

## Telford & Wrekin Local Plan: Examination in Public

### Initial Statement by the Council – Matter 8: Site Allocations

1. Much of the Council's evidence base has focused on explaining the three stage sieve that has led to 17 housing and SUE allocations and 28 employment allocations (Docs B2b, B2c, B1a, A3). The approach has been iterative and subject to extensive consultation at each stage. The logic for our allocations is justified as follows:
2. For **Newport**, it is logical for the town to grow south relative to the Wrekin Local Plan boundaries because of the A518, retail approval at Audley Avenue Business Park, proximity to schools and a cluster of sites to the south with either planning permission or resolutions to approve and an employment allocation to the south (E27) that will make best use of the existing links to road infrastructure and funding to deliver. This logic extends to Site H13 as part of this comprehensive approach to the area. Site H13 is not a village green. There is no need to plan for growth to the north.
3. For **Telford**, our approach has been overwhelmingly to keep growth within the urban area including sites with s7(1) consents and to limit growth beyond existing urban boundaries. The history of the town is one of mining legacy and therefore the sites we have chosen within the urban area must not only be appropriate but deliverable too. Growth beyond existing boundaries has been limited to the north east of the town because of its proximity to employment land. Fringe growth at these locations allows more opportunities for extra housing to reverse net in commuting into the borough.
4. Only two allocations are supported beyond the existing urban boundaries. This is because we made a decision consistent with the Growth Hub option (refer D2a) to look to locations with good road and public transport access that will deliver SUEs and with a mix of uses that tackle problems in the New Town associated with the segregation of land uses. They are also in largely in private ownership. Thus we are bringing to the market a choice of land in different ownerships to be promoted. No other sites (apart from H1 and H2) are of sufficient scale to deliver these benefits.
5. The final extent of allocations was informed by our OAN (initially, 9,940 homes) and our "planning on" desire to deliver beyond this OAN. There is no need to build further out into the countryside including beyond the existing boundaries of Site H1 principally because of the proximity of the Lilleshall Strategic Landscape.
6. Our trajectory and the evidence we will offer today will demonstrate that these allocations are deliverable.
7. Our overall approach accords with the NPPF and the likely direction of travel set out in the *White Paper* - supporting the release of brownfield land, planning positively for growth.
8. Most of the housing allocations are small and it is not necessary to provide more information on them apart from the indicative yield if assessed against good practice in recently adopted Local Plans. Appendix B of the Local Plan identifies preferred uses for the various employment allocations. However, we recognise that the Local Plan would

be improved if we provided more information on the scale and mix of uses in our SUEs (refer Appendix to J8/TWC).

Vincent Maher MRTPI