

# Hearing Statement – Matter 9 Bridgnorth Place Plan Area (Policy S3).

## Tasley Garden Village.

On behalf of Bloor Homes Ltd and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd.

Date: September 2024 | Pegasus Ref: P20-1800\_R016v1 PL\_JB/JB

Representor ID: A0609, B-A070

Author: Jonathan Burns

# TASLEY GARDEN VILLAGE





## Document Management.

Version	Date	Author	Checked/ Approved by:	Reason for revision
1	September 2024	Jonathan Burns	Jonathan Burns	-



# Contents.

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Matter 9 Questions – Development Strategy.....	4
1. What is the background to the site allocation? How was it identified and which options were considered? .....	4
4. What is the current planning status of the site in terms of planning applications, planning permissions and completions/construction? .....	4
5. What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring? .....	4
6. What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated? .....	4
8. What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed? .....	5
9. Is the site realistically viable and deliverable? .....	5
10. What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic? .....	5
11. Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary? .....	6
12. Are the detailed policy requirements effective, justified and consistent with national policy? .....	7
3. Conclusions.....	8



# 1. Introduction.

- 1.1. Pegasus Group is instructed by Bloor Homes Ltd ('Bloor') and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd ('Taylor Wimpey') to prepare Statements in respect of their land interests at Tasley Garden Village, Bridgnorth. Tasley Garden Village is identified as an allocation with the draft Shropshire Local Plan as a comprehensive mixed use sustainable urban extension (BRDO30), identified under Policy S3 – Bridgnorth Place Plan Area.
- 1.2. This Statement deals with Matter 9 Bridgnorth Place Plan Area (Policy S3) which addresses the following issue:

***Issue – Whether the proposed Place Plan Area and site allocations within it are justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy.***



## 2. Matter 9 Questions – Development Strategy.

2.1. The following provides a response to some of those questions identified in the Stage 2 Matters, Issues and Questions document (ID40). These are dealt with in the order that they appear within ID40.

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

2.2. Shropshire Council's EV013 provides a summary of the options considered and background to the site allocation BRDO30.

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

2.3. Bloor and Taylor Wimpey are in the process of preparing a planning application for the site with the view to submitting an outline application in early 2025. An EIA Scoping Opinion request was submitted in respect of the site on 23rd July 2024 (ref. 24/O2859/SCO) with a response provided on 5th September. As discussed in respect of question 11, this Scoping Opinion request was for an application boundary for the site that differs from the allocation boundary for BRDO30 as shown on the draft policies map.

**5. What are the benefits that the proposed development would bring?**

2.4. The proposed development would deliver a comprehensive mixed-use development capable of delivering associated infrastructure and services to meet the needs of future and existing residents. The residential development would generate additional council tax receipts of around £2.3million per annum<sup>1</sup> and additional household expenditure of around £27.3million a significant proportion of which would be retained locally within Bridgnorth or other destinations in Shropshire. The benefits associated with the employment allocation within the site are dealt with through Matter 26.

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

2.5. Potential adverse impacts and their mitigation are addressed in the Development Guidelines for BRDO30 as set out in Schedule S3.1(i). This allows for mitigation through the construction and operational phases of the development. In addition a wide range of technical assessments have been undertaken to inform the draft allocation and the future planning application. These have not identified any technical issues that cannot be mitigated.

2.6. The loss of agricultural land is an adverse impact that cannot be mitigated in terms of potential food production; however this would be the case of any development on existing agricultural fields.

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on 2024/25 rates.

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

2.7. As with the potential adverse impacts, the Development Guidelines for BRDO30 identify the necessary infrastructure requirements for the proposed development. These include;

- Local retail, community and service provision to be delivered through a local/village centre;
- A new primary school;
- A potential requirement for a medical centre dependent on discussions with Shropshire Telford and Wrekin Integrated Care System (ICS);
- Green infrastructure and open space, including sports facilities;
- Highways infrastructure including new accesses into the site and associated crossings;
- A footbridge over the A458 if required;
- Off-site highways improvements;
- Sustainable drainage features;
- Extension of bus network to and through the site.

2.8. These infrastructure requirements would all be delivered or funded by the development/developers. As part of the preparation of the planning application and the initial due diligence to support the land deal; these infrastructure requirements have been costed by Bloor and Taylor Wimpey. These infrastructure requirements are not unusual for a development of this scale and the work done to date demonstrates that these can be delivered by the development.

2.9. No other constraints to development have been identified.

**9. Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?**

2.10. Yes. The broad viability of the site is demonstrated through the viability appraisal work carried out to inform the Local Plan process in EV115 and GC49. In addition, both the viability and deliverability of the scheme is demonstrated by the commitment by Bloor and Taylor Wimpey through both the promotion of the site through the Local Plan and the planning application currently being prepared. This is done alongside willing landowners.

2.11. As set out in respect of Question 8, viability work undertaken by the developers as part of their due diligence and to support the planning application preparation confirm that a policy compliant development could be delivered.

**10. What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?**

2.12. As set out in our representations to the additional submission documents (ID B-A070) and the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG13), it is considered that the delivery rates

assumed within the Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement (GC47) are overly cautious. Instead, it is expected that the development would see two outlets delivering across the site with completions averaging at least 100 per year with first completions in 2025/26 and final completions in 2035/36. These are considered a cautious estimate as a third outlet may be introduced on parts of the site which could boost annual delivery rates on the site to around 125 dwellings per annum.

- 2.13. The delivery of infrastructure, including the local/village centre will come forward alongside the rest of the development and in accordance with an agreed phasing plan.

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

- 2.14. As set out in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG13), the boundary of the draft site allocation was informed by an initial masterplan prepared by Taylor Wimpey through the Local Plan process.
- 2.15. Since that masterplan was prepared, Bloor has assumed control of the majority of the Tasley Garden Village site and associated Potential Future Direction of Growth area. As such, Bloor is now leading on the overall promotion and delivery of the scheme. Taylor Wimpey has maintained control over a smaller part of the site and will be a development partner of Bloor moving forward.
- 2.16. Consistent with the proposed Development Guidelines for the site, Bloor and Taylor Wimpey are currently reviewing the masterplan to inform the potential sustainable development of the site. This review will ensure that the development achieves proposed site guidelines, wider policy requirements, and responds to the change in land control and implications this will have on the phasing of development. This work is ongoing with an expectation that Bloor and Taylor Wimpey will engage with the local planning authority and undertake consultation prior to the Matter 9 Local Plan examination hearing.
- 2.17. Through this ongoing masterplanning process consideration is being given to the design, layout and the suitable phasing of development and infrastructure delivery. Based on the masterplanning work emerging it is expected that the revised masterplan will identify an opportunity to improve the development and associated phasing. As such, it is expected that an amendment to the proposed Tasley Garden Village allocation boundary, and Potential Future Direction of Growth boundary, will be considered appropriate. This would be sought and could be delivered through a main modification to the plan.
- 2.18. Notwithstanding this, if there is a requirement for further housing delivery over the plan period for whatever reason then the area identified as the Potential Future Direction of Growth, or part thereof, could be brought into the allocation boundary as part of any boundary amendments.
- 2.19. Such an approach would have the added benefit of allowing the preparation and delivery of a comprehensive masterplan incorporating the land currently identified as the potential future direction of growth. This would allow mitigation and infrastructure requirements to be planned for and delivered comprehensively for the site as a whole rather than requiring this to be phased whilst allowing planning for the management and maintenance of open space across the site.

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

- 2.20. In general the policy requirements are considered to be effective, justified and consistent with national policy. However, we do have some concerns regarding certain elements of the policy as per the draft in MMO81. These concerns are set out in the following paragraphs.
- 2.21. As set out in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG13); we do not consider that a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) that is currently required within the Development Guidelines is necessary or justified. The requirement for an SPD is inconsistent with Development Guidelines for other similar sized allocations elsewhere in the draft Local Plan and would not achieve any additional controls, or deliver a better scheme, that could not be achieved through the allocation Development Guidelines and preparation of an agreed masterplan and design code for the site. Instead, and consistent with Development Guidelines for other larger allocations within the draft Plan, there should only be a requirement for a masterplan to be agreed to inform the future development of the site; rather than an SPD.
- 2.22. As set out in our representations to the Submission Draft Plan (ID: AO609) and Statement of Common Ground (ScCG13), whilst we support the delivery of a local/village centre as required by the Development Guidelines, the requirement for the delivery of this to be linked to the first phase of residential development is not effective or justified. Such a requirement would make it difficult to secure occupiers for the commercial uses noting that there is unlikely to be sufficient demand to support these through the delivery of the first phase. In addition, this approach would also require the siting of the local centre close to the first phase which could limit its accessibility and ability to serve later phases of residential development, and the employment uses.



### 3. Conclusions.

- 3.1. Bloor and Taylor Wimpey continue to support the allocation of the Tasley Garden Village site (BRDO30) and the Potential Future Direction of Growth area to deliver a mixed-use development to help meet existing and future housing and employment needs.
- 3.2. Amendments are sought to the draft policy wording and development guidelines as set out in this hearing statement, the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG13) and previous representations. For ease of reference the following amendments are sought:
- Removal of requirement for an SPD to be prepared in support of the allocation, to be replaced with a requirement for a masterplan.
  - Amendment so that local centre requirement is not linked to the first phase of residential development.
  - Amendments to the allocation boundary to reflect updates to the site masterplan and expected phasing.
  - Inclusion of identified Potential Future Direction of Growth within the Tasley Garden Village allocation for development within and beyond the current plan period.

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)  
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

**Liverpool**

No. 4 St Paul's Square, Liverpool, L3 9SJ  
T 0151 317 5220  
E [Liverpool@pegasusgroup.co.uk](mailto:Liverpool@pegasusgroup.co.uk)  
Offices throughout the UK.

# Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, GL7 1RQ  
We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001



[Pegasus\\_Group](#)



[pegasusgroup](#)



[Pegasus\\_Group](#)

**PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK**