

**CABINET**  
**11 MARCH 2021**  
**PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

**1. From Rob Wilson**

I welcome the passing of the Putting Pedestrians First motion at the Council meeting held on Thursday 25th February 2021.

What immediate actions will the Council be taking to implement the resolutions contained in the motion? In particular those practical steps that require no significant expenditure, but would provide an immediate benefit to residents, in particular:

- Keeping pavements clear of temporary signs
- Reducing the waiting times at pedestrian crossings to a minimum
- Launching a countywide Commonplace-style consultation to identify where pavements and the walking environment are inadequate

Please can you give a timescale for the other resolutions.

**Response:**

Thank you for your question. There are a number of issues that we are bringing forward. This is the development of a Walking and Cycling Plan (LCWIP) and we are currently interviewing and seeking to appoint someone to the post of Active Travel Manager on an interim basis to develop, consult and seek adoption of this plan. Intrinsic to that process will be the use of various consultation tools in shaping the draft LCWIP, and a Common Place style consultation is recognised as one of the key tools in moving this forward. Previous responses relating to our Local Transport Plan development and consultation and stakeholder engagement after the election period has already been made. Hence the hopeful appointment and the progression with the LCWIP and Local Transport Plan will provide a coherent approach.

On a day-to-day basis where temporary signs are “obstructing” the pavements then this are / can be requested to be removed or relocated under existing powers.

## **2. From Charles Green, CPRE**

*Mr Green has circulated several questions which have been circulated to all Cabinet members and are attached to the web page for the meeting. Written responses to all his questions will be provided in due course. He has been invited to identify one of his question to be raised at the meeting and that is:*

The top line of the Preparation Programme on page 12 incorrectly shows the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) as having been published in both December 2019 and December 2020. It appears on the Preparation Programme because it is a Key monitoring document and it was also said to be a Key document for the Regulation 19 stage of consultation on the Draft Plan. In fact however, no AMR has been published since March 2018 and this important monitoring document is now over three years overdue. Its non-appearance is thought by us and others to be one reason why the Draft Plan may be unsound. Will the Preparation Programme on page 12 be amended to remove this incorrect information? When will the AMR actually be published (it was last promised for “early 2021”) and will this date now be shown correctly on the Preparation Programme?

### ***Response:***

It is recognised that the Authorities Monitoring Report (AMR) is an important document in monitoring the progress of the adopted Local Plan’s policies and Shropshire Council generally aims to publish such a document each year. Over recent years the Council has needed to balance this with the need to progress a comprehensive Local Plan Review. However, it is anticipated that an updated AMR will be published in advance of the publication of papers for Full Council in July. When the AMR is to be published we will notify those on our consultee database.

## **3. Malcolm Andrew Trefonen Rural Protection Group**

*Mr Andrew has also circulated several questions which have been circulated to all Cabinet members and are attached to the web page for the meeting. Written responses to all his questions will be provided in due course. He has been invited to identify one of his question to be raised at the meeting and that is:*

‘At what point does the Cabinet expect to ratify the Final Draft Local Plan to allow the Place Overview Committee to give scrutiny to the Final Draft Local Plan, in accordance with their Work Programme, before it is presented to Full Council in July?’

## **Response:**

Cabinet will not be asked to agree the 'Submission' version of the Local Plan ahead of Full Council in July. Whilst the current work programme of the Place Overview Committee continues to include reference to the Local Plan, there is only one further meeting of the Committee in the current administration and this item is not due to be discussed. It will therefore be a decision for the new Place Scrutiny Committee in the new administration following May's local elections whether to continue to include this item on the work programme for the Committee.

## **4. From David Cooper**

"It was reported recently that the Leader of Dudley Council has called for Shropshire to make more provision to meet the Black Country's needs in the Local Plan. The draft Local Plan already includes provision for 1,500 homes to meet the Black Country's needs up to 2038.

The Shropshire Star reported that Councillor Harley said: "Some 1,500 of this could be met by the proposed housing allocations in the plan around Shifnal and Bridgnorth, with the addition of up to 3,000 dwellings to be met at land to the north of junction three of the M54 as part of a new strategic settlement."

The draft plan includes a new allocation at Bridgnorth for a 1,050 home Garden Village. This would be developed by 2038, with further expansion later. This proposal is understood to have been brought forward by the developer to meet Shropshire Council's growth aspiration for Bridgnorth. Could the Council explain what steps have been taken to arrive at the conclusion that this is an appropriate scale of development for Bridgnorth, and in particular the extent to which this was intended to meet the Black Country's needs?"

## **Response:**

Draft Policy S2 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan identifies the overall housing requirement for the County in the Plan period of 30,800 dwellings. It is proposed that as part of the Duty to Cooperate process that this requirement incorporates 1,500 dwellings from the Black Country Authorities in order to provide support to meeting an element of their unmet need. This cross boundary unmet need is proposed to be incorporated into the overall housing requirement for the County and it is therefore not proposed that any specific site or settlement is intended to incorporate these needs. It should be noted that this scale of proposed cross boundary residential of 1,500 dwellings has been endorsed by the Association of Black Country Authorities (ABCA), of which Dudley Borough Council is included, in their recent response to the Regulation 19 consultation. The Council will be continuing Duty to Cooperate discussions through ABCA. The proposed housing requirement for Bridgnorth, identified in policy S3 of the Draft Local Plan as 1,800 dwellings over the plan period, seeks to respond to the identified role of Bridgnorth as a Principal Centre within the Plan as well as being the County's third largest settlement. The proposed scale of

growth has therefore taken account of the strategic nature of the town plays in the east of the County; the town's extensive level of services and facilities; the opportunity to strengthen the town's economic role and to deliver a better balance of development between housing and employment; and the relatively low levels of residential completions in recent years. The draft Plan proposes that a significant proportion of this requirement, around 1,050 dwellings, will be met through the delivery of the proposed Garden Village on land to the West of the town in land outside the Green Belt, which is felt an appropriate opportunity to meet Bridgnorth's development needs, incorporating a sustainable mix of new facilities and uses, including employment.

## **5. From David Walker**

In recent media output there has been comment from cabinet members about the use of CIL and s106 money to contribute to building the NWRR. The council have published their Infrastructure Statement dated December 2020, some 10 months after year end. Many authorities have been quicker at reporting their Annual Infrastructure Statement. Indeed Shropshire Council used to publish CIL figures much earlier in the year. Sometimes as early as May.

Given we are nearly at the end of this financial year, what are the projected totals for the CIL categories for 2020/21?

How much of the CIL categories / s106 money has been allocated to the NWRR?

Does that allocation have any implications for items listed in the statement / regulation 123 lists, given they are out of date and don't mention the NWRR?

Will there be any unallocated funds left after contributing to the road?

Quoting the council's website

The CIL Regulation 123 List is annually signed off by Cabinet, following the process set out in the Core Strategy and its accompanying Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document and Code of Practice.

Why then is the last publish list so out of date, a list that makes no mention of the NWRR?

Wouldn't a more timely approach to reporting be more beneficial to everybody?

Can parish councils be updated on their neighbourhood funds so that they can properly plan their own activities?

## **Response**

In light of the detail needed and the short time available to respond, a written response will be provided after the meeting.