### SHROPSHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

## **Stage 1 Hearing Statement**

Representor unique Part A Ref *	A0356
Matter	8 - Infrastructure & Delivery, Monitoring & Viability
Relevant questions no's	1, 3, 4, 8, 14, 16, 18
Comments as attached.	



# SHROPSHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION Stage 1 Hearing Statement Matter 8 – Infrastructure & Delivery, Monitoring & Viability

Reference: A0356 Date: 01/06/2022

#### **Question 1**

1.1 CEG notes that the Strategic Infrastructure Implementation Plan EV067 sets out key infrastructure requirements for each of the 18 Place Plan areas of Shropshire. We consider that further detail on funding requirements from developers is required, specifically in relation to the Shrewsbury Place Plan's 'necessary upgrades to A5 junction capacity'. This is needed to ensure that developers of the various allocations around Shrewsbury understand the amount of funding required from them as part of their respective developments. This will assist with clarity on site-specific viability and other matters.

#### Question 3 and 4

1.2 CEG consider that the principles of Shropshire's Strategic Infrastructure and Investment Plan 2022 are acceptable, however there need to be a more robust analysis as to how the findings are to be applied to proposed site allocations. At this stage it is unclear how projects, which have funding gaps, will be delivered and whether they will rely on developer contributions. If so there appears to be no mechanism in place for calculating or defining these contributions on a site-specific basis. This could affect the delivery of the plan and we would welcome greater certainty and definition to the infrastructure requirements in policies and/or development guidelines of the Plan.

#### **Question 8**

1.3 CEG would welcome the production of an Infrastructure Funding Statement as recommended in PPG.

#### **Question 14**

1.4 CEG consider that the Council's Local Plan Delivery & Viability Study EV115 was broadly carried out in accordance with the advice contained within the Viability PPG, particularly with reference to the inclusion of strategic site typologies including proposed site allocation SHR060, SHR158 and SHR161.

However, no further versions of the Study were produced following CEG's consultation response, which queried its infrastructure cost inputs and viability conclusions in respect of this allocation. CEG have offered to engage with the Council and the Study's author to discuss these findings and obtain further



information on their assumptions with a view to a further iteration of the study being produced.

#### **Question 16**

- 1.5 In respect of viability CEG were consulted on the draft viability assessment and made written responses on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2020 and September 2020. These responses are attached in Appendix I.
- 1.6 In respect of proposed site allocation SHR060. SHR158 and SHR161, CEG disagreed with the Council's assumptions that the site was 'Marginal' in terms of viability; and provided evidence on costs and values to inform this the viability assessment at the plan making stage. CEG confirm that the proposed site allocation is both viable and deliverable.

#### **Question 18**

1.7 In respect of the Strategic Infrastructure and Investment Plan 2022, it is unclear whether CEGs comments on the draft viability assessment have been considered by the Council. The Council's Viability Study (July 2020) made various assumptions regarding the delivery of proposed allocation SHR060, SHR158 & SHR161, in particular a £17.38m cost of abnormal site infrastructure costs, which the Study's author states is a high-level assumption provided by the Council.

At this stage, CEG consider that this appraisal is inconclusive, and we do not yet fully understand how Shropshire Council are planning to address site wide and offsite infrastructure provided by developers where this would normally have been paid for via CIL. CEG would welcome clarity on this matter.