

Appendix B.2. Shropshire Council- Local Plan Review- Preferred Sites Consultation

Bishop's Castle
Shropshire Council

04 June 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 23 pages including the cover.

Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Bishop's Castle	JL	BN	VD	VD	22/05/2019
Rev 2.0	Final Bishop's Castle	JL	TH	VD	VD	04/06/2019

Client signoff

Client	Shropshire Council
Project	Shropshire Council- Local Plan Review- Preferred Sites Consultation
Job number	5188227
Client signature / date	

Contents

Chapter	Page
Introduction	5
1. Overview	6
2. Delivering Local Housing Needs	6
2.1. Question 3	6
2.2. Question 4	6
3. Windfall Development	7
3.1. Question 5	7
3.2. Question 6	8
4. Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area	8
4.1. Question 8 (a)	8
4.2. Question 8 (b)	8
4.3. Question 8 (c)	9
4.4. Question 9 (a)	10
4.5. Question 9 (b)	10
4.6. Question 9 (c)	10
4.7. Question 9 (d)	11
4.8. Question 10 (a)	11
4.9. Question 10 (b)	11
4.10. Question 10 (c)	12
4.11. Question 10 (d)	12
4.12. Question 10 (e)	12
4.13. Question 11 (a)	12
4.14. Question 11 (b)	12
4.15. Question 11 (c)	13
4.16. Question 11 (d)	13
4.17. Question 12 (a)	13
4.18. Question 12 (b)	13
4.19. Question 12 (c)	14
4.20. Question 12 (d)	14
5. Further Information	14
5.1. Question 63	14
5.2. Question 64	15
Appendices	17
Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.	18
A.1. Question 3	18
A.2. Question 4	18
A.3. Question 5	18
A.4. Question 6	18
A.5. Question 8 (a)	18
A.6. Question 8 (b)	19
A.7. Question 8 (c)	19
A.8. Question 9 (a)	19
A.9. Question 9 (b)	19

A.10. Question 9 (c)	19
A.11. Question 9 (d)	19
A.12. Question 10 (a)	20
A.13. Question 10 (b)	20
A.14. Question 10 (c)	20
A.15. Question 10 (d)	20
A.16. Question 10 (e)	20
A.17. Question 11 (a)	20
A.18. Question 11 (b)	20
A.19. Question 11 (c)	21
A.20. Question 11 (d)	21
A.21. Question 12 (a)	21
A.22. Question 12 (b)	21
A.23. Question 12 (c)	21
A.24. Question 12 (d)	21
A. 25 Question 63	21

Tables

No table of figures entries found.

Figures

No table of figures entries found.

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 9th 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; and
- 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 Bishop's Castle Place Plan area.

1. Overview

This report provides a summary of the consultation comments received in response to Bishop's Castle 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. Questions 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 that responded to Bishop's Castle-specific questions are summarised in Sections 2 and 3.

There were 20 questions specifically relating to Bishop's Castle 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 Bishop's Castle-specific questions.

A total of 139 consultees responded to these questions.

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

2. Delivering Local Housing Needs

2.1. 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 majority of respondents, who were interested in the Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area, supported the policy. The reasons for supporting a cross-subsidy exception site policy include:

- The need for affordable housing should outweigh consideration for other types of housing, with specific focus on young families and low-income earners.
- The cross-subsidy exception site policy needs to be robust to ensure it results in a more balanced community which supports local needs.
- To check financial viability of the development.

The key issues raised by respondents who did not support the cross-subsidy exception site policy, allowing an element of open market housing to support the delivery of affordable housing included:

- There is no mention of the proportion of open market housing to affordable housing.
- Supporting an increase in affordable housing.

One respondent referred to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which suggests a need to support opportunities to bring forward exception sites and not to develop policies that allow reconfiguration of exception sites to normal allocations. The cross-subsidy exception site policy should relate to the existing settlement and its communities to meet their needs.

One respondent objected to the use of the term 'need' in para. 2.4 of the Consultation document, as it should only be applied to affordable housing. If the viability report identifies consistent county-wide rural exception site viability, a policy establishing robust tenure percentages is advised.

Some respondents, those that supported, objected and did not know/ no opinion to the cross-subsidy exception site policy, responded with the interest of increasing affordable housing.

2.2. 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, should be utilised. The majority of respondents, who were interested in the Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area, supported assessment on a site by site basis.

The following relevant comments were made supporting a development mix to be assessed on a site by site basis:

- Allows flexibility, an element of 'Affordable in Perpetuity'.

- Open Market housing to remain a smaller proportion than affordable units.
- Development mix to be assessed on a site by site basis is vital for small rural areas and subject to village needs.

The following relevant comments were made supporting a set development mix:

- The right development mix should be focused on viability and cater for the needs of the local area and community.
- Worthen lacks smaller rented / affordable family houses.

One respondent suggested that the development mix should be 60:40 or 50:50 of open market to affordable housing to ensure the developments are viable. Another respondent commented 75% of new homes should be affordable housing either in perpetuity or for at least 10 years, to reflect the area's proportion of low-income earners and young families. Developers and landowning partners need to make housing projects viable.

Some respondents declined to select a preference and provided comments which included:

- The need for affordable housing is met.
- A preference towards low cost / rented housing for local people which should not be allowed to be sold for profit in the open market.

The majority supported a development mix to be assessed on a site by site basis centred around site context and the need to make decisions based upon the housing need of the community. The theme of affordable housing was evident from these comments, which encouraged meeting the demand for low cost, affordable and/or social housing.

One respondent commented that government guidance states affordable housing may be secured for future eligible households, but retention in perpetuity is only raised in relation to rural exception sites rather than general housing development.

3. Windfall Development

3.1. 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. Overall the majority of consultees, who were interested in the Bishop's Castle Place Plan area, supported a windfall allowance for housing.

Consultees that supported the inclusion of a windfall allowance commented:

- Windfall allowance would be necessary to allow certain local projects to enhance rural settlements.
- Housing developments within the windfall allowance are essential if they positively add value, target the needs of the community, character of the settlement and pay attention towards existing effects.
- Only supported where appropriate, as windfall sites often ignore the local highways considerations of the area, focusing only on immediate surroundings.
- Windfall allowances should be required to help deliver the housing guideline to meet a 75% affordable housing target. A large proportion of windfall sites are used for unaffordable housing stock.
- It is likely that Bedstone and Bucknell Parish Council will not support development which impacts the village's physical or social character.

Comments from consultees opposed to the inclusion of a windfall allowance included:

- A need for a sensible definition of 'windfall' and careful attention to development boundaries.
- If windfall allowances are introduced they are likely to be used to prevent development once the figure has been achieved, as it would become a maximum figure rather than a target to seek to achieve.

A respondent referred to the NPPF paragraph 70 and expressed concern about how the Council has arrived at the identified windfall allowance for each settlement. Factors which need to be taken into consideration are:

- evidence necessary to support windfall allowance as stated in the NPPF.
- changes in the policy framework with which applications are determined against.
- changes in the 5-year housing land supply position and recognition that there is a finite supply of windfall sites in settlements.

One respondent stated that this approach is an untried and untested policy for some settlements in order to deliver its housing guideline. The geographical extent of ‘windfall’ around settlements was encouraged to include land within 1 kilometre of the development boundary.

3.2. 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. The majority of respondents, who were interested in the Bishop’s Castle Place Plan area, demonstrated support for a windfall allowance for employment. Among the supporters, concern was expressed over the lack of existing employment opportunities and the need to improve the existing road network to accommodate extra traffic.

A small number of respondents expressed opposition to the windfall allowance for employment, although no specific comments were provided to support their response.

In terms of those who did not know / had no opinion on employment windfall allowance, one respondent commented that local employment opportunities in the area are often low income, which reinforces the need for affordable housing for young families. Another comment was made concerning the lack of knowledge and need to clarify employment guidelines.

4. Bishop’s Castle Place Plan Area

4.1. Question 8 (a)

Question 8(a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Bishop’s Castle. The majority of respondents did not know or did not have an opinion on this proposal. Of the remaining respondents, a similar proportion agreed or disagreed with the proposal.

Among the supporters of the preferred housing and employment guidelines, one comment referred to a good range of facilities and services in Bishop’s Castle to support planned employment growth.

Concerns over the housing and employment guidelines included:

- There is adequate employment land in the area which needs to be taken up. There is the need to support vacant properties/ under-used homes in the town centre.
- The delivery of affordable housing should be balanced by employment opportunities in Bishop’s Castle.
- The housing guideline should be larger due to Bishop’s Castle’s sustainability, its key centre status and its range of facilities including library, police station and health services.
- One respondent stated that they consider housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10%, however employment targets are consistent.

Respondents who stated ‘don’t know / no opinion’ provided comments including a suggestion that employment windfall development should be supported with affordable housing for low income earners. There was also uncertainty on what the guideline is based on.

4.2. Question 8 (b)

Question 8 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bishop’s Castle. The majority of respondents did not know or had no opinion about the proposed development boundary, but a similar amount also disagreed with the proposed development boundary. They provided the following relevant comments:

- Alternative sites to the east and south of the town were promoted to be included in the development boundary. The sites in question are located adjacent to the main trunk road system A488 where the consultee suggests major developments are better suited. The consultee suggests an extension of the boundary in this area would enable the removal of site BIS028 and the redrawing of the development boundary to the north-west of the settlement.
- Several respondents opposed the development boundary being extended to include site allocation BIS028. Other respondents used this question to express their concerns about this site. A comment referenced paragraph 4.16 (regarding the negative nature of traffic movements along Kerry Lane) of the Town Centre’s Conservation Area Statement.
- The proposed development boundary would exacerbate pressures on existing local highways.

- Comments made by the Bishop's Castle Community Partnership stated that there was a departure from paragraphs 5.8 and 5.9 of the Bishop's Castle Place Plan Consultation document, specifically referring to the difficulties with vehicular access through the Town Centre to access the A488.
- Reference to the Bishop's Castle Market Town Profile (Winter 2017/18), with the role of the tourism economy in the area. The proposed development boundary would abut the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is popular with walking tourists who can explore South Shropshire and the Welsh borders which are only 1.5 miles away. This is supported by paragraph 5.5 of the Place Plan consultation document.
- The proposed development boundary would result in the loss of Green Belt (it should be noted that the Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area does not have a Green Belt).

No comments were provided in support of the proposed development boundary.

4.3. Question 8 (c)

Question 8 (c) sought views on the preferred housing allocation Site BIS028 in Bishop's Castle. The majority of respondents were opposed to the site allocation. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Concerns were raised over highway safety associated with accessing the proposed housing site, owing to the poor junction visibility and increased likelihood of traffic and parking on the narrow road layout.
- This conflicts with Shropshire Council's policy to reduce traffic entering the Historic Town Centre. It would also exacerbate air quality and have landscape and visual impacts.
- Footpaths and public rights of way (PRoW) would be impacted by the proposed development. National Cycle Route 44 is also near the preferred housing allocation. One comment supported development so long as PRoWs were maintained.
- The surrounding area includes community assets such as allotments and orchards. A respondent indicated that a nearby site has had a Section 106 agreement imposed, to ensure town residents have access to footpaths on the land for recreational use.
- Site BIS028 would be in a position that would visually impact on the local character and cause negative visual impacts of Wintles Hillside and the Shropshire Hills to the east.
- This site was previously rejected in 2013 because of insufficient public service provision (including education, healthcare and public transport).
- At previous consultations, respondents have objected to the development of Site BIS028.
- The tourism economy of Bishop's Castle town will be impacted.
- A consultee supported the proposed development plan submitted by Bishop's Castle Town Council.. This promotes site to the east of the town and opposes sites to the west. Sites to the east benefit from better access to the A488, whilst sites to the west would result in increased traffic through the town to access the A488.
- Alternative sites have not been adequately considered or consulted upon.
- Preferred allocation BIS028 performs poorly within the Sustainability Appraisal assessment. The sites promoted by the respondent (BIS012 , BIS013 and BIS018) all perform better, with 'fair' scores.
- Bishop Castle's Community Led Plan seeks to avoid developments to the west or north west of Bishop's Castle.

Of those who supported this housing allocation site, one respondent made the following comments:

- Site BIS028 would have access to community facilities and the Town Centre.
- Site BIS028 will not impact on the Town Centre's Conservation Area.
- Vehicular access would be through the Conservation Area, but due to it being two-way traffic, walking distance to the Town Centre and alternative routes promoted, it is believed the site is appropriately situated.
- The respondent did not consider that there was a need to widen The Wintles to accommodate more traffic, as it was effectively designed and in accordance with Manual for Streets.
- Site BIS028 would be suitable, subject to consideration of ecology and trees within and adjacent to the site.

A number of respondents stated 'Don't know / no opinion'. One respondent emphasised visibility issues at Castle Green Junction and an increase in traffic on Welsh Street. Another consultee suggested land to the east as being a more viable alternative due to access issues.

4.4. Question 9 (a)

Question 9 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Bucknell as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents 'did not know/ had no opinion' on the status of this Community Hub. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with the proposal.

Those who agreed with the identification of Bucknell as a Community Hub provided comments including:

- Development in Bucknell must not hinder its Community Hub status.
- Bucknell has many local services and facilities, it is positioned near a railway station and has employment opportunities, making it a sustainable location. Proposed housing and employment developments will increase demand and help to ensure the viability of the current shops / services.

Those who disagreed with the identification of Bucknell as a Community Hub suggested the village's road network is unsustainable.

Numerous respondents 'did not know or had no opinion' or declined to answer. One respondent commented that local people ought to be able to decide on Community Hub status and developments should be appropriately designed to consider surrounding environs and people's needs.

4.5. Question 9 (b)

Question 9 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bucknell. Most of the respondents did not have a view on the housing guideline. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with the proposal.

Of those who disagreed, the following comments were made:

- The capacity of the existing housing allocation (BUCK001) and preferred housing allocation (BKL008a) will exceed the guideline (100 dwellings) identified within the SAMDev Plan between 2006 and 2026.
- Bucknell has enough development committed in the area.

Those who agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bucknell made the following relevant comments:

- The increase in population should be matched with housing delivery. This requires careful and balanced management.
- Pending planning applications in the area should be prioritised before further development proposals.
- Several consultees suggested that all housing completions achieved during the current Local Plan period (2006-2026) should count towards the achievement of the housing guideline for the village.
- Site BKL011 (the existing employment allocation) should provide a mix of both market and affordable dwellings. A suggestion of 15% - 20% should be allocated to affordable housing to support the achievement of the housing guideline for the village.
- The housing guideline should be fewer than 100 dwellings and not exceeded. The housing guideline for the SAMDev Plan period 2006 to 2026 was around 100 dwellings.

4.6. Question 9 (c)

Question 9 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bucknell. Most respondents did not know or did not have an opinion on the development boundary and no specific comments were provided to support their response. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Those who disagreed with the proposed development boundary for Bucknell made the following relevant comments:

- Green spaces outside the current development boundary must be retained and should not be open to development opportunities.
- Housing development should be focused within the development boundary, rather than on the edge of the settlement.

- Bedstone and Bucknell Parish Council suggested the development boundary be amended so that sites BKL001, BKL002 and BKL004 are placed outside the development boundary and remain open agricultural grazing spaces.
- Bedstone and Bucknell Parish Council suggested the boundary be altered to the east edge of Ladywell cul-de-sac, west edge of Chestnut Meadow cul-de-sac and run to the south of the Railway Station.

4.7. Question 9 (d)

Question 9 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation BKL008a in Bucknell. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the preferred housing allocation. Of the remaining respondents the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Those that did not know or did not have a view, in the majority provided no specific comments to support their response. Those that did, commented:

- Existing allocated sites should be prioritised before further developments are made on this site.
- Severn Trent Water have undertaken improvement works to the Bucknell Waste Water Treatment Works to facilitate the release of the existing allocated development site. A new development site poses risks to water quality in River Clun, causing delay to development.
- Site BKL008a should provide affordable and/or social housing.

Bedstone and Bucknell Parish Council made several comments about this Site BKL008a, these include:

- The current brownfield housing and employment allocation (BK011), has been under consideration for many years. Issues with water quality in the River Clun catchment area and contaminated land are still to be overcome.
- General disagreement towards development on greenfield land at Site BKL008a when the current housing and employment allocation offers the potential for housing and employment delivery on a previously developed site.
- Support for delivery of additional dwellings on the current allocation (the capacity suggested within the current Local Plan is 70 dwellings), which could be achieved by extending the site to the east.
- The Coal Yard at Site BKL011 (current employment allocation) is an important employment opportunity and could provide new premises for Sheltered Housing or a Care/ Nursing Home.
- Development of more than 20 dwellings at BKL008a would result in the southern area of the proposed site becoming 'landlocked'.
- Highways implications associated with the preferred Site linking onto the B4367.
- Landscape and visual impacts to the AONB and impacts on Redlake Meadow.

Other concerns raised by respondents included:

- Redevelopment of brownfield sites are encouraged before greenfield sites.
- Existing infrastructure is insufficient to accommodate additional growth.

4.8. Question 10 (a)

Question 10 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Chirbury as a Community Hub. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view with regarding the identification of Chirbury as a Community Hub and no specific comments were provided to support their response. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with the proposal.

One comment stated Chirbury is a thriving community with good employment opportunities and additional housing is needed to support existing facilities and services. Similarly, another comment highlighted the importance of supporting local community services.

One respondent stated that Chirbury is identified as not having employment opportunities and fails to meet the criteria for a Hub.

4.9. Question 10 (b)

Question 10 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Chirbury. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the housing guideline for Chirbury; only one comment was made by these respondents, which stated support for accommodating affordable and/or social housing.

Of those who disagreed with the preferred housing guideline, specific comments were made which referred to:

- the poor quality of the highway network and sewage infrastructure in Chirbury.
- the need for car parking spaces.
- A need for smaller developments nearer Churchstoke.
- Consideration should be given to the Parish Plan.
- Include additional windfall sites.
- CIL policy needs to be reviewed to make developments more financially viable in Chirbury.

4.10. Question 10 (c)

Question 10 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Chirbury. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the proposed development boundary for Chirbury and no specific comments were provided to support their response.

The few remaining respondents disagreed with this proposal. The few respondents who disagreed with the proposed development boundary for Chirbury raised concerns that:

- The development boundary does not follow Horseshoe Road. One respondent made reference to flood risk at this location.
- An area with planning permission next to Site CHR002 has not been included in the boundary.

4.11. Question 10 (d)

Question 10 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation CHR001 in Chirbury. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on this housing allocation in Chirbury. Of these, one comment was made which supported the accommodation of affordable and/or social housing.

Of the remaining respondents, the majority supported the proposal.

One respondent who disagreed with the preferred housing allocation commented on the poor vehicular access to the site.

4.12. Question 10 (e)

Question 10 (e) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation CHR002 in Chirbury. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on this housing allocation in Chirbury and no specific comments were provided to support their response. Of the remaining respondents, the majority supported the proposal.

Those who agreed with the preferred housing allocation CHR002 in Chirbury made the following comments:

- Highways safety issues with accessing certain lanes of Chirbury. The Highways Authority should improve highways infrastructure such as public footpaths.
- The level of development should reflect the size of the settlement.
- Speed limits, flat topography and open space make Chirbury suitable to accommodate this housing development.

4.13. Question 11 (a)

Question 11 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Clun as a Community Hub. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view with the identification of Clun as a Community Hub and no specific comments were provided to support their response.

Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with this proposal. Those who agreed with Clun's Community Hub Status agreed Clun has good services and employment. The delivery of houses in the settlement is essential for the viability of these services.

4.14. Question 11 (b)

Question 11 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Clun. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the housing guideline for Clun, one comment was made which supported the delivery of affordable and/or social housing.

The remaining respondents agreed with this proposal. A number of respondents expressed support for Clun's preferred housing guideline of 95 dwellings but queried whether the current allocation (CLUN002) is developable and deliverable. Furthermore given that CLU005 is effectively an 'extension of the existing allocation (CLUN002) this would also be subject to this uncertainty.

Respondents also stated that:

- It is difficult to meet the housing guideline in Clun and alternative sites should be promoted.
- Clun requires additional land to deliver the intended housing guideline.
- The housing guideline should be set as a minimum figure.
- Housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Clun.

4.15. Question 11 (c)

Question 10 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Clun. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the proposed development boundary for Clun and no specific comments were provided to support their response. The remaining respondents provided a mixture of agreement and disagreement with the proposal.

4.16. Question 11 (d)

Question 11 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation CLU005 in Clun. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the housing allocation CLU005 in Clun and one comment supported the delivery of affordable and/or social housing. The remaining respondents provided a mixture of agreement and disagreement with the proposal.

One respondent agreed with the preferred housing allocation CLU005 being the most suitable site as it has good links to employment opportunities; adjoins an allocated site at Turnpike Meadow in the SAMDev Plan; has a good mix of facilities and services; minimal highways impacts; and sufficient open space for a large number of houses.

One respondent suggested that the existing footpath should be developed into a green corridor through the development.

4.17. Question 12 (a)

Question 12 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Worthen & Brockton as a joint Community Hub. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the status of Worthen & Brockton as a joint Community Hub and provided no specific comments to support their response. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with the proposal.

Those who agreed with the identification of Worthen & Brockton as a joint Community Hub referred to the range of facilities and services being shared, making the settlements suitable as a joint Community Hub. One respondent suggested the need for better infrastructure in these settlements such as highways and public transport. By securing growth, there is less risk of shrinkage of services and less jeopardy of losing vibrancy in the villages.

Of those who disagreed with a joint Community Hub status, comments referred to:

- a desire for the villages to remain separate, characterised by their individual needs.
- the status has not been previously consulted upon with local residents.
- One respondent stated that Worthen & Brockton is identified as not having employment opportunities and fails to meet the criteria for a Hub.

4.18. Question 12 (b)

Question 12 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Worthen & Brockton. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the housing guideline for Worthen & Brockton. One comment was made that the guideline should accommodate affordable and/or social housing.

Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with the proposal. Those who agreed with the preferred housing guideline commented on the areas' poor highway infrastructure and pedestrian access to local amenities. These themes were also referenced by respondents who disagreed with this housing guideline.

4.19. Question 12 (c)

Question 12 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Worthen & Brockton. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the proposed development boundary for Worthen & Brockton; although comments were made in support of accommodating affordable and/or social housing or open market housing.

Those who supported the proposed development boundary made the following relevant comments:

- The development boundary will stop fringe developments which could negatively impact the village's character.
- There should be a continuation of the line parallel to B4386 between the settlements as it is an obvious place for infill with clear access to the main road, school and surgery.

Those who disagreed with the proposed development boundary made the following relevant comments:

- The development boundary should link the two Community Hubs.
- Boundaries are disproportionate, with the vast majority of facilities and services situated in Brockton.
- An extension should be made to the boundary to include site WBR009 (not a preferred allocation) which benefits from good access onto the Back Lane.

4.20. Question 12 (d)

Question 12 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocations WBR007/WBR008 in Worthen & Brockton. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on this housing allocation. Of the remaining respondents the majority supported the proposal.

Respondents that did not know or did not have a view made the following relevant comments:

- The preferred housing allocation has poor vehicular access.
- The poor highway infrastructure (access to the B4386) will affect access to local amenities.

Comments made in support of the allocation include:

- Appropriate location close to B4386 with minimal highways impacts.
- Improvements need to be made to the existing highway infrastructure (footpaths, traffic calming, safe crossings). In addition to improving the drainage and sewage system around these preferred housing allocations as these new developments would experience these issues.

A comment in opposition to the preferred allocation WBR007/WBR008 compared the Sustainability Appraisal score of 'Poor' to Site WBR009 (not a preferred allocation).

One comment expressed concerns about highway safety and the access route to the school and surgery. Traffic calming is needed. The respondent also had concerns about capacity of sewage system and broadband.

5. Further Information

5.1. 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 any of the existing 'Community Clusters' identified in the consultation document should be removed. Most respondents, who were interested in the Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area, stated that they did not know or had no opinion.

One respondent suggested Lydham could be an additional Community Cluster, suggesting it is a sustainable settlement with good transport links to Shrewsbury, Bishop's Castle and Craven Arms, which has been overlooked. Another respondent proposed that Westbury and Hope should be added.

Chirbury with Brompton Parish Council commented that they are working with Shropshire Council to ensure a housing needs assessment is undertaken and that they would provide a response in relation to Community Clusters before the October 2019 deadline.

A comment referenced the Right Home, Right Place Survey being conducted for Chirbury and Worthen Parishes. Community Hubs should be consulted and there are concerns of more large housing developments to be built in places which are not infill.

A comment from Worthen with Shelve Parish Council stated a housing needs survey is unavailable, therefore consultees cannot comment.

5.2. Question 64

Question 64 sought any other views. Where suitable, responses on this question have been consolidated into the relevant Bishop's Castle specific questions. A number of respondents took this opportunity to discuss Bishop's Castle and associated Community Hubs and Community Clusters. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Shropshire's Local Plan should seek to keep traffic away from Bishop's Castle Conservation Area.
- One respondent commented that the existing Bishop's Castle development boundary would not be able to accommodate the Shropshire Local Plan growth targets and suggested establishing a policy enabling development beyond the existing boundary. The consultee added that the Shropshire Local Plan growth targets are regularly reviewed against a continuous and ongoing five year supply target and the timeframe is continuously extended.
- The Bishop's Castle Community-Led Plan survey highlighted the need to conserve the historic infrastructure, streetscape and architecture of the town and for development to recognise the importance of the landscape not only for residents but to ensure the vibrancy and vitality of the tourism economy.
- Need for affordable housing to ensure young people can remain in Bishop's Castle.
- Comments referred to the lack of employment opportunities in the area and increasing access to employment further afield for Bishop's Castle.
- Multiple comments stated the former brownfield site in Bucknell will be delivered.
- The current allocation in Bucknell is on brownfield land and there is concern that a greenfield allocation would undermine delivery of this site, which would contradict the NPPF.
- The Shropshire Council Local Plan Review should prioritise current allocations before emerging allocations are brought forward.
- Consultee comments on alternative sites in Clun. Site CLU001 is positioned on a slope would have a visual impact on the historic town and is located in a sensitive landscape parcel. CLU002 is part of a Local Wildlife Site. CLU003 and CLU004 are small sites, which would lack significant contributions to housing needs. This was recognised within the Clun Housing Sustainability Appraisal Appendix 2.3.
- Flood risk is present in Brockton and Worthen, associated with existing sewage connections Resulting in increased risk to health and the environment. As such drainage and water removal measures are needed. Improvements to highway infrastructure is also required.
- Improvements are said to have been made to Bucknell Waste Water Treatment by Severn Trent Water.
- Various alternative sites were promoted by respondents:
 - Sites BIS005, BIS008, BIS012, and BIS013 have been judged in the SLAA as "available, viable and achievable" and are preferable to BIS028 due to their safer vehicular and pedestrian accesses.
 - Site BIS027 is identified as a 'Long Term Potential SLAA Residential Site' with no significant constraints and has the potential to deliver housing for Bishop's Castle.
 - Bishop's Castle Civic Society considered the proposed preferred housing site BIS028 to be a sub optimal proposal as a result of the impact on the local highway network with its existing inadequate infrastructure.
 - In Worthen and Brockton, the site between Millfield and Millstream Bank is a suitable site to deliver both required highways infrastructure such as footpaths and relevant housing required by the Parish to sustain the village services and facilities including the school and doctor's surgery.
 - Several comments refer to a general reallocation of the preferred housing Site BIS028 to land on the north east or east of the town near the A488.
 - Station Site in Bucknell has been promoted to deliver 3 to 4 dwellings, despite a recent Outline Planning Application, which was refused due to the land being outside the development boundary.

- Development potential for open market housing in the neighbouring settlement. Lydham, which has good access to a range of services and is nearby to Bishop's Castle for other education and local services. Lydham would benefit with additional open market housing.
- Site WBR006, land east of Hawthorns at Brockton, promoted for affordable / open market housing is suggested as a windfall site, it has no practical constraints and the landowner is confident a suitable access solution to the site can be established.
- Sites WBR007 and WBR008, land at Bank Farm, Worthen, are promoted for development. They have a medium landscape and visual impact. Both sites provide adequate connectivity, with an easy and safe walking distance to local school and outdoor sports facility.
- Land bordering the B4385 between Millfield House and Millstream Bank (Worthen) is capable of providing infrastructure including a footpath required by the Parish, and family housing types needed in the Worthen and Brockton Village.
- The current allocation in Bucknell is a brownfield site and is promoted for a mix of market and affordable housing to help support the housing guideline of 100 dwellings.
- Land north of Ramfords in Bishop's Castle is promoted as an alternative site with suitable access onto the A488 with no detrimental impact to the Bishop's Castle Conservation Area.
- Clungunford, Aston-on-Clun, Chapel Lawn are promoted are suitable settlements to include developments.

Appendices



Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

The following quantitative analysis looks at the standard questions provided for Bishop's Castle, it illustrates the percentage answers to each of the questions:

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, who were interested in the Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area, and that completed this question:

- 64% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 12% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 24% 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, who were interested in the Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area, and that completed this question:

- 38% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option;
- 62% 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, who were interested in the Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area, and that completed this question:

- 74% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 5% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 21% 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, who were interested in the Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area, and that completed this question:

- 55% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 5% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 40% 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 8 (a)

Question 8 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Bishop's Castle. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 21% agreed that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Bishop's Castle;

- 25% did not agree that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Bishop's Castle; and
- 54% don't know/ no opinion that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Bishop's Castle.

A.6. Question 8 (b)

Question 8 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the development boundary for Bishop's Castle. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the development boundary for Bishop's Castle;
- 44% did not agree with the development boundary for Bishop's Castle; and
- 48% don't know/ no opinion with the development boundary for Bishop's Castle.

A.7. Question 8 (c)

Question 8 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BIS028 in Bishop's Castle. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the allocation BIS028 for Bishop's Castle;
- 51% did not agree with the allocation BIS028 for Bishop's Castle; and
- 44% don't know/ no opinion with the allocation BIS028 for Bishop's Castle.

A.8. Question 9 (a)

Question 9 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Bucknell as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 17% agreed with Bucknell as a Community Hub;
- 6% did not agree with Bucknell as a Community Hub; and
- 77% don't know/ no opinion with Bucknell as a Community Hub.

A.9. Question 9 (b)

Question 9 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bucknell. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bucknell;
- 8% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Bucknell; and
- 81% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Bucknell.

A.10. Question 9 (c)

Question 9 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bucknell. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bucknell;
- 16% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Bucknell; and
- 81% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Bucknell.

A.11. Question 9 (d)

Question 9 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation BKL008a in Bucknell. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 2% agreed with the preferred housing allocation BKL008a in Bucknell;
- 17% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation BKL008a in Bucknell; and
- 81% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation BKL008a in Bucknell.

A.12. Question 10 (a)

Question 10 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Chirbury as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 12% agreed with the identification of Chirbury as a Community Hub;
- 6% did not agree with the identification of Chirbury as a Community Hub; and
- 82% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of Chirbury as a Community Hub.

A.13. Question 10 (b)

Question 10 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Chirbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 4% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Chirbury;
- 9% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Chirbury; and
- 87% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Chirbury.

A.14. Question 10 (c)

Question 10 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Chirbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 1% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Chirbury;
- 14% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Chirbury; and
- 85% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for Chirbury.

A.15. Question 10 (d)

Question 10 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation CHR001 in Chirbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 10% agreed with the preferred housing allocation CHR001 in Chirbury;
- 3% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation CHR001 in Chirbury; and
- 87% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation CHR001 in Chirbury.

A.16. Question 10 (e)

Question 10 (e) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation CHR002 in Chirbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 12% agreed with the preferred housing allocation CHR002 in Chirbury;
- 1% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation CHR002 in Chirbury; and
- 87% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation CHR002 in Chirbury.

A.17. Question 11 (a)

Question 11 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Clun as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the identification of Clun as a Community Hub;
- 0% did not agree with the identification of Clun as a Community Hub; and
- 89% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of Clun as a Community Hub.

A.18. Question 11 (b)

Question 11 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Clun. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Clun;
- 2% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Clun; and
- 95% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Clun.

A.19. Question 11 (c)

Question 11 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Clun. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Clun;
- 2% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Clun; and
- 95% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for Clun.

A.20. Question 11 (d)

Question 11 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation CLU005 in Clun. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the preferred housing allocation CLU005 in Clun,
- 2% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation CLU005 in Clun, and
- 95% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation CLU005 in Clun.

A.21. Question 12 (a)

Question 12 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Worthen & Brockton as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 30% agreed with the identification of Worthen & Brockton as a Community Hub;
- 5% did not agree with the identification of Worthen & Brockton as a Community Hub; and
- 65% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of Worthen & Brockton as a Community Hub.

A.22. Question 12 (b)

Question 12 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Worthen & Brockton.

- 27% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Worthen & Brockton;
- 8% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Worthen & Brockton; and
- 65% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Worthen & Brockton.

A.23. Question 12 (c)

Question 12 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Worthen & Brockton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 23% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Worthen & Brockton;
- 16% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Worthen & Brockton; and
- 61% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for Worthen & Brockton.

A.24. Question 12 (d)

Question 12 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocations WBR007/WBR008 in Worthen & Brockton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 23% agreed with the preferred housing allocations WBR007/WBR008 in Worthen & Brockton;
- 11% did not agree with the with the preferred housing allocations WBR007/WBR008 in Worthen & Brockton; and
- 66% don't know/ no opinion with the with the preferred housing allocations WBR007/WBR008 in Worthen & Brockton.

A. 25 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, who were interested in the Bishop's Castle Place Plan area, that completed this question:

- 6% agreed that a 'Community Cluster' needs to be formed;

- 1% agreed that a 'Community Cluster; needs to be removed;
- 19% do not agree 'Community Cluster' will be added or removed; and
- 74% 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