

Western Division

Emma Pierce-Jenkins
Telford and Wrekin Council
Environment and Regeneration
Darby House PO Box 212
Lawn Central
TELFORD
Shropshire TL3 4LB

Your Ref:
Our Ref:

Direct Line: 0121 352 5482
Fax No: 0121 352 5188

Date: \ | August 2005

Dear Emma

PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT CORE STRATEGY DPD

I am sorry about the long delay in getting these comments to you.

There are a lot of good things about your draft, particularly the links to the Community Strategy, the way you have followed the methodology set out on page 35 of the POS Report and your avoidance of re-iterating national policies. I appreciate that a great deal of your work has been done before the advice from London was available and indeed much of the thinking on "spatial" matters is still developing. I have, however, raised quite a number of points below and in many ways this is because of the many new features that are meant to be covered in core strategies.

A number of my concerns relate to the profile on page 5 and the vision on pages 18 and 19. The POS study does give some idea of what might be in a spatial profile on page 36. I think you might expand both of these sections to be more focused.

There is also, in my view, a lack of precision in your spatial objectives. An example, perhaps, is the housing provision. Your spatial objectives appear very general whereas the objectives in the POS, as for example on page 23, are much more detailed. I cannot see your housing provision figures mentioned anywhere in this document.

This leads me to what concerns me most about your document. In my view, there is a lack of depth and spatial content in the work that follows the strategic objectives and in particular the options for Telford. As they stand in your draft, these appear to me to be simplified land use alternatives. In my view, there should be a lot more in this work about the aspects set out Table 6 page 23 of the POS Report. How would the housing target be achieved? What transport and infrastructure will be needed to support it? Who would provide the housing? Who would provide the supporting infrastructure? When would the housing be provided, including crucial matters such

as phasing? What sort of housing will be provided and what would be the needs of those living in the new housing.

I suppose another way of looking at it is the way in which the large new English Partnership sites will interact with windfalls and other smaller sites over the plan period and what problems they will present for the new inhabitants and for the provision of infrastructure.

In this way, the core strategy would move much more into the new domain of "spatial plans" dealing with matters other than those requiring planning permission. There would be a closer integration of the land use options you set out and the wider corporate issues and objectives.

I think the Core Strategy should show the broad locations for development in geographical terms. In other words, for the different phases of the plan the approximate location of the various sites.

Another point for the Core Strategy is that there should be a clear monitoring and implementation framework. Once Core Policies are drafted it is essential that they provide clear objectives for achieving delivery and that their effectiveness and outputs can be measured through monitoring work.

Finally, although you have a section on page 5 on the profile of the area I find this to be rather cursory.

As the Core Strategy proceeds, I hope some of these points can be taken on board.

Yours sincerely

PETER TODD