

PUBLIC QUESTION/S

CABINET 2 MAY 2018

Question 1 – from Julian Francis Chair on behalf of Trefonen Rural Protection Group (TRPG) Management Committee

Can the Cabinet confirm that Officers will be reviewing and correcting data and outcomes in Table 10; and omitting wording from Para 5.40 so that it corresponds with the **full** definition for Hubs and Other Rural settlements set out in the “approved” *HofS* and the *PS&DD* documents.

We request that the reviewed *HofS* is brought before Cabinet again for re-approval before Community Hub settlement designations are confirmed and the next steps taken towards allocations, boundaries and sites.

Response to be provided at the meeting by Councillor Robert Macey:

These issues have previously been raised as part of a previous question to Cabinet on 15 November 2017 and during a meeting with Trefonen Rural Protection Group on 21 November. They have also been raised in the Consultation Response submitted by TRPG to the Preferred Scale and Distribution of Development Consultation. The final methodology set out in the Hierarchy of Settlements was approved by Cabinet on 18th October and there are no plans to review it.

However, I can confirm that, consistent with the commitment previously given to TRPG, officers are reviewing and correcting any factual errors in Table 10 that were identified in responses to the recent consultation and we will also consider whether these have any implications for the identification of Community Hubs as summarised in paragraph 5.40 of the approved Hierarchy of Settlements.

As the Local Plan review proceeds, there will be an opportunity for any unresolved objections to the approach taken by Shropshire Council to identify Community Hubs to be considered by an independent planning inspector as part of the formal ‘Examination in Public’.

Question 2 – from Mr Charles Green on behalf of CPRE Shropshire

In relation to Agenda Item 10 *Shropshire Council Local Plan Review* - Tabled before Cabinet under Agenda item 10 is the Consultation Response Summary on the Preferred Scale and Distribution of Development.

We note that on pages 4 and 5, under its comments on Question 4 of the consultation, this Summary makes no reference to the fundamental query our consultation response raised (at paragraphs 4.13 to 4.32) about the maths underpinning the Council’s employment land requirement, which therefore called into question the whole concept of “balanced” growth.

Can the Council explain the mismatch between average job densities in tables 6 and 7 of the consultation papers, as identified in paragraphs 4.23 and 4.24 of our consultation response? Table 7 uses an average job density of 42.25 sq m per job, whereas in Table 6 the average job density is effectively 77.18 sq m per job.

Response to be provided by Councillor Robert Macey

The authority welcomes this question and is happy to provide further clarification to the advice already provided to the CPRE.

In the Consultation Papers, Tables 6 and 7 are contained in Appendix 2 and this explains:

- *how the Council came to the preferred employment land requirement of 305 hectares.*

and the evidence for both:

- *the Productivity Growth Scenario summarised in Table 6;*
- *and the Balanced Growth Strategy summarised in Table 7.*

The evidence for these two planned approaches to our economic future are different in one key respect. The Productivity Growth Scenario was commissioned from consultants Oxford Economics using their economic model as part of the evidence for Shropshire's Economic Growth Strategy:

- *Their model predicts the net increase in jobs (at 14,900) by assessing the anticipated performance of the Shropshire economy and the expected job gains and job losses.*
- *When job gains and job losses are deducted within the model, then each new job that is sustained appears to need a larger amount of land to deliver it.*

However, the preferred approach of a Balanced Growth Strategy in the Local Plan Review was prepared by the authority using the evidence presented as part of the recent consultation:

- *This strategy predicts only the anticipated job gains required to support housing delivery in the County and to sustain the communities within our 'development' settlements;*
- *When only the anticipated job gains are considered it is possible to see that a lower amount of land is actually required to deliver each one of the new jobs.*

Please note that this Balanced Growth Strategy is still being developed:

- *the Summary Analysis of consultation responses presented in the report today recognises the desire of some respondents to see the strategy and the employment land requirement tested further;*
- *the Consultation on Preferred Options presented last year identified how the authority will bring forward further evidence to test the strategy as part of the Local Plan review.*