

**Telford & Wrekin Local Plan: Examination in Public
Matter 8: Housing Sites Allocations**

Response to Inspector's note of 13 March 2017

EiP Reference: K24/40j

This note provides (Appendix 1) rebuttal responses to the submissions from DPP (K24/40c), Barton Willmore (K24/40d) and Gladman Development Ltd (K24/40e), and Parkhill Estates (K24/40f).

Appendix 1

Council responses to relevant representations received on K20/40a

DPP (on behalf of Tesni Properties Ltd) K24/40c

Paragraph/ section	Comment	TWC response
p2	DPP suggest that the scoring exercise of all 314 sites pre-dated the compilation of the SA (D4b), and it did not as evidence inform the process, it was a result of it, by reference to para 2.16 of B2b.	To clarify, the IA July 2015 informed the choice of allocations, having been incorporated at sieve 2 (site assessment) stage as set out in Appendix VI of D4b. The text in B2b paragraph 2.16 could have been written more clearly. The more appropriate wording for 2.16 would be to say, "...set out in the SA...", rather than "...for the SA."
p2	DPP request that the Council fully explain what is meant in point 6 about the earlier sieves, and specifically whether Tesni Properties Ltd, Sites 901 and 902 were removed from consideration at Stage Three by an undisclosed sieving exercise? If this is so, why wasn't this disclosed earlier and where is the evidence of the exercise?	The first sentence of point 6 has been explained in paragraph 7 ii) of K24/40f. To clarify, sites 901 and 902 were assessed at the Strategic Fit stage 3 (see Appendix IX of D5b, p63/72). As section 5 of B2b explains, the 17 sites were ultimately chosen for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3-5.5 and the objectors' sites (including sites 901 and 902) did not qualify for allocation on that basis. It is incorrect to say that the final sieving exercise was "undisclosed" because the outcome of the exercise was clearly made public. Further, it can be seen how application of the approach set out in section 5 of B2b produces the finally allocated 17 sites. We also have K24/40a which illustrates how application of planning considerations to those sites which met 5 or more (See proviso at paragraph 7ii) of K24/40g) of the Strategic Fit criteria supports the selection of the allocated 17 sites. It is acknowledged that no contemporaneous record of the exercise whereby approximately 315 sites were reduced to 17 can be found but it is not accepted that the criteria and outcomes are not transparent.
p3	DPP request that the Council is asked to expand upon the point 6 and the 'planning assessment' column to explain clearly how the scoring methodology	In the Council's opinion, to expand upon point 6 and the planning assessment column would not be helpful given that the scoring exercise was not determinative, as explained in paragraphs 4 and 5 of K24/40g. To clarify, the Strategic Fit score was out of

Paragraph/ section	Comment	TWC response
	was selected, its reasoning for its selection and rejection of alternative approaches.	10.
p3	<p>The application of the scoring is not explained and it raises a final fundamental concern that the Council has not applied any consistent or objective approach. It appears a different approach is applied depending on the outcome sought. If this is not the case, then why would only the selected sites be scored in a different manner? How could these sites have been identified prior to scoring if it were not by some measure of <u>pre-determination</u>? It must be so because how and why were those sites selected for positive scoring? And how can there be no example of a positively scored site not allocated? Either this was deliberately undertaken at the outset, perhaps at the same time 215 sites were seemingly removed from consideration, or retrospectively undertaken to justify a pre-determined selection.</p> <p>We request the Council fully explains why it chose to use separate positive and negative scoring of sites, and more importantly how it</p>	<p>The Council does not consider there to be any merit in providing further explanation regarding the strategic fit stage given that the 17 sites were ultimately chosen for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3-5.5 of B2b.</p> <p>But to assist and clarify, sites were not scored differently nor were the choices of sites pre-determined prior to the Strategic Fit stage. Sites were scored by assigning 1 or 0 to denote a score against each criterion and this was then set out in summary in Table 4.55 of D4b, and again in Appendix IX of D5b. The Council does not consider it unreasonable to state why some sites were selected and why some were rejected. This ensures the reader can understand how the site has scored against the criteria. (Reference is made to paragraph 8 of K24/40g which explains why K24/40a only deals with around 100 of the 315 sites which were scored against the Strategic Fit Criteria).</p>

Paragraph/ section	Comment	TWC response
	determined which sites it would select to apply such scoring and when this was done in the process.	
p3	DPP make reference to the implausibility of scoring site 776 positively against criteria 4 (Promote strategic urban extensions), raising concerns with the merit of the methodology.	<p>To reiterate, the sites were ultimately chosen for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3-5.5 of B2b, including site 776 (proposed site allocation H4) and the scoring of sites was not the determinative basis on which the proposed sites were chosen for allocation.</p> <p>To clarify, as stated in Table 4.55 of D4b and Appendix Ix of D5b, site 776 did not score positively against criterion 4.</p>
p4	DPP request that the Council is asked to provide the full Appendix 2 record for all 314 sites taken through to the Stage Three strategic fit and the scoring of each site. Considering the missing records, we also request the Council clarifies when the scoring of all 314 sites was undertaken.	<p>Please refer to paragraph 8 of K24/40g for the response to the point being raised.</p> <p>To clarify, the site selection process was undertaken and completed prior to issuing the Initial Consultation (Regulation 18) Version of the local plan (D4a) in July 2015.</p>
p4	DPP request that the Council is invited to explain how it considers its evidence and its actions on non-disclosure of the scoring of 314 sites in a timely and appropriate manner, including its partial disclosure now, has led to a fair and transparent Examination process, and how this amounts to a fully justified evidence base as required by NPPF.	<p>To clarify, the Strategic Fit stage outputs were published alongside the consultation version of the local plan (D4a) in July 2015, as set out in Table 4.55 of D4b. Sieve 1 was published as G10, in October 2016. Stage 2 (site assessment) was undertaken in the spring of 2015 and was informed by the IA (D4b) which was published alongside the regulation 18 local plan (D4a). The detailed schedule of site assessments (B2c) was published in June 2016 at the time of submission, alongside the publication of document B2b.</p> <p>Consequently, information relating to stage 2 and 3 was publicly available at the date of submission and available for inspection. All parties have had opportunity to comment on these allocations and on the outcomes of the Council's decision making.</p>

Paragraph/section	Comment	TWC response
		Please refer to paragraph 7(i) of K24/40g for further response to the point being raised.

Barton Willmore, on behalf of Metacre (K24/40d)

Paragraph/section	Comment	TWC response
Paragraph 5	BW suggest that the Council confirmed that the strategic fit stage was not meant as a 'sift' where a minimum of 5 SFC must be achieved for sites to progress to 'stage 4'.	<p>The Council, as explained in paragraph 7(ii) of K24/40g, incorrectly stated that all the sites chosen for allocation had achieved 5 or more at the strategic fit stage. Therefore, it is accepted that a "minimum score for allocation" approach was not, in fact, applied.</p> <p>As section 5 of B2b explains, the sites were ultimately chosen for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3-5.5 and the objectors' sites (including site 658) did not qualify for allocation on that basis.</p>
Paragraphs 7-11	BW do not accept the SF assessment of the Metacre Site. The site meets a minimum of 5 SFCs and should have been progressed to stage 4. We remain uninformed as to how the Council conclusions on the Metacre site have been arrived at and why those conclusions differ to those made in relation to the sites that were selected. So the plan is neither justified nor compliant with the provisions of the NPPF. This is compounded by inclusion of sites 445 and 613, which scored less than 5.	<p>The Metacre site (658) has been considered alongside all the other sites that were assessed through the site selection process.</p> <p>However, the scoring of sites was not the determinative basis on which the proposed sites were chosen for allocation.</p> <p>As section 5 of B2b explains, the sites were ultimately chosen for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3-5.5 and the objectors' sites (including site 658) did not qualify for allocation on that basis.</p>
Paragraph	BW suggest that the	The scoring of sites information was available

Paragraph/ section	Comment	TWC response
16	<p>Council has not sought to provide any information as to how compliance with SFCs has been given weight in the final planning judgement.</p> <p>Indeed, it has confirmed that the SFCs are neither a minimum requirement nor a scoring system for the selection of Sites.</p>	<p>but was not the determinative basis on which the proposed sites were chosen for allocation.</p> <p>As section 5 of B2b explains, the sites were ultimately chosen for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3-5.5 and the objectors' sites (including site 658) did not qualify for allocation on that basis.</p>
Paragraph 20	<p>BW suggest that some sites have been allocated because of existing designations i.e as former new town sites granted permission under s7(1) of the New Towns Act.</p>	<p>The Council has referred to existing permissions issued under section 7(1) of the New Towns Act in paragraph 5.4 of B2b as this is a material consideration.</p> <p>The Council consider it is justified in applying this approach (See paragraphs 13 and 14 of K24/40g for further explanation) and there is a clear intention of the landowner to bring forward the sites for development as illustrated by the Telford Land Deal signed with DCLG to accelerate delivery of remaining HCA land in Telford.</p>
Paragraphs 22-29	<p>Various comments are made questioning the approach to allocating certain sites ahead of the objector's site (658)</p>	<p>A direct comparison of one site against another has not, explicitly, been undertaken. Indeed, there is no such requirement in policy or guidance that suggests that this should be done. The relevant comparison that this Council has to apply is one of comparing all sites, including site 658, against the overall plan strategy. This is consistent with the NPPF and PPG, which states that it is for the development plan itself to determine which sites are most suitable to meet needs (Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 3-003-20140306).</p> <p>As section 5 of B2b explains, the sites were ultimately chosen for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3-5.5 and the objectors' sites (including site 658) did not qualify for allocation on that basis.</p>

Gladman Developments Ltd (K24/40e)

Paragraph/section	Comment	TWC response
Paragraph 1.2.4	No further information provided for criteria 1 and 7.	The Council considers that the criteria are self-explanatory.
Paragraph 1.2.5	Criteria 3 and 5: was the distance measured from the edge or centre of the site, and was 800m 'as the crow flies' or using 'shortest walking route'?	For clarification, the assumption applied is based on the straight-line distance from the site boundary.
Paragraph 1.2.6	Sites 144, 482 and 508 are not within 400m of a strategic employment area so should not have passed criteria 5.	SHLAA sites 144, 482 and 508 form part of proposed Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) H1. It is accepted that sites 144 and 508 are not, when considered separately, located within 400 metres of the nearest Strategic Employment Area (SEA). However, these sites form part of a single allocation, which is within 400 metres (referenced from the boundary of site 482 to the nearest SEA) and have been assessed on that basis. Nowwithstanding this, the SUE is expected to generate substantial amounts of employment on site (and this is made clear in the proposed modification set out in Appendix 1 of J8/TWC).
Paragraph 1.2.7	Criterion 10 does not provide any further clarification on how this has been applied to the Council's allocated and rejected sites.	The Council considers this criterion to be clearly stated and has applied this as a simple measure for each site.
Paragraph 1.2.10	Scores for some sites are inflated in Appendix 2 of K24/40a. Sites 144 and 482 are specifically identified.	The site scores in paragraph 1.2.10 have been stated incorrectly. As stated in Appendix IX of A3a (p10/72) site 144 scored 7 against the Strategic Fit criteria, not 8. In addition, site 482 scored 6, not 7 (as stated on p30/72 of the same document). In any event, the scoring of sites was not the determinative basis on which the proposed sites were chosen for allocation
Paragraph 1.2.11	The Council, in their assessment of the sites they have chosen to allocate, seem to have employed a copy and	Please refer to paragraph 8 of K24/40g for an explanation for submitting Appendix 2 of K24/40a.

Paragraph/section	Comment	TWC response
	paste approach to their scoring system, given that the conclusions are remarkably similar and does little more than record the sites that are allocated and those that are not.	
Paragraphs 1.2.12-1.2.14	Sites in FZ3 should not have passed the preliminary stage. This is relevant for site 482 (part of H1) which was identified in SFRA 2008.	Sites were assessed for their suitability against known areas of flood risk. The Council applied a measure of 50% or more within flood zone 3 being sufficient to justify exclusion of a site. The Council has stated its reasoning for allocating certain sites where flood zones have been flagged. Site 482 has a 30% coverage of flood zone 3.
Paragraph 1.3.5	The Council do not explain why 298 sites have been rejected as unsuitable for allocation.	Please refer to paragraph 8 of K24/40a for the Council's response to the point being raised.

Parkhill Estates (K24/40f)

Paragraph/section	Comment	TWC response
p1 – General	<p>The additional information provided does not explain fully the process of reducing the sites from 315 to 17.</p> <p>Appendix 2 which purports to set out the planning considerations for each site relates only to 99 sites – the introductory text suggesting that the other sites 'had already been sieved out'.</p> <p>There is no explanation as to why or how those 216 sites were discarded or the SF score which was</p>	<p>Please refer to K24/40a for the Council's response to the point being raised (Paragraph 8 in particular).</p> <p>At Strategic Fit stage, every site was scored by assigning 1 or 0 to denote a positive or negative score against each of the criteria, and this was then set out in summary in Table 4.55 of D4b, and again in Appendix IX of D5b.</p>

Paragraph/ section	Comment	TWC response
	afforded to each.	
p1 - General	<p>Appendix 1 provides a very brief summary of the planning assessment criteria but no indication as to how these have been applied to individual sites</p> <p>Whilst the total SF score is shown for each of the 99 Appendix 2 sites we are not told which SF criteria have been scored and which have not</p>	<p>The scoring of sites information was available but was not the determinative basis on which the proposed sites were chosen for allocation.</p> <p>As section 5 of B2b explains, the sites were ultimately chosen for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3-5.5 and the objectors' site (included in site 435) did not qualify for allocation on that basis.</p>
p1 - General	<p>Document K24/40a suggests that all (non-allocated) sites advocated during the Matter 8 Hearing Session 'scored less than 5 when judged against the Strategic Fit Criteria'. Surely, provision of the information suggested above is the minimum which could be expected in order to demonstrate the process in a transparent manner.</p>	<p>The Council has clarified in paragraph 7(ii) of K24/40g that not all proposed allocation sites, in fact, scored 5 or more.</p> <p>A site's score was not the determinative basis on which the proposed sites were chosen for allocation.</p> <p>As section 5 of B2b explains, the sites were ultimately chosen for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3-5.5 and the objectors' site (included in site 435) did not qualify for allocation on that basis.</p>
p1-2	<p>We have previously expressed our concern that the Council chose to consider the Parkhill Estates Ltd (PEL) proposed allocation together with large, separate areas promoted by others as one single site for</p>	<p>The Council did not explicitly state, or promise, at the outset of the site selection process that it would assess each and every SHLAA site on an individual basis. In fact, the Council has considered a number of sites on a grouped-basis where this was considered to be appropriate. The Council consider it entirely logical to assess site 435 on the basis of the boundary identified. Simply because a smaller parcel of the larger site has a separate</p>

Paragraph/ section	Comment	TWC response
	consideration – an action which we believe seriously prejudices any planning assessment of our site.	landownership does not materially change this. Consequently, the Council does not consider there to have been any prejudice caused. In the event, as section 5 of B2b explains, the sites were ultimately chosen for the reasons given in paragraphs 5.3-5.5 and the objectors' site (included in site 435) did not qualify for allocation on that basis.
p3	Parkhill Estates believes that the evidence on strategic fit has been presented in a contrived and unbalanced manner.	The Council refutes this comment. To clarify, sites were not scored differently nor were the choices of sites pre-determined prior to the Strategic Fit stage. The sites were scored by assigning 1 or 0 against each of the criteria, and this was then set out in summary in Table 4.55 of D4b, and again in Appendix IX of D5b. The Council does not consider it unreasonable to state why some sites were selected (the 'positive' perspective) and why some were rejected (the 'negative' perspective). This ensures the reader can understand how the site has performed scored against the criteria.

*