



Shropshire Council
Local Plan Examination

**Matter 17 – Market Drayton Place Plan Area
(Policy S11)**

September 2024



[gladman.co.uk](https://www.gladman.co.uk)



01260 288888

Page intentionally left blank

1 MATTER 17 – MARKET DRAYTON PLACE PLAN AREA

MDR039 – LAND AT LONGFORD TURNING

Question 1: What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered?

- 1.1.1 This is primarily a question for the Council to address although, as a broad matter of principle, no criticism is made by Gladman of the Council's approach to site selection.

Question 2: What is the scale and type/mix of uses proposed?

- 1.1.2 Schedule S.11.1(i) indicates that Land at Longford Turning, comprising both MDR039 & MDR043, will deliver 120 dwellings. Gladman has undertaken a significant amount of design and technical work in respect of MDR039. This work formed the basis for two outline planning applications made to date. This work demonstrates that MDR039 can accommodate a high-quality form of development of up to 100 dwellings, comprising a balanced mix of house types and sizes. Further commentary on the status of the applications is provided in response to Question 4 below.

Question 3: What is the basis for this and is it justified?

- 1.1.3 The design and technical work that has underpinned the outline planning applications made by Gladman on MDR039 demonstrates that MDR039 can satisfactorily accommodate up to 100 dwellings.
- 1.1.4 As a broad matter of principle, this helps demonstrate that MDR039 & MDR043 together can accommodate at least 120 dwellings, as indicated in Schedule S.11.1(i). Gladman has not undertaken any detailed technical or design work in respect of MDR043 however.

Question 4: What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction?

- 1.1.5 MDR039 has been subject to two outline planning applications, both of which were for up to 100 dwellings.

Application Ref. 21/04307/OUT

- 1.1.6 The detail of outline planning application ref. 21/04307/OUT is set out in the Statement of Common Ground between Gladman and Shropshire Council (SoCG08).
- 1.1.7 As made clear in the SoCG, outline planning permission was only refused on the basis that the principle of housing development on the site is not supported by the current statutory development plan; and, that the Local Plan (currently subject to Examination) could not be afforded sufficient weight to be able grant outline planning permission at the point of determination. The decision did not raise any locational sustainability issues; or, any insurmountable infrastructure capacity constraints or technical issues that could undermine the delivery of the site. It is common ground (as made clear in SoCG08) that the site is suitable for housing development and is deliverable.
- 1.1.8 Whilst the application was refused, the parties agree that a number of important principles were established through the planning application process, which underpin the suitability and deliverability of the site for housing development. The key points of agreement are set out in section 3.2 of the SoCG08.

Application Ref. 23/00089/OUT

- 1.1.9 A further outline planning application for up to 100 dwellings (ref. 23/00089/OUT) was submitted in January 2023. This was a resubmission of 21/04307/OUT.
- 1.1.10 Responses from consultees on the application were unsurprisingly in line with those made in relation to 21/04307. These demonstrate that the proposal raises no unacceptable issues from a highways and transportation, landscape and visual, ecology and biodiversity, heritage, air quality or flood risk and drainage perspective.
- 1.1.11 Outline planning permission was refused on 31st May 2023 for 2 reasons. The first was an identical 'in principle' reason to that attached to the decision on 21/04307/OUT, i.e. that the principle of housing on the site was not supported by the current statutory development plan; and, that the Local Plan (currently subject to Examination) could not be afforded sufficient weight to be able grant outline planning permission at the point of determination.

1.1.12 A second reason for refusal was also cited. This states:

Insufficient information has been provided in relation to the potential noise implications for future occupiers of the proposed development.

The noise assessment provided indicates that the site is significantly impacted by road traffic noise from the A53 and to a lesser extent from local roads. The report concludes that to achieve the recommended internal and external standards, good acoustic design principles will need to be applied to the design of the development. Therefore, a detailed mitigation scheme is required as the mitigation measures required could have a significant impact on the design and layout of the site. Any mitigation scheme submitted should include a plan detailing which facades will meet the recommended noise levels. As such the scheme is contrary to the NPPF and policies CS6 and MD2 of the Shropshire of the Shropshire adopted development plan for the area, as it fails to protect the residential amenities of future residents.

1.1.13 The reason for refusal issued was on the basis of 'insufficient information'. It does not amount to an in-principle objection to the release of the site for housing on noise grounds. Since the refusal of application ref. 23/00089/OUT, Gladman has provided the Council with further noise assessment work and information on how good acoustic design principles can be applied to the development. It demonstrates that a range of good acoustic design measures (in accordance with industry best practice, as set out in Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise) can be incorporated within the scheme. This includes incorporating approximately 30m of spatial separation between the A53 and the facades of proposed dwellings; designing the layout and orientating buildings and localised screening to minimise noise propagation across the site; using bespoke internal dwelling arrangements to position the most noise sensitive rooms away from sources of noise; and, using the building envelope to mitigate noise to acceptable levels, where required.

1.1.14 Overall, it is common ground with the Council that, whilst noise is an issue which needs to be considered carefully in designing a scheme, a housing development of approximately 100 dwellings can be accommodated on the site that secures an

acceptable noise environment for future residents through good acoustic design. It is agreed that there are no insurmountable noise issues that would prevent the development of the site for housing, as proposed in the plan.

Question 5: What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?

1.1.15 The proposed development will deliver a range of important benefits, including the following:

- The delivery of additional housing, and affordable housing in line with emerging policy requirements, to help meet identified needs in Market Drayton and the wider borough.
- The delivery of highway and pedestrian /cycle improvements, which will ensure that the housing development is accessible. Importantly, the accessibility improvements will also help support the relocation of the Greenfields sporting facilities to a new location to the north of MDR039. The proposal will therefore support a central objective of the Policy S.11.1 Development Strategy for Market Drayton and an important part of the Council's sports strategy. The accessibility improvements required, the nature of which have been agreed with Shropshire Council through application ref.'s 21/04307/OUT and 23/00089/OUT, are unlikely to be deliverable without the release of the site for housing as proposed.
- A range of economic benefits.
- At least a 10% biodiversity net gain (when compared with the pre-development baseline).
- The delivery of green infrastructure and public open space, which will be available to both new residents of the site and the surrounding local community (on land that currently has no public access to it).

Question 6: What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site?
How could they be mitigated?

- 1.1.16 It has been demonstrated through the consideration of Gladman's previous application submissions on the site (application refs: 21/04307/OUT and 23/00089/OUT), as well as the supplementary information provided in respect of noise, that any adverse impacts arising from the development of the site for housing can be appropriately mitigated.

Question 7: How is the site affected by flood risk? How has this been taken into account in allocating the site? How have the sequential and, if necessary, exception tests been applied?

- 1.1.17 Both outline planning applications (21/04307/OUT and 23/00089/OUT) have been accompanied by a detailed Flood Risk Assessment. This demonstrates that:

- The Environment Agency flood zones mapping shows the whole site is located in Flood Zone 1, which is land outside the 1 in 1000-year (0.1% Annual Exceedance Probability) of fluvial flooding, at 'low' risk. The risk of fluvial flooding is negligible.
- The site is not located close to tidally affected flooding sources and so the flood risk from this source is assessed as negligible.
- The risk of groundwater flooding is negligible.
- The risk of surface water flooding is assessed as negligible for the vast majority of the site, with a small area of low risk associated with ponding in the west of the site, which can easily be mitigated through the adoption of a surface water management strategy.

- 1.1.18 In the context of EA Flood Zone mapping and appropriate land uses, residential development is an acceptable use within Flood Zone 1. The sequential test is passed and the exceptions test is not engaged.

Question 8: What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?

1.1.19 The technical work underpinning the outline planning applications submitted in respect of MDR039, and the consultation responses received from consultees during the application processes, have identified the infrastructure requirements associated with bringing forward the site for housing. Furthermore, the broad costings for delivering the required infrastructure are known to Gladman.

1.1.20 As has been set out above, the physical and other constraints to development are known; and are minimal. There are no insurmountable constraints to the development of the site for housing, as proposed.

Question 9: Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?

1.1.21 Gladman has a good understanding of the costs associated with delivering necessary infrastructure, securing mitigation and meeting the policy requirements associated with bringing forward a high quality housing development at the site; and can confirm that the site remains viable and deliverable.

Question 10: What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?

1.1.22 As a broad matter of principle, Gladman is in a position to prepare and submit a planning application; and secure planning permission quickly. The site is available and deliverable and has the potential to deliver a significant number of dwellings within a 5 year period.

Question 11. Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary?

1.1.23 The boundary of MDR039 is considered appropriate and is logical, having regard to land ownership and existing physical features. There is no justification for amending the boundary.

Question 12. Are the detailed policy requirements effective, justified and consistent with national policy?

1.1.24 Gladman considers that the detailed policy requirements relating to MDR039 are effective, justified and consistent with national policy.

