

Bayston Hill Parish Council Response to Local Plan Review:

The following responds to the questions relating to Bayston Hill and some sites in Shrewsbury only. The numbers relate to the questions in the Preferred Sites Questionnaire for the Shrewsbury Place Plan area. Only those questions with a direct relevance to Bayston Hill have been answered. Only those that do not fit into the printable boxes have been set out below:

Shrewsbury Place Plan Area:

Q46

f) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation SHR145 in Shrewsbury? **No**

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

The proposal to create a new access onto Hereford Road is likely to increase the numbers of vehicles using the A5/A49 Dobbie's roundabout and is likely to add to the existing congestion around the entrance to Meole Brace Retail Park where traffic is regularly backed up towards Meole Brace roundabout. There is a central reservation on Hereford Road so any new access is likely to be left turn only. This will force residents and visitors (including carers if developed as a care home) to drive all the way around Dobbies Island in order to access the town centre unless an access is retained via the retail park. The alternative is to install either another mini-roundabout or a light controlled junction to enable vehicles to turn right. Either option will add to the pressure on the retail park roundabout which will have a knock on effect on the Meole Brace roundabout, negating any improvements that may have been expected from its recent remodelling. If this site is to be developed it will be essential to relieve the pressure on this junction by creating a second exit from the retail park onto Oteley Road.

Q48. Bayston Hill:

a) Do you agree with the identification of Bayston Hill as a Community Hub*? **Yes**
Bayston Hill recognises that it is a Community Hub and expects to provide for some development. It has a mix of facilities and infrastructure which ensures development can take place in a sustainable way but the facilities are already overstretched and vulnerable. Development is much less sustainable if it takes place rapidly on a small number of larger sites, such as is proposed. The recently completed Community Led Plan revealed a clear preference within the community for smaller developments. This was made clear by the Parish Council during the pre-consultation discussions with Shropshire Council and it is disappointing that this has not been taken account of when selecting preferred sites.

b) Do you agree with the preferred housing guideline for Bayston Hill? **No**
The allocation of 200 houses over the plan period will be difficult to achieve without extending the development boundary as the density estimate of 30 houses per hectare is unrealistic. Recent developments in Bayston Hill and the outline scheme design for site BAY 050, (Former Oaklands / Glebelands site) have average densities of 16.9 dwellings per hectare and it is recommended that this figure is used as a more appropriate estimate when assessing site capacities. Shropshire Council has estimated 100 houses on site BAY 039, which is far lower than the theoretical capacity of the site

*based on 30 houses per ha. The Parish Council does not consider BAY 039 to be appropriate for development due to its poor access but has proposed a number of smaller alternative sites, some of which have been assessed more favourably at Stages 2 & 3 than the Preferred Sites being proposed. These smaller sites deliver sufficient capacity based on 30 dwellings per ha but not at the more realistic capacity of 16.9 / ha. A more realistic allocation (excluding BAY039 would be 114 houses spread over sites **BAY050; BAY013; BAY026 and BAY019**. This would leave a windfall requirement of 57 dwellings to achieve the 200 proposed. Shropshire Council has estimated a windfall allowance of between 6 - 12% in Bayston Hill. 57 dwellings would represent 33% of the unallocated target. Whilst this compares favourably with the 40% windfall allocation calculated in Shrewsbury, a windfall allowance of 20% seems more realistic in Bayston Hill. This would result in a housing guideline of approximately 150 houses.*

c) Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Bayston Hill? No

Shropshire Council proposes to re-draw the development boundary to include site BAY 039 which was promoted for development in 2017. Shropshire Council rejected the site on the grounds it was outside the development boundary and would result in the loss of higher quality agricultural land. It was decided that the planned housing numbers in Bayston Hill were likely to be significantly exceeded and that the enhanced proposal of 25% affordable housing was not considered to sufficiently outweigh the conflict with the development plan. This decision was reached just 12 months ago and nothing has changed other than the proposal to redraw the development boundary. This would seem to be an opportunistic approach by Shropshire Council to take advantage of a 'ready-made' scheme and to avoid defending a challenge from an aggressive developer. An alternative option is to redraw the development boundary around those sites promoted by the Parish Council mentioned in the response to Q48b. The Parish Council would question why these smaller sites have been rejected despite scoring more favourably under Stage 2 & 3 assessments.

The proposed revised development boundary fails to include the recently completed developments on Downey Ridge; Hanley Lane and Jarvis Drive. This is unexplained and is inconsistent with the proposal to include BAY039.

The fields around Bayston Hill form part of a rapidly disappearing landscape known as 'Upstanding Enclosed Commons'. They are rich in natural flora and fauna and provide much valued accessible countryside. Shropshire Council has failed to demonstrate that this valuable landscape feature will be protected if the development boundary is extended.

d) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation BAY039 in Bayston Hill? No

The Parish Council objected strongly to this development in 2017 due to the poor access via Lyth Hill Road and the probability of additional traffic causing the junction with Hereford Road to become overwhelmed. Whilst the Highways Agency did not object formally they indicated that the combined effect of developing both BAY 039 and BAY 050 would push the junction beyond its capacity. Promotion of both sites is therefore unacceptable.

The site is remote from most of the existing facilities in the village and its development will have a negative impact upon existing residents. It will also have a negative impact on the neighbouring Lyth

Hill Country Park, which is being nominated as a Local Nature Reserve and as such will have increased protection under planning legislation.

Approval of this site will have the effect of devaluing the land owned by Shropshire Council at Oakland School and could impact on the viability of delivering a Community Hub. The scheme is already designed and if approved as a preferred site would be delivered in parallel with BAY050. The development of both sites would put serious strain on local infrastructure.

e) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation BAY050 in Bayston Hill? Yes

The numbers of houses proposed, together with the delivery of a Community Hub is in line with the Council's aspirations however the mix of housing has not been defined. Bayston Hill has a need for retirement bungalows and low cost 2 and 3 bedroom homes. This is evidenced in the recently completed Community Led Plan survey, (2018) the results of which were shared with Shropshire Council Planning Policy Team in August. It is anticipated that this scheme is ready for submission for outline planning and the Parish Council will wish to review the final scheme before deciding if it will be supported but if approved the site is likely to be available at an early stage in the plan period. The Parish Council recognises this site as the most appropriate location for a larger scheme as it has good links with existing infrastructure and offers the opportunity to enhance the village facilities through the provision of a Community Hub. Nevertheless, the open space of the Glebeland is much valued by the local community and it is important that a significant area of green space is allocated on the site. This is reflected in the outline scheme and the proposed housing allocation of 50 aligns well with that ambition.

64. Please use the space below to make any further comments on this Consultation:

Shropshire Council has invested in a number of Landscape Assessments but has not published one covering Lyth Hill Country Park, despite its popularity and importance to the health and well-being of numerous residents and visitors alike.

It has failed to adequately explain why it has rejected sites assessed as GOOD in favour of sites assessed as FAIR, in direct conflict with the views of the Parish Council. The main reason appears to be the unknown availability of these sites, which Shropshire Council has thus far failed to investigate.

Five sites within the Bayston Hill Parish boundary have been designated as SHR (Shrewsbury) development sites, which indicates that any development will contribute to the target allocations for Shrewsbury rather than Bayston Hill. This has been used in the past by speculative developers to argue that housing targets have not been met within the parish, disregarding the developments at Bestune Way and Otter Drive in their efforts to secure approval for sites within the Green Gap.

*Bayston Hill Parish Council urges Shropshire Council to re-designate these sites as BAY sites and consult fully with the Parish Council over any development proposals. It is only marginally reassuring that these sites have not been included as preferred sites at this stage as continued delay over the delivery of housing on site BAY050 is likely to encourage developers to promote such sites more strongly, particularly if BAY039 is rejected but the target allocation remains at 200. This applies to sites **SHR056, SHR066, SHR182, SHR185 and SHR194.***

See also the printed questionnaire for shorter question responses.