



Shurdington Parish Council

c/o 6 Bailey Way

Dursley

GL11 4FF

26th April 2021

Mr. Ian Kemp
PO Box 241
Droitwich
WR9 1DW

Dear Mr Kemp,

Shurdington - Allocation Sites SHU1, SHU2, SHU3.

I understand, as a result of a communication from Ms J. Symons (Principal Planning Policy Manager), that the Planning Inspector would welcome a formal letter from Shurdington Parish Council, supported by Badgeworth Parish Council, that my Council supports the proposed three site allocations mentioned above and the fact that they would be released from the Green Belt. This letter confirms that to be the case.

Ms. Symons also thought that the Planning Inspector may welcome a copy of an email sent to her and Paul Skelton of Tewkesbury Borough Council recently by both Shurdington and Badgeworth Parish Councils. A copy of the email is attached.

Perhaps I should mention that Badgeworth Parish Council has been involved with Local Plan matters concerning Shurdington due to the fact that site SHU1 lies within Badgeworth Parish and that parts of the new settlement area for Shurdington contain parts of Badgeworth Parish.

I would be grateful if you could arrange to pass this letter and attachment to the Inspector.

regards



John Kay
Clerk to Shurdington Parish Council

Enc. Email sent to Joanna Symons and Paul Skelton (26th February 2021)

Cc Cllr George Porter, Chair of Shurdington Parish Council
Cllr Mike Howe, Chair of Badgeworth Parish Council,
Ms J. Symons (Principal Planning Policy Manager), Tewkesbury Borough Council.

From: Michael Howe [REDACTED]
Date: 26 February 2021 at 13:31:27 GMT
To: joanna.symons@tewkesbury.gov.uk, Paul.Skelton@tewkesbury.gov.uk
Subject: Shurdington - Planning Inspector's Examination

Jo and Paul

Listening to the Planning Inquiry re. the TB Plan, it is clear that the Planning Inspector wishes to set aside a full session on the 9 March to examine in detail the unique Green Belt position of Shurdington as a high ranking Service Village.

I would not normally contact you at this stage of an Inquiry, but in the light of the detailed questioning to date by the Inspector I thought it may be helpful to set down some points from Shurdington and Badgeworth PCs which you may find useful on the 9 March. Some of the points have already been made in the joint submission report by the two Parishes in response to the Preferred Options.

a. Following detailed discussions with two of your former colleagues, both Parish Councils fully support the proposed Shurdington settlement boundary. The new boundary is logical, sensible and robust and allows restricted removal of Green Belt areas for development of the 3 allocated sites SHU1, 2 and 3. All three sites meet the Green Belt 'exceptional circumstances' test and are supported by the outcome of Landscape Assessments undertaken by Toby Jones and yourselves.

b. The revised settlement boundary which runs along the eastern side of the Village, along the A46, is particularly helpful and logical. It has removed the former zigzag boundary, allowing the removal of some parcels of land from the Green Belt for future infill development during the plan period to 2031. A recent land clearance (not one of the infill sites) along this boundary appears to indicate that some development may already be forthcoming although we have no idea yet of the intentions of the landowner. You have indicated that a total of 35 dwellings could be erected on the infill parcels of land along the eastern boundary.

c. Despite the Planning Inspector stressing that the indicative housing figures for Service Villages are just a mathematical method of distributing 880 homes, some members of the development industry appear to work to these figures and beyond. The 3 sites allocated for Shurdington will achieve 85 dwellings which, together with the 16 commitments/approvals since 2011, will total 101 homes or 72% of the indicative level. Shurdington and Badgeworth are fairly confident that with certain infills during the plan period the Village will reach a higher total than 101 homes. Shurdington PC stated in its response to the Preferred Options that Severn Vale Housing would support further developments on sites similar to allocation site SHU3 and within the settlement boundary.

d. Despite the wish of the Inspector to avoid discussion on omission sites, some representatives of the development industry attempt to introduce the matter through the 'back door'. There are 2 omission sites in Shurdington, SHU4 and a parcel of land referred to by Toby Jones as SHUR3. In total these 2 Green Belt sites would provide a total of 230 dwellings which, together with the indicative number of 141, would result in a staggering increase of 48% homes above the present number of Shurdington settlement dwellings. We hope discussion on these sites can be avoided at the Inquiry

because both form an essential and critical part of the Green Belt and your assessment is that neither would meet the Green Belt 'exceptional circumstances' test; both are outside the agreed village settlement area. Written statements have been submitted by Claremont Planning and Planning Prospects in respect of these sites.

e. As you are aware, the omission site SHU4 is 'politically' charged. It was withdrawn, quite properly, from the proposed site allocations at a very late stage (on the day the Council approved the submission plan in July 2019). I think I recall reading that Planning Prospects regarded this decision as perverse. There was substantial local and Borough Council opposition to this site being included in the site allocations. Just in case Planning Prospects for PE Duncliffe Ltd. point out that they feel the Council's decision was 'unsound' because the adjoining aggregate recycling centre was not permanent but temporary, you should be made aware that mineral workings and recycling operations have been in operation on this site for 50 plus years. There can be no guarantee that the County Council will refuse a further planning approval when the present one terminates in about 5 years time. The advice of the Borough Council's Environmental Health Officer to recommend that SHU4 should not be developed on environmental health grounds was a sound one. It is also a site detached from the centre of the village settlement area.

I hope you find the points above of some help and please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any further help on [REDACTED]

Kind regards

Mike Howe (Badgeworth Parish Council) and on behalf of Shurdington PC.