of the needs of the traveller community over the lifespan of your development plan? Have you worked collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities? Have you used a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of your local plan and make planning decisions?	The West Midlands RSS Interim Policy Statement on the Provision of New Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople was agreed by all West Midlands Authorities in March 2011. This contains allocations to 2027 (ie. beyond the plan period). It demonstrates a collaborative approach and provides a robust evidence base and policy combined, that effectively updates CS12.	No significant differences. No changes.

26

Policy B: Planning for traveller sites (paras 7-11)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects**	**Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
Set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in your area, working collaboratively with neighbouring lpas (8)	Have you identified, and do you update annually, a supply of specific, deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against locally set targets? Have you identified a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10, and, where possible, for years 11-15. (9)	This will be addressed in the forthcoming Gypsy and Traveller DPD.	No significant differences. No changes.
Consider the production of joint development plans that set targets on a cross-authority basis, to provide more flexibility in identifying sites.	Have you identified constraints within your local area which prevent you from allocating sufficient sites to meet likely future need? If so have you prepared a joint development plan or do you intend to do so? Is the reason for this clearly explained?	Sufficient sites to meet future need can be identified within Shropshire. A joint development plan has not been prepared.	No significant differences. No changes.

27

Relate the number of pitches and plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population size and density.		The Type and Affordability of Housing SPD (chapter 6) addresses this.	No significant differences. No changes.
Protect local amenity and environment.		Covered by policies CS12, CS5 and CS6 and the Type and Affordability of Housing SPD (chapter 6).	No significant differences. No changes.
Set criteria to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need.	Has an up-to-date assessment of the need for traveller sites been carried out? If an unmet need has been demonstrated has a supply of specific, deliverable sites been identified based on the criteria you have set? Where there is no identified need, have criteria been included in case applications nevertheless come forward?	Policy CS12 sets criteria to guide provision of gypsy and traveler accommodation. A sub-regional GTAA was carried out in 2008 for the preparation of the Core Strategy.	No significant differences. No changes.
Ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.	Have your policies been developed taking into account criteria a-h of para 11 of the policy	This is covered by policy CS12 and chapter 6 of the Type and Affordability of Housing SPD.	No significant differences. No changes.

28

Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside (para 12)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects	Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings lpas should ensure that the scale of such sites do not dominate the nearest settled community?		Policy CS12 places a size limit of under 5 pitches on very rural sites. The Type and Affordability of Housing SPD provides the necessary careful treatment in balancing needs and community harmony.	No significant differences. No changes.

Policy D: Rural exception sites (para 13)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects**	**Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
If there is a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs, lpas in rural areas, where viable and practical, should consider allocating and releasing sites solely for affordable travellers sites.	If you have a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs in your rural area have you used a rural exception site policy, and if so, does it make it clear that such sites shall be used for affordable traveller sites in perpetuity?	Policies CS12 and CS5 explicitly allow for exception sites for gypsies and travellers.	No significant differences. No changes.

Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt (paras 14-15)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects**	**Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
Traveller sites (both permanent and temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.	Have you made an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site? Has this alteration been done through the plan-making process and is it specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only	This is relevant to local authorities that only have Green Belt. As Shropshire has plenty of land that is outside the Green Belt, this should not be an issue.	No significant differences. No changes.

Policy F: Mixed planning use traveller sites (paras 16-18)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects**	**Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
	Have you considered including travellers sites suitable for mixed residential and business use (having regard to safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents)? If mixed sites are not practicable have you considered the scope for identifying separate sites for residential and for business purposes in close proximity to one another? Have you had regard to the need that travelling showpeople have for mixed-use yards to allow residential accommodation and space for storage of equipment? **NB Mixed use should not be permitted on rural exception sites**	Policy CS12 allows for "essential business uses" on site, with further guidance contained in the Type and Affordability of Housing SPD.	No significant differences. No changes.

Policy G: Major development projects (para 19)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	**Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects**	**Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?**	**How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?**
	Do you have a major development proposal which requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site? If so has a site or sites suitable for the relocation of the community been identified (if the original site is authorised)?	n/a	n/a