

SHROPSHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Stage 1 Hearing Statement

Representor unique Part A Ref *	A0457, Ford Parish Council
Matter	8
Relevant questions nos	2, 3 and 7

Matter 8 – Infrastructure and delivery, monitoring and viability (policies SP1, SP2, SP14)

Issue Whether the approach to infrastructure delivery, implementation and monitoring is positively prepared, justified and consistent with national policy.

2. What are the likely impacts of the proposed scale and distribution of development on the various aspects of infrastructure? How have these been assessed?
3. Are the infrastructure requirements clearly set out in a policy/policies in the Local Plan? If not, should they be?
7. How will the provision of infrastructure be related in terms of timing/phasing to development proposals / areas?



Andrea Pellegram Ltd.

Prepared by Dr Andrea Pellegram, MRTPI

1. In Ford PC's response to Matter 3, Q15, the point was made that Ford is not a sustainable settlement that can meet the day-to-day needs of its residents. This will be made worse if the proposed allocation FRD011 is retained in the adopted plan, which the PC has advised against. Those arguments will not be repeated here.
2. The infrastructure requirements set out for land adjoining Butt Lane on A458 (FRD011) are set out in Policy S16.2 and Schedule S16.2(i). Should this site be allocated in the adopted plan, the PC wishes that these requirements be amended and augmented to take account of the following matters:
 - a. The policy wording fails to acknowledge that the existing primary school is at capacity and that this proposed allocation will put additional strain on it. The wording of the policy should recognise that the school must increase its intake.
 - b. The proposal should make an appropriate contribution towards the reinstatement of bus services in order to mitigate against the additional traffic to locations such as Shrewsbury which the new residents will require to meet their day-to-day needs.
3. In addition, Ford PC is concerned that Shropshire Council's approach has been to spend the majority of CIL (Local element- circa 90% of CIL) in the Place Plan area a development takes place in. In Ford's case, this is Shrewsbury Place Plan area which is a wide area. Facilities used by parishioners do not always align to the Place Plan area, for instance, the local secondary school for Ford, Mary Webb, is in a different Place Plan area (Pontesbury and Minsterley). Therefore, Ford PC is concerned that CIL collected from any development at FRD011 is not guaranteed to be spent on necessary improvements in the parish, such as provision of additional school places. Policy DP25(2) states:

For new development where the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) applies, priority will be given to using CIL funds to support any critical or statutory infrastructure requirements resulting from the development.
4. This wording should provide a clear commitment in either DP25 or policy S16.2 that the CIL from the allocation will be spent to meet locally identified shortfalls to support that particular

development (FRD011). “Locally” should be defined as Ford parish not the wider Shrewsbury Place Plan area as is the case at present. CIL raised in Ford should be spent in Ford parish and not at other locations.

5. Ford PC requests that:

- **DP25 insert the text in bold:**

*For new development where the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) applies, priority will be given to using CIL funds to support any **local**, critical or statutory infrastructure requirements resulting from the development.*

- **Schedule S16.2(i) insert text in bold:**

*FRD011 will be developed in its entirety and will deliver a lower density development to satisfy the settlement housing guideline and provide infrastructure improvements **such as school places** to the benefit of the local community.*

*....An improved access across the A458 to the services on the south side should also be considered. **A contribution towards improvements to bus services will be required.***