

Further statement on behalf of Eyton Parish Meeting in response to Matter 5, Issue 2 (MIQs)

This statement is supplemental to our original submission and comments dated 1 May 2025.

Qu 51 It is not clear that evidence has been presented as to the viability of the overall SC proposals. Policy HO4 requires all major developments to deliver a minimum of 25% affordable homes, although there is no indication in the information issued by developers of SC3 whether or how this will be met. Additionally, Policy NE3 confirms the Council's intention to aspire to achieving 20% BNG, whereas the developers' vision/Masterplan documents issued so far are indicating 10% BNG.

Qu 52 We continue to believe that the employment land requirement in SC3 is over-stated and refer to the comments contained in paras 2.21 – 2.25 of our representations document dated 1 May 2025.

Qu 53 We do not believe that the impact of growth planned in the SCs on flood risk, individually and cumulatively, has been fully and adequately assessed. The Technical Note on Flood risk dated 30 September 2024 prepared for the Wappenshall SC development consortium expressly indicated that further information was needed and a revised plan would have to be carried out. We believe that the requirement for such a comprehensive assessment and viable flood risk plan should be expressly articulated in order to ensure the effectiveness and soundness of Policy HO2 (and Policy CC5).

We understand that the Strine Internal Drainage Board (SIDB), in collaboration with Cranfield University, is examining strategic approaches to flood water attenuation at scale, with the objective of enabling the efficient use of land for housing on development sites, whilst moderating peak flows to reduce downstream flood risk and addressing low-flow conditions within the river system.

More detail on comprehensive potential solutions and proposed modification provisions to be inserted in Policies HO2 and CC5 of the Plan have been supplied by the SIDB in their hearing statement in response to this Question. We strongly endorse and support their comments and believe that their proposed amendment language should be incorporated as a specific condition in the Delivery section of Policy HO2 as it relates to SC3 Land North of A442 Wheat Leasows.

Qu 56 We do not believe that there is yet clear and convincing evidence of how and when the highways and sustainable transport infrastructure needed for successful delivery of each SC will be provided, including especially, mitigation of impacts on local roads and existing communities. We would refer to the comments contained in paras 2.21 – 2.25 of our representations document dated 1 May 2025. We believe that further detail of the nature and phasing of necessary highways and transport infrastructure should be set out in the Plan for the policy on SCs to be effective.

Qu 58 We believe that the policy should require development in SC3 to contribute to projects for the enhancement of heritage assets, including in particular, restoration of the Shrewsbury & Newport Canal, the alignment and restoration of which is protected and supported by Policy C14, and which runs along part of the northern boundary of the SC3 site.

The incorporation of such an express requirement would contribute positively to the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain through the creation and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological connectivity, and help address low flow issues in the Strine. In addition, the site could provide accessible green space, supporting wider green infrastructure objectives, and contributing to the effectiveness of Policies NE1, NE3, NE4, NE5 and C14.

The same comments may be made in respect of Matter 6, Issue 7, Qu 135 for Policy C14 to be effective.