

# Appendix B.1. Shropshire Council- Local Plan Review- Preferred Sites Consultation

Albrighton

Shropshire Council

28 May 2019

# Notice

This document and its contents have been prepared and are intended solely as information for Shropshire Council and use in relation to analysing and summarize the consultation responses from the recent Preferred Sites Consultation and to provide a number of key deliverables to support the Council in moving forward the review of the Local Plan.

Atkins Limited assumes no responsibility to any other party in respect of or arising out of or in connection with this document and/or its contents.

This document has 12 pages including the cover.

## Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Albrighton	DG	BN	VD	VD	25/04/19
Rev 2.0	Final Albrighton	DG	BN	VD	VD	28/05/19

# Contents

Chapter	Page
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Delivering Local Housing Needs</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. Question 3	5
1.2. Question 4	5
<b>2. Windfall Development</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Question 5	5
2.2. Question 6	6
<b>3. Albrighton Place Plan Area</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1. Question 7a	6
3.2. Question 7b	6
3.3. Question 7c	6
3.4. Question 7d	7
3.5. Question 7e	7
<b>4. Further Information</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1. Question 63	7
4.2. Question 64	7
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.</b>	<b>10</b>
A.1. Question 3	10
A.2. Question 4	10
A.3. Question 5	10
A.4. Question 6	10
A.5. Question 7a	11
A.6. Question 7b	11
A.7. Question 7c	11
A.8. Question 7d	11
A.9. Question 7e	11
A.10. Question 63	11

# Introduction

Following approval from Cabinet on the Shropshire Council Preferred Sites Consultation, consultation documents for this third stage of the Local Plan Review were published on 29th November 2018 and the consultation ran till the 9<sup>th</sup> February 2019.

This stage of consultation sought views from all parties on the Preferred Sites Consultation in Shropshire for the period 2016-36.

Specifically, the consultation sought views of all parties with an interest in the preferred development strategy and sites in these identified locations, so that relevant views and evidence can be taken into account in deciding the best way forward. The Consultation Document:

- Outlines a housing policy direction to improve the delivery of local housing needs;
- Establishes development guidelines and development boundaries for Shrewsbury, Principal and Key Centres and each proposed Community Hub;
- Sets out the preferred sites to deliver the preferred scale and distribution of housing and employment growth during the period to 2036;

These responses will be used to inform further development of the Local Plan Review. This document summarises the key issues raised by respondents to the consultation in the Albrighton Place Plan area.

# 1. Delivering Local Housing Needs

This report provides a summary of the consultation comments received in response to the Albrighton Place Plan Area-specific questions posed as part of the Shropshire Council Local Plan Review Preferred Sites Consultation.

The following sections set out the analysis of the qualitative comments from the consultation. Question 3 and 4 sought views on the delivery of local housing need, question 5 and 6 sought views on windfall development. The key issues and concerns raised in response to these questions by consultees responding to Albrighton-specific questions are summarised in Sections 2 and 3.

There were five questions specifically relating to the Albrighton Place Plan Area, the responses to these questions are summarised in Section 4. Section 5 summarises the other comments raised by consultees that responded to Albrighton-specific questions.

A total of 49 consultees responded to these questions.

The quantitative assessment of the comments is set out in Appendix A.

## 1.1. Question 3

Question 3 sought views on whether respondents thought that Shropshire Council should introduce a cross-subsidy exception site policy allowing an element of open market housing to support the delivery of affordable housing. The responses received to this question from respondents, who were interested in the Albrighton Place Plan Area, generally supported the cross-subsidy policy, with several comments identifying the need to deliver market homes to ensure affordable homes are financially viable.

## 1.2. Question 4

Question 4 sought views on whether respondents preferred (subject to viability assessment) if development mix should be assessed on a site by site basis or a set development mix, which would be geographically defined and subject to the findings of a viability assessment undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review.

The responses received to this question from respondents interested in the Albrighton Place Plan Area, were evenly split in their views of the preferred approach.

Those preferring the development mix to be assessed on a site by site basis suggested this approach allowed an appropriate mix of tenures to meet local needs and for consideration of the unique circumstances of certain sites and settlements.

The key reasons raised by respondents in favour of a set development mix were; ensuring that the required mix is clear to developers prior to a planning application, and to discourage developers from amending site plans to reduce affordable housing numbers from proposals.

# 2. Windfall Development

## 2.1. Question 5

Question 5 sought views on whether respondents thought that it was appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guidelines. In general, respondents to this question, who were interested in the Albrighton Place Plan Area, supported a housing windfall allowance.

Despite this, concerns were raised by numerous respondents over an overreliance on windfall development to meet the housing guidelines. Consultees in support of windfall allowances had a clear preference that sites should be allocated as a priority and that windfall allowances should make up a smaller proportion of the remaining guideline. One consultee identified there are limited opportunities for brownfield windfall in Albrighton.

## 2.2. Question 6

Question 6 sought views on whether respondents thought that it was appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guidelines. Respondents to this question, who were interested in the Albrighton Place Plan Area, supported the windfall allowance.

In support of an employment windfall allowance, consultees suggested:

- The focus should be on the use of brownfield sites.
- Should only be acceptable for significant developments.

As with Question 5, a key concern raised related to a preference for allocated sites to ensure the development is well planned. A respondent noted that windfall development rarely delivers meaningful quantities of employment development and that more employment land needs to be allocated.

# 3. Albrighton Place Plan Area

## 3.1. Question 7a

Question 7a sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Albrighton. Most respondents did not know or had no opinion.

Comments in response to this question were limited and mixed. While some consultees supported the guideline of 500 homes, other suggested that this should be set as the minimum delivery target owing to Albrighton's sustainable location. One consultee suggested that the guideline should be increased to absorb some of the housing guidelines from less sustainable settlements.

The respondents that disagreed with the guidelines for Albrighton, preferred having more houses allocated in 'key centres.' A concern raised by a respondent related to the need for preferred allocations to provide employment opportunities for young people. Another response expressed concern over the high housing targets, which should be reduced by 10% to fall in line with the adequate employment land which is available.

## 3.2. Question 7b

Question 7b sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Albrighton. The majority of respondents did not know or have an opinion, the rest mainly disagreed with the proposed development boundary. Comments from those who disagreed were concerned that the tight nature of the proposed development boundary did not give room for flexibility and allow for adaptation should the needs of the settlement change. One respondent felt that due to concerns with delivery at ALB017 and ALB021, further land should be allocated and included within the boundary. It should be noted that several respondents who disagreed also put forward cases for including land for allocation and development that lie outside of the proposed development boundary. Concerns were also raised over the deliverability of the current site allocation as there are some 'ransom strip' issue related to the access. Contaminated land issues should also be considered for brownfield sites. Another comment stated that the development boundary must be informed by a strategic sites consultation.

## 3.3. Question 7c

Question 7c sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed Preferred Site for Albrighton – ALB017. The majority of respondents did not know or have an opinion, the rest mainly support the preferred allocation ALB017. While respondents agreed that the site was in a logical and sensible location, a number of caveats were added by respondents, including ensuring masterplanning of the site, and provision of improvements to supporting infrastructure; namely drainage, railway station, secondary education, medical services and local highway network.

A consultee expressed concerns over the deliverability of ALB17, ALB021 and Land at Stanmore Lane stating that other land should be allocated due to these concerns of deliverability. Other comments made reference to issues such as land use, design, surface water drainage and sewage issues, as well as the site falling within Plan A (Aerodrome) Statutory Safeguarding Zone for RAF Cosford. Another comment made reference to the fact that the development boundary must be informed by a strategic sites consultation.

### 3.4. Question 7d

Question 7d sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed Preferred Site for Albrighton – ALB021. The majority of respondents did not know or have an opinion, the rest mainly did not agree with the proposed site ALB021. Comments focused on the need for similar infrastructure provision as with the ALB017 site but a number of consultees raised issues regarding access to the site, both regarding traffic issues on A41 bypass and the reliance on preferred allocation ALB017 to provide highways access.

Other comments made reference to issues such as land use, design, surface water drainage and sewage issues, as well as the site falling within Plan A (Aerodrome) Statutory Safeguarding Zone for RAF Cosford. Another comment stated that the development boundary must be informed by a strategic sites consultation.

### 3.5. Question 7e

Question 7e sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed Albrighton's Preferred Areas of Safeguarded Land. The majority of respondents did not know or have an opinion, the rest mainly did not agree with the proposed Safeguarded Areas, with a variety of reasons presented, including:

- Unnecessary release of Green Belt land as sites outside of the Green Belt are available;
- Poor highways access compared with sites closer to A468;
- Impacts on the form and character of the village and conservation area;
- Lack of physical barriers to prevent sprawling development;
- Distance from existing transport infrastructure;

Consultees making representations for alternative sites identified Harp Land, Land off Shaw Lane and Land at Cross Road as available and situated outside of the Green Belt.

One Consultee stated that to continue the development of Albrighton to the east is not logical and alternative options should be investigated. Other comments made reference to issues such as land use, design, surface water drainage and sewage issues, as well as the site falling within Plan A (Aerodrome) Statutory Safeguarding Zone for RAF Cosford. Another comment stated that the development boundary must be informed by a strategic sites consultation.

## 4. Further Information

### 4.1. Question 63

Question 63 sought views on whether respondents thought any additional 'Community Clusters' to those identified within the Preferred Sites Consultation should be formed or whether any of the existing 'Community Clusters' identified in the consultation document should be removed. The majority of respondents to this question, who were interested in the Albrighton Place Plan Area, answered 'Don't know / No Opinion' with no general comments. Cosford has been identified as a proposed Community Hub rather than community cluster, but it was suggested to be removed because its facilities are primarily military and not available to the wider community. Beckbury was suggested as an additional Community Cluster with the consultee highlighting the size and public service provision of the settlement is greater than other Community Clusters identified in the consultation document.

### 4.2. Question 64

Question 64 sought any other views. A number of respondents to this question, who were interested in the Albrighton Place Plan Area, took this opportunity to promote sites within Albrighton as well as sites in surrounding settlements that are within the Albrighton Place Plan Area. Suggested sites within or adjacent to Albrighton include: Land at Cross Road, Harp Land, Land off Shaw Lane and Land west of Elm Road (twice). Suggested sites within the Albrighton Place Plan Area include: South of Snowden Lane (Beckbury) and Land east of Newport Road (Crossford) (twice).

Many comments focused on the issues surrounding infrastructure within Albrighton both currently and if the development goes ahead. Capacity of education and healthcare facilities, as well as concerns over traffic, parking and flooding were all mentioned by various consultees. A key concern is the lack of parking at the railway station and the station's overall capacity and usage.

Numerous comments were received in relation to the strategic site at Tong, including comments from Tong Parish Council. The Parish Council expressed concern about the lack of information available to local residents regarding the potential strategic site. Albrighton Parish Council also stressed that the omission of strategic sites from this consultation prevented them from commenting on impacts of the proposed Local Plan Review on Albrighton and local infrastructure. In addition, Albrighton Parish Council expressed concern over the 'inadequacy' of the responses given to questions relating to the strategic site at Tong which were posed at a public consultation meeting on the Shropshire Local Plan. The Parish Council have questioned:

- Whether Albrighton's Place Plan priorities will be funded through CIL contributions?
- What plans are in place to supporting the development of the railway station to facilitate strategic growth at Tong?
- Whether the Council has considered infrastructure capacity issues arising from the planned growth in and around Albrighton?
- The extent of cross boundary cooperation with South Staffordshire District Council regarding M54 corridor development?



# Appendices



# Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

This appendix details the responses provided to the multiple choice questions posed for the Albrighton Place Plan Area.

## A.1. Question 3

Question 3 sought views on whether respondents thought that Shropshire Council should introduce a cross-subsidy exception site policy allowing an element of open market housing to support the delivery of affordable housing. Of the unique respondents that were interested in the Albrighton Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 59% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 6% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 35% don't know/ no opinion on the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy.

## A.2. Question 4

Question 4 sought views on whether respondents preferred (subject to viability assessment) if development mix should be assessed on a site by site basis or a set development mix, which would be geographically defined and subject to the findings of the findings of a viability assessment undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review. Of the unique respondents that were interested in the Albrighton Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 54% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option;
- 46% preferred a set development mix option.

## A.3. Question 5

Question 5 sought views on whether respondents thought that it was appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guidelines. Of the unique respondents that were interested in the Albrighton Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 72% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 14% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 14% don't know/ no opinion that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline.

## A.4. Question 6

Question 6 sought views on whether respondents thought that it was appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guidelines. Of the unique respondents that were interested in the Albrighton Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 54% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 15% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 31% don't know/ no opinion that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline.

## A.5. Question 7a

Question 18 sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Albrighton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 17% agreed that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Albrighton;
- 25% did not agree that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Albrighton; and
- 58% don't know/ no opinion that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Albrighton.

## A.6. Question 7b

Question 7b sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Albrighton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 18% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Albrighton;
- 26% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Albrighton; and
- 56% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for Albrighton.

## A.7. Question 7c

Question 7c sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed Preferred Site for Albrighton – ALB017. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 24% agreed with the proposed Preferred Site for Albrighton – ALB017;
- 19% did not agree with the proposed Preferred Site for Albrighton – ALB017; and
- 57% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed Preferred Site for Albrighton – ALB017.

## A.8. Question 7d

Question 7d sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed Preferred Site for Albrighton – ALB021. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 19% agreed with the proposed Preferred Site for Albrighton – ALB021;
- 24% did not agree with the proposed Preferred Site for Albrighton – ALB021; and
- 57% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed Preferred Site for Albrighton – ALB021.

## A.9. Question 7e

Question 7e sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed Albrighton Preferred Areas of Safeguarded Land for Albrighton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the proposed Albrighton Preferred Areas of Safeguarded Land;
- 30% did not agree with the proposed Albrighton Preferred Areas of Safeguarded Land; and
- 59% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed Albrighton Preferred Areas of Safeguarded Land.

## A.10. Question 63

Question 63 sought views on whether respondents thought any additional 'Community Clusters' to those identified within the Preferred Sites Consultation should be formed or any of the existing 'Community Clusters' identified in the consultation document should be removed. Of the unique respondents that were interested in the Albrighton Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 14% agreed that a 'Community Cluster' needs to be formed;
- 14% agreed that a 'Community Cluster' needs to be removed;
- 8% do not agree 'Community Cluster' will be added or removed; and
- 64% don't know/ no opinion about addition or removal of 'Community Clusters'

**Atkins Limited**

The Axis  
10 Holliday Street  
Birmingham  
B1 1TF

Tel: +44 (0)121 483 5000  
Fax: +44 (0)121 483 5252

© Atkins Limited except where stated otherwise