
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 27 January 2015

Site visit made on 27 January 2015

by Tom Cannon BA DIP TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 May 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/A/14/2228348

Land south of Brook Cottages, Ford, Shrewsbury, SY5 9LJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Oak Street Properties Limited against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 14/01036/OUT, dated 7 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 29 August 2014.
 - The development proposed is a residential development of up to 30 dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was made in outline with all matters reserved other than access. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The parties agreed at the Hearing that the Council's emerging Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev) can be afforded limited weight as the examining Inspector's report has yet to be produced. Based on all that I have read and heard I agree with this. I have, therefore, considered the appeal against the adopted development plan and national policy.
4. Following the closure of the Hearing, an amended Unilateral Undertaking (UU) was submitted, to include definitions of discounted sale and rented dwellings. The revised UU has been agreed with the Council. I have also been provided with updated position statements from the parties regarding housing supply in Shropshire, and a copy of the appellant's Five Year Supply Rebuttal Statement submitted to the SAMDev examining Inspector. Comments have been received from both the appellant and Council in response to the respective statements.

Main Issue

5. Based on all that I have seen, read and the discussion at the Hearing, I consider that the main issue in this case is whether or not the proposal would provide a suitable site for housing having regard to housing supply, and the principles of sustainable development.

Reasons

Background

6. The appeal site lies in the open countryside to the west of the village of Ford. It forms part of a large parcel of agricultural land which extends between existing residential development in Manor Crest and Brook Cottages to the north, and the A458 to the south. The northern boundary of the land is defined by mature landscaping, with a brook course meandering through the rear gardens of properties and incidental open space in Manor Crest. An existing public right of way crosses the north-east corner of the site linking the adjacent residential development with the A458. To the south-east is the Leasowes Recreation Ground.
7. The proposed residential development would be accessed off Bank Lane which provides one of two routes into the village off the A458. The land to the west of Back Lane is principally in agricultural use although it does include an existing poultry farm which benefits from an extant planning permission for employment use.
8. The development plan comprises of the Shropshire Local development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2011(CS) and certain policies of the Shrewsbury and Atcham Local Plan 2001 (LP) which have been saved following a Direction made by the Secretary of State. I find no significant conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in respect of the development plan policies cited in the Council's reason for refusal and, accordingly, will give them full weight insofar as they are relevant to the appeal scheme.

Housing land supply

9. The Framework sets out in paragraph 47 that to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should be able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. There is a disagreement between the parties as to whether the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land. The Council confirmed at the Hearing that they can currently demonstrate a 5.43 year supply of deliverable housing land not the 5.48 years referred to in their appeal statement.

Housing requirement

10. Policy CS1 of the CS sets out a housing requirement figure of 27,500 new homes for Shropshire within the plan period 2006-2026. The Council would prefer to apply a phased rather than annualised approach to calculating their housing requirement. I recognise that this method has been accepted elsewhere and the policy wording in Policy CS10 of the CS originally contained reference to a phased trajectory prior to its adoption in 2011. However, this reference was removed due to concerns that it could suppress development. Moreover, the explanation for Policy CS10 makes it clear that the purpose of this policy is to guide phased allocations in the SAMDev and will not impact on the assessment of five year supply. Therefore, in my view the annualised approach is the most appropriate method to apply in this case. This equates to an annual requirement of 1,375 dwellings or a total requirement for the period 2006-2014 of 11,000 new homes.

Under-delivery and application of the buffer

11. Over the first 8 years of the plan period 8,280 dwellings have been provided in Shropshire. This represents a shortfall in the supply of housing of 2,720 dwellings. In addressing its existing shortfall the Council has put forward four potential scenarios. One of these approaches follows the 'Sedgefield method' where the shortfall in delivery should be met within the next five years, with the remaining three options advocating the 'Liverpool method' where it should be spread out over the remainder of the plan period, in this case the next 12 years.
12. I acknowledge the Council's concerns that the resultant five year requirement is so large that it would be undeliverable in the Shropshire market. I also recognise that the SAMDev is at an advanced stage of preparation and may facilitate the delivery of sites later on in the plan period. However, this would be at a stage of even higher forecast housing demand following the increasing five year bands in Policy CS10 and where there are likely to be fewer allocations. Moreover, the 'Sedgefield approach' more closely accords with the Framework requirement to 'boost significantly the supply of housing' and advice in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) that local planning authorities should aim to deal with any undersupply within the first five years of the plan period where possible which in this case amounts to 2,720 dwellings.
13. The Council does not dispute that there has been persistent under delivery of housing in previous years of the plan period. In the circumstances, the application of a 20% buffer, in accordance with paragraph 47 of the Framework, is agreed between the parties. I have no reason to disagree. This amounts to a total of 1,375 dwellings.
14. It is however disputed how the 20% buffer should be applied to the five year requirement or to the five year requirement plus the backlog. The appellants argue that the application of the buffer should include the backlog, thereby increasing the five year housing requirement, and reducing the housing land supply to less than five years based on the late November 2014 figure. The Framework makes clear that the buffer is to ensure choice and competition in the market for land, that it should be supply brought forward from future years of the plan period. I am persuaded by the Council's argument that applying the buffer to the sum of the five year requirement and the backlog would increase the total housing requirement over the lifetime of the plan, and that this approach would represent a penalty on the Council which is not intended by the Framework.

Housing supply

15. I do not agree with the appellant's points concerning an additional discount for North Shropshire, due to the viability of building residential properties in the Northern part of the County as opposed to other parts of the County. Although the appellant has indicated that the delivery rate is proportionally lower in the North, the logical implication of such a policy would be to even out such a discount by reducing discounts in other areas of the County.
16. The appellant has made reference to delays in issuing section 106 legal agreements and older consents. The Council confirmed at the Hearing that about 76% of applications with a resolution to grant subject to a section 106 agreement included in their five year supply have now been issued. Whilst a

- proportion of these applications remain unsigned, I note that such sites have a 10% discount applied to them which appears reasonable to me. This buffer also allows for reduced delivery rates on sites recently granted outline planning permission, or sites in the early stages of construction such as on land at Bowbrook and Sutton Grange in Shrewsbury and Coppice Green Lane, Shifnal.
17. It has been put to me that the proposed delivery rates for the Shrewsbury and Oswestry Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) are overly optimistic. The SUEs at Shrewsbury south and west are either under construction or subject to current planning applications. The time period allowed for the appropriate consents and suggested delivery rates appear to be reasonable in both cases. However, a planning application has yet to be submitted on land North of Shrewsbury Road, Oswestry. There are also potential land ownership issues with this site. It therefore appears somewhat optimistic for outline and reserved matters approval to be granted, conditions discharged and the first 25 dwellings to be constructed by the end 2017 as the Council suggests. Consequently, I have discounted the 25 units to be provided in 2016/17 from the Council's late November 2014 housing supply figure of 11,063 houses.
 18. In reference to older permissions, the Council has included a number of outline consents which are over three years old and have therefore expired. Some of these permissions were granted more than ten years ago and have not been superseded by full planning permissions. The Council's housing supply update confirms that sites at Ellesmere Wharf, the Royal Shrewsbury Hospital, Arrow County Services, Longden, Mill Green Lane, Knighton and Newcastle Road Market Drayton have either been constructed or benefit from extant planning permissions. However, on the basis of the evidence put before me I am unable to conclude that the remaining sites are still viable or available, offer a suitable location for development, and are achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered within five years. Therefore, I cannot conclude that any of these sites are deliverable. As such, I have deleted 39 dwellings in this category.
 19. From the other sites identified with potential delivery problems, I also note that the Former Dairy Site, School Road, Ruyton XI Towns is still in commercial use. Nevertheless, the Council's update has confirmed that this site has an extant planning permission. I have not therefore discounted the impact of this site (80 units) from supply.
 20. It has also been put to me that C2 units should not be included in the Council's 5 year supply figures, with affordable housing only counting if it has secure funding from the Homes and Community Agency (HCA). The Council confirmed that it only includes C2 accommodation if they are self-contained residential units, which appears to be a reasonable approach to me. Although the appellant has queried whether certain sites have HCA funding I have not been provided with any evidence to verify this. Furthermore, the Council's November 2014 update confirms that the Unicorn/Whittington Road site in Oswestry which benefits from HCA funding has not been included in their 5 year supply. This site would provide 53 units and therefore exceed the total number of affordable units referred to by the appellant. The site at Station Road, Dorrington which was dismissed on appeal has also been deleted from the Council's November 2014 figures.

21. The appellant has referred to the recent examination into the Cheshire East Local Plan where the Inspector stated that many local plan proposed allocations may be excluded from supply since they are not yet allocated or committed. Nevertheless, although it has been agreed that the SAMDev only attracts limited weight in the assessment of this appeal it is clearly at an advanced stage of preparation with the Inspector's report anticipated in April/May 2015.
22. Furthermore, I have not been supplied with specific details of the potential unresolved objections to certain selected allocations which the appellant indicates should not be considered. Nor, as confirmed by the Council at the Hearing, should small sites such as Schoolhouse Lane, Bishops Castle be discounted purely due to their relative proximity to the River Clun Special Area of Conservation. Consequently, the evidence provided by the Council provides an up to date assessment on the current status of many of these sites and the ones considered appropriate to include within the 5 year housing land supply. I am therefore satisfied on the basis of the evidence put before me that these sites are achievable and viable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the sites within five years.

Housing conclusion

23. In summary, the Council's five year housing requirement is 6,875. Accounting for the identified shortfall and implementation of the 20% buffer, and removing 25 dwellings from the total number of units to be delivered at the Oswestry SUE and 39 houses from sites with outline consent from the late November 2014 figure of 11,063 leaves a supply of 10,999 dwellings. This represents a surplus of 29 houses.
24. Therefore, from the evidence that was available to me, it appears that from the Council's perspective, they are able to demonstrate a 5 year supply deliverable housing land. Consequently, paragraph 49 of the Framework is not engaged and local plan policies relevant to the supply of housing are up-to-date, subject to their consistency with the Framework as set out in paragraph 215.

Development plan

25. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan comprises of the Shropshire Local development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2011(CS) and certain policies of the Shrewsbury and Atcham Local Plan 2001 (LP) which have been saved following a Direction made by the Secretary of State.
26. I note that Ford has not been identified as a Community Hub or Cluster in the emerging SAMDev and Policy CS4 of the CS does not therefore apply in this case.
27. Policy CS5 states that new development will be strictly controlled in the countryside except for certain defined uses, none of which are subject to this proposal. It was agreed by the parties at the Hearing that these aims are broadly consistent with the countryside protection policies of the Framework. I concur with this assessment. Thus, as the proposed residential development

would be located in the open countryside it would conflict with Policy CS5 of the CS.

28. Policy CS6 of the CS seeks to create sustainable places. It requires development to be designed to a high quality using sustainable design principles, to achieve an inclusive and accessible environment which respects and enhances local distinctiveness. It also says that proposals likely to generate significant levels of traffic should be located in accessible locations where opportunities for walking, cycling and use of public transport can be maximised and the need for car based travel to be reduced.
29. This policy aligns closely with the core planning principles of the Framework that planning should; actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable, and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it.
30. Policy HS3 of the LP says that new housing development in specified settlements, including Ford, will only be permitted, providing amongst other things, the development lies wholly within the settlement. It therefore applies a more restrictive approach and is not therefore entirely consistent with the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development. This reduces the weight I attach to this policy in my assessment of this case.

Sustainability and accessibility

31. Ford is a small to medium sized settlement with the built form concentrated to the north of the A458. Many of the existing services and facilities serving the village are situated along this road which provides an important transport corridor between Shrewsbury and Mid-Wales. These services include a petrol station and large general convenience store which is open until 22:00, Indian restaurant, transport café, which also sells incidental goods such as newspapers and confectionary, and a public house. Ford also benefits from a primary school, village hall and parish church. Such facilities provide many of the essential services required to meet the basic daily needs of residents in the village. Nevertheless, they are concentrated to the east of the settlement with no direct route from the appeal site to these services.
32. As the appeal site is located towards the west of the village it does not immediately adjoin any of the above facilities. However, I have been provided with a plan identifying a number of potential routes that future occupiers of the site could utilise to access facilities in the village. The distances specified on this plan were agreed by the parties at the Hearing.
33. In terms of pedestrian links, the most direct route from the appeal site to facilities in the village would be via the public right of way which extends along the eastern boundary of the appeal site towards the A458. As this route is through farmland it would be unsuitable for those with limited mobility or with children in pushchairs. It is also unlit and does not include a defined footway making it unattractive for users at night or in inclement weather. Even following this route, future occupiers would have to travel at least 700 metres to access services in the village. For the above reasons, this route would not provide a viable option for all occupants of the scheme.

34. Immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of the appeal site is an existing footway and bridge over the brook, which links the land to Manor Crest. The indicative plans show a new pedestrian link connecting the appeal development to the footpath in Manor Crest. There are two potential routes for pedestrians to access services in the village in this direction. The first would be via Manor Crest and Crompton Mews, with the second following Manor Crest round to Butt Lane.
35. I observed that both routes are served by continuous footways and street lighting. However, neither option provides a direct route to facilities in the village. The first route involves travelling through a residential area and a covered walkway which extends underneath several dwellings. No signs demark this route and I had to be directed to the access onto Butt Lane by the appellant during my site visit. Although the bus stop at the junction of The Leasowes and Butt Lane is only about 250 metres from this direction, the school and general convenience store are 692 metres and 1.1 Kilometres away. The second option offers a circuitous route through Manor Crest onto Butt Lane. This also increases the distance to the school to 823 metres and general convenience store to 1.2 Kilometres.
36. I therefore conclude that a combination of the nature of both these routes and the distance to local services would not make them attractive to prospective occupiers of the appeal development. Alternatively, future occupants of the development could travel north along Bank Lane to access Butt Lane. However, this would add a further 250 metres to the total journey lengths referred to above.
37. The land on the appeal site gradually slopes down towards the brook, levelling out opposite the existing footway and bridge. This area in the north-east corner of the site, which on the indicative plans is shown to form part of a landscaped buffer, together with brook, bridge and footway is situated in flood zone 3. The parties were unable to confirm if this area is defined as zone 3a, land with a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of river flooding or 3b, functional floodplain. Nevertheless, local residents and local Councillors have confirmed that this part of the site, the bridge, footpath and sections on Bank Lane often flood. In a flood event access to the footpath and bridge from the appeal site would not therefore provide a viable option for future occupiers of the scheme to access services in the village. Similarly, in times of flood it would not be possible to travel north along Bank Lane to access Butt Lane.
38. Alternatively, in the event of a flood, future residents could also travel south along Back Lane to access services on the A458. I recognise that Bank Lane appears to be a moderately trafficked road, and the appeal scheme would provide improved the necessary visibility splays, a modest section of footway along the site frontage and passing bays on the lane. However, despite these measures there would be no continuous footpath or street lighting on Back Lane. This would make the route less attractive for pedestrians.
39. Back Lane also provides access from the A458 to the village and contains several sharp bends restricting visibility. Such considerations and the significant additional vehicle movements associated with the appeal development could make this route less appealing for pedestrian users and cyclists. Moreover, following this route the school at about 1.1 kilometres and

the general convenience store approximately 1.3 Kilometres away would not be within reasonable walking distance of the appeal site.

40. It has also been suggested that an alternative pedestrian link could be provided through Leasowes Recreation Ground. Nevertheless, this option has been discounted due to the visual impact of a new bridge over the brook, the absence of lighting and the potential exit point over an existing vehicular access. For these reasons, the Parish Council as landowners would resist a potential new pedestrian route over this land. I have not therefore considered this option in reaching my decision.
41. In terms of public transport, I understand that both the Arriva bus service and the Shropshire Link Dial a Ride pre bookable scheme have been discontinued. Nevertheless, it was confirmed at the Hearing that Ford is served by two bus services, the 74 and X75 which provide a regular service between approximately 08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Saturdays from Shrewsbury to Llantyllin. The X75 stops on the A548 adjacent to Butt Lane, with the route of the 74 passing through the village, with a bus stop located at the junction of The Leasowes and Butt Lane to the north of the settlement. Both services therefore provide a realistic alternative to the private motor vehicle for residents of Ford to access a range of facilities, potential employment opportunities and health care services available in Shrewsbury. However, although the bus stop is located within relatively close proximity to the site, it is not served by a direct footpath link, further reducing its connectivity with the village and its facilities.
42. In relation to vehicular access there are two potential routes to the appeal site. The most direct option is to exit the A548 onto Back Lane. The proposed access is only a short distance from this point when travelling by motor vehicle. Therefore, the site would be easily accessible from this direction. Alternatively, vehicles could leave the A458 at the junction with Butt Lane and travel through the village before entering the appeal site at the northern end of Bank Lane. I recognise that this route is longer and motorists would be required to negotiate school traffic at certain times of the day, the narrow bridge and section of Bank Lane which local residents have indicated occasionally floods. However, it still provides a potential alternative for motorists accessing the site. The provision of two routes to the site would also potentially distribute additional traffic movements associated with the development across the local road network.
43. Notwithstanding my conclusions with regards to vehicle access, the appeal development would effectively 'turn its back' on the existing village and would fail to provide an appropriate level of integration and connectivity with the existing settlement by means of access to services in Ford for both pedestrians and cyclists. It would not therefore provide an inclusive environment or be located where opportunities for walking, cycling and use of public transport can be maximised and the need for car based travel to be reduced. Consequently, the appeal scheme would conflict with Policy CS6 of the CS and the provisions of the Framework in this respect.

Loss of agricultural land

44. The appeal development would result in the loss of existing agricultural land. Paragraph 112 of the Framework says that local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land

is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.

45. I observed during my site visit that the land appeared to have been used to grow crops. Despite the gently undulating levels, local residents also indicated that the field had been used for this purpose for some time. The Council state that the site is Grade 3 agricultural land. Paragraph 26 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms that Grade 3 land is divided into two sub-categories, 3a and 3b, with 3a defined as the best and most versatile agricultural land. The appellant was unable to clarify if the site represented grade 3a land. Therefore, on the basis of the evidence put before me I cannot rule out that the appeal scheme would result in the loss of a significant area of the best and most versatile agricultural land. This further weighs against the development.

Character and appearance

46. The appeal site immediately adjoins the built up form of the village. The development would therefore read as an extension to the existing settlement pattern rather than isolated development in the open countryside. Similarly, whilst the site directly adjoins the Ford Conservation Area, it is located away from the historic core of the settlement, which is concentrated to the north and west of village and is visually separated from the appeal site by modern housing development and the topography of the land. The development would thus preserve the character and appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area.
47. Nevertheless, the proposal would involve the development of existing agricultural land. Due to the scale and quantum of development proposed, on a site which is currently free from development, the appeal scheme would clearly impact on the character and appearance of the countryside. Although the design and appearance of the scheme are not matters to be determined under this appeal, the gradual rise in levels on site would also increase the visual impact and prominence of the proposal when viewed from the surrounding open countryside. This adds to the harm I have identified above.

Overall Planning Balance

48. Paragraph 7 of the Framework states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These roles are mutually dependant and should be jointly sought to achieve sustainable development.
49. The Framework seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing. Given my conclusion of the Council's five year housing supply, however, the appeal site is not required to meet the area's identified housing need. Therefore, little weight can be attached to the release of this unallocated, greenfield site to meet housing need.
50. The proposal would generate substantial economic benefits during the construction phase and through the ongoing support for local businesses in Ford by future occupiers of the new dwellings. It would also provide additional income through the new Homes Bonus and Council Tax receipts. I attach moderate weight to these benefits.
51. Turning to the social aspects of sustainability, the scheme would provide on-site affordable housing to meet a recognised need in accordance with Policy CS11 of the CS and the Shropshire Local Development Framework Type and

Affordability of Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD). It would also represent chargeable development under the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy required to mitigate the effects of the proposal and thereby contributes towards infrastructure in the local area. I apportion moderate weight to such considerations.

52. In relation to the environment, the scheme would provide a large open area and through a subsequent reserved matters application could introduce enhancements to landscaping both within the site and on its boundaries. However, such measures would only serve to mitigate the harm that I have identified through the potential loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land and harm to the character and appearance of the countryside. Furthermore, the lack of connectivity and integration of the appeal scheme with the village would increase the reliance of the potential future occupiers of the development on the private motor vehicle, reducing the scope of more sustainable travel choices.
53. Boosting significantly the supply of housing will inevitably require housing to be built on some greenfield sites which will result in changes to local environments. Nonetheless, the policy conflict, shortcomings of the sites location in terms of accessibility and sustainability with the settlement, the potential loss of agricultural land and impact on the character and appearance of the countryside would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the acknowledged benefits of the proposal. I therefore conclude that the appeal should fail.

Other Matters

54. I recognise that local residents and the PC are of the view that there is no demand for either market or affordable housing in Ford following recent housing developments in the village. I am also mindful that the Parish Council (PC) have undertaken their own housing needs survey which demonstrated a limited demand for new housing in the area. Nonetheless, the Council confirmed at the Hearing that such provision locally does not negate the need or policy requirement for new affordable housing across the wider local area and County in general. I agree with this assessment as Policy CS11 of the CS and the Shropshire Local Development Framework Type and Affordability of Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) identifies a clear need for affordable housing in Shropshire, and the requirement for all new residential development to contribute towards such provision.
55. It has been put to me that an extant planning permission for employment use, on land to the north-west of the appeal site could, if implemented add to vehicular movements on Back Lane. Nevertheless, no details have been provided of this permission, which I understand from the Council was granted some years ago. Therefore, I am unable to conclude, based on the available evidence, that the cumulative impact of the appeal scheme and this historic permission would adversely affect highway safety in the area.
56. Other concerns have been raised by local residents, the PC and the local Councillor regarding potential noise and disturbance from the proposed development to residents in Manor Crest, the effect on ecology and the potential impact on the local primary school which is operating at full capacity. I recognise that the appeal site occupies a slightly elevated position in relation to Manor Crest. However, the existing landscaping and area of open space

between the appeal site and these properties would help mitigate any noise generated from the proposed development. A landscaped buffer is also proposed on the northern part of the site, further reducing any impact to neighbouring occupiers.

57. The submitted Phase 1 Environmental Survey demonstrates that the development would not have a detrimental impact on protected species subject to the conditions recommended by the Council's Ecologist. Although it is suggested that there is currently no available space at the primary school for children connected with the proposed development, the situation could change by the time the scheme is completed. This matter does not therefore weigh against the proposal.

Unilateral Undertaking and the Community Infrastructure Levy

58. A signed Unilateral Undertaking (UU) dated 30 January 2015 has been submitted which would secure contributions towards affordable housing. The appeal proposal would also represent chargeable development under the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which would help mitigate the impact of the scheme if permission were granted. However, given my conclusions on the appeal, there is no need for me to consider the matter further.

Conclusion

59. For the reasons set above, and having regard to all other matters raised, including the scope of possible planning conditions, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Cannon

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Mrs Bicknell | Les Stephan Planning Ltd |
| Mr M Parrish | The Planning Group Limited and Principal of Oak Street Properties Ltd |
| Mr D Richards | The Planning Group Limited |
| Mrs H Howie | Berrys |

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Mr T Rogers | Area Planning Manager Shropshire Council |
| Mr D Wallace | Senior Specialist Planning Policy Shropshire Council |
| Mrs N Brown | Technical Specialist Planning Officer Shropshire Council |
| Councillor R Evans | Councillor Shropshire Council |

INTERESTED PARTIES

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Mr R Blyth | Vice Chair, Ford Parish Council |
| Mr S Courtney | Local Resident, 69 The Leasowes, Ford, SY5 9LU |

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

1. A signed copy of addendum to Statement of Common Ground
3. Plan showing the extent of Flood Zone 3
4. Plan identifying Ford development boundary in the Shrewsbury and Atcham
Local Plan 2001
5. Plan indicating different potential routes, including distances to facilities in Ford
6. Policy HS3 of the Shrewsbury and Atcham Local Plan 2001
7. Policy CS10 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core
Strategy 2011
8. Appendix 3 to Shropshire Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement