

# Appendix B.3. Shropshire Council - Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation

Bridgnorth

Shropshire Council

30 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 the summarising and analysis of consultation responses to 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 21 pages including the cover.

## Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Bridgnorth	LH	BN	VD	VD	17/05/2019
Rev 2.0	Final Bridgnorth	LH	BN	VD	VD	30/05/2019

## Client signoff

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

# Contents

Chapter	Page
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. Overview</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. Delivering Local Housing Needs</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1. Question 3	6
2.2. Question 4	6
<b>3. Windfall Development</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1. Question 5	7
3.2. Question 6	7
<b>4. Bridgnorth Place Plan Area</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1. Question 13 (a)	8
4.2. Question 13 (b)	8
4.3. Question 13 (c)	9
4.4. Question 13 (d)	9
4.5. Question 14 (a)	10
4.6. Question 14 (b)	10
4.7. Question 14 (c)	11
4.8. Question 14 (d)	11
4.9. Question 14 (e)	11
4.10. Question 14 (f)	12
4.11. Question 15 (a)	12
4.12. Question 15 (b)	12
4.13. Question 15 (c)	13
4.14. Question 15 (d)	13
<b>5. Further Information</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1. Question 63	13
5.2. Question 64	14
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.</b>	<b>17</b>
A.1. Question 3	17
A.2. Question 4	17
A.3. Question 5	17
A.4. Question 6	17
A.5. Question 13 (a)	18
A.6. Question 13 (b)	18
A.7. Question 13 (c)	18
A.8. Question 13 (d)	18
A.9. Question 14 (a)	18
A.10. Question 14 (b)	18
A.11. Question 14 (c)	19
A.12. Question 14 (d)	19
A.13. Question 14 (e)	19
A.14. Question 14 (f)	19
A.15. Question 15 (a)	19

A.16. Question 15 (b)	19
A.17. Question 15 (c)	19
A.18. Question 15 (d)	20
A.19. Question 63	20

## 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 until 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; 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 Bridgnorth Place Plan area.

# 1. Overview

This report provides a summary of the consultation comments received in response to the Bridgnorth 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, questions 5 and 6 sought views on windfall development. The key issues and concerns raised in response to these questions by consultees that responded to Bridgnorth-specific questions are summarised in Sections 2 and 3.

There were 14 questions specifically relating to the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area, the responses to this question are summarised in Section 4. Section 5 summarises the other comments raised by consultees that responded to Bridgnorth-specific questions.

A total of 268 consultees responded to these questions, including 2 petitions with over 1,000 signatures.

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 consultees 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.

Over half of consultees who responded to this question, who were interested in the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area, stated that they do not support the proposed policy and provided two headline reasons for this:

- A number of consultees commented that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that local authorities should support opportunities to bring forward exception sites.
- Several consultees outlined that this policy is attempting to mitigate against current housing policies not providing affordable housing. The consultees further provided a preferred approach which includes a review of the current housing policies within the Local Plan and then developing policies that meets the need identified for the local area.

Of those consultees in support of the exception policy, it was commented that it would enable the delivery of affordable housing. One developer commented that the NPPF requires local planning authorities to support housing development that meets local needs which includes rural exception sites to provide affordable housing. With that, the provision of affordable housing is an exception to the construction of new dwellings in the Green Belt as listed in the NPPF.

There was some confusion surrounding the concept of the cross-subsidy exception site policy which resulted in a number of consultees misunderstanding the question. Several respondents highlighted this and one highlighted their inability to find a definition or provide any further information.

### 2.2. Question 4

Question 4 sought views on whether respondents preferred 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.

Many of the respondents to this question, who were interested in the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area, did not provide comment on this question. Of those that provided a response the majority selected a “development mix to be assessed on a site by site basis”.

Of those consultees who indicated a preference for a development mix to be assessed on a site by site basis, comments provided included:

- This option provides greater flexibility.
- Setting a fixed development mix may unnecessarily constrain the delivery of viable developments.
- Planning assessments need to be relevant when proposing to develop any new site; therefore, a site by site policy is required.

- Developments should be determined by local circumstances and the level of local demand.

Of those who indicated a preference for a set development mix, the following comments were provided:

- A development mix would encourage more diverse communities and would help to avoid segregation.
- The costs would be clearer.
- This option provides tailored housing to local needs and conditions.

Some respondents commented that neither option should be implemented.

## 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, respondents to this question, who were interested in the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area, were split equally between agreeing, disagreeing and having no opinion or they didn't know if housing windfall allowances were appropriate.

Consultees that support the inclusion of a housing windfall allowance commented:

- They agree with a windfall allowance; however, they feel these allowances should not encroach on the countryside or result in loss of the Green Belt.
- The windfall sites should be limited to brownfield sites or sites within current communities.

Those consultees that are opposed to the inclusion of a housing windfall allowance commented:

- Sites should not be developed within the Green Belt.
- The proposal would be difficult for the Council to manage and developers would find a way around National Planning Policy.
- If a windfall allowance is introduced, it would be more likely to be used to prevent development becoming a maximum figure rather than a target.
- A restriction should be placed on windfall allowances giving the local community more control.

Of those respondents that were against inclusion or did not know / had no opinion a large number of respondents commented that they did not understand the definition of a windfall allowance and did not understand the context of the question.

### 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.

Approximately half of the respondents to this question, who were interested in the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area, responded that they 'do not know / no opinion'. Most of the comments from these consultees stated they did not understand the definition of an employment windfall allowance and did not understand the context of the question. Of the other respondents slightly more supported the inclusion of an employment windfall allowance than were opposed to it.

Consultees that support the inclusion of employment windfall allowance commented:

- They agree however, they feel these allowances should not encroach on the countryside or result in the loss of Green Belt.
- The allowances should be based on brownfield sites or sites within current communities.

Consultees that were against the inclusion of an employment windfall allowance commented:

- Employment windfall sites should not be acceptable in the Green Belt.
- Bridgnorth is a commuter town and existing employment is adequate.
- A number of these consultees also did not understand the definition of a windfall allowance or did not understand the context of the question.

## 4. Bridgnorth Place Plan Area

### 4.1. Question 13 (a)

Question 13 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Bridgnorth. The vast majority of consultees disagreed with the guidelines.

A large number of respondents commented that the guideline, particularly the housing guideline, is too large in comparison to the size of the current town. A large proportion of these respondents made the comment that the Office for National Statistics (ONS) does not project a population growth that corresponds with the proposals of this magnitude and there is no local need / requirement. In addition, a number of respondents outline that the largest area of population growth is within the age bracket of the 65s and up therefore, housing (if any) should be built closer to the centre of the town. Some respondents also comment that there is no guarantee that the homes proposed will be affordable (which should be prioritised) and there is no system in place to allocate housing to local people.

A large number of respondents commented that the town's current infrastructure; including roads, drainage and parking spaces are currently inadequate and will not cope with the increase in population indicated by the guidelines. In addition to this, some respondents make follow on remarks about increased noise and air pollution impacts.

A large number of respondents commented that Bridgnorth's services are already close to capacity. Respondents mention how they currently struggle to get appointments at the local doctor's surgery and that the bus service and public transport options are poor. The majority make comment that the current services in the area including the hospital, doctor's surgery, bus service, schools, police / fire service are and will be increasingly inadequate should the housing guideline for Bridgnorth be delivered.

A considerable proportion of respondents comment that such a change in the population and employment guidelines will alter the historic character and appearance of the town.

Some respondents outline that the employment levels in Bridgnorth are falling rather than rising suggesting that the employment guideline is not required.

Some respondents commented that the guidelines are too restrictive and a Green Belt review east of Bridgnorth will identify additional housing sites.

Only a small number of respondents support the proposed guidelines. Respondents commented that they support the guideline; however, the character of Bridgnorth should be maintained and Stanmore Country Park should not be developed on.

One respondent stated that there is a lack of an up to date evidence base for sports facilities needed. There are opportunities for developments to invest in Bridgnorth Rugby Club.

A respondent, representing a developer provided detailed response to this question in support of the guidelines and outlines Bridgnorth's role in maintaining a balance and ensuring self-containment. The respondent comments on the evidence demonstrating significant constraints to development relating to topography, landscape, scale and Green Belt around the edges of the settlement and implies exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing land from Green Belt to meet the guidelines.

### 4.2. Question 13 (b)

Question 13 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bridgnorth. The clear majority of respondents disagreed with the proposed development boundary.

A large number of respondents raised specific concerns over the release of Green Belt within the proposed development boundary. The majority of these respondents highlight that there does not appear to be any 'exceptional circumstances' put forward by the Council to justify the release of the Green Belt. In addition, some comment that a Green Belt Review needs to be undertaken.

A large amount of respondents and 2 petitions with over a 1,000 signatures object to the development of Stanmore Country Park and the inclusion of the Country Park in the development boundary. Many of these respondents make comment that the Country Park is a valuable community asset offering disabled access and hosting a number of community events each year. Consultees comment that the park is well maintained by the Friends of Stanmore Group who have been awarded grants from Tesco and Veolia for their efforts to improve its facilities.



A considerable number of respondents reference the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) produced in November 2018 which rejected that Stanmore Country Park as unsuitable for development with Bridgnorth Town Council having identified alternative sites.

A considerable number of respondents referred to ecological benefits associated with the Green Belt and Stanmore Country Park, stating that these would be lost if included within the development boundary. A number of flora and fauna species are specifically mentioned as being present in the area including protected species, namely bat, owl and various bird species. Respondents expressed concern that the proposed development boundary would enable development which will have a negative effect on these species and their habitats.

Some respondents commented that the guidelines are too restrictive and a Green Belt review east of Bridgnorth will identify additional housing sites.

A respondent who opposes the proposed boundary, suggested it should include additional land at Grove Farm, between the proposed development boundary at Stanmore and the A458.

Another respondent stated that historic landfills are within the proposed development boundary and contaminated land issues must be considered.

There were only a small number of responses demonstrating support for the proposed development boundary. One respondent highlights that land to the east of The Hobbins and north of Stanmore that is identified as Safeguarded Land in the Plan is likely to be needed to deliver the employment guideline in the plan period to 2036.

Other respondents that agreed with the proposal provide various reasons for this support. One respondent in particular highlights that the Local Plan Review should oblige developers to deliver supporting facilities (schools, health centre, shops) etc.

Consultees who stated 'don't know / no opinion' or declined to answer did not provide any further comment.

### 4.3. Question 13 (c)

Question 13 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred mixed-use allocation P54 (part); P56 (part); P59a; STC002; STC004; STC005; and STC006 in Bridgnorth. The majority of respondents disagreed with the mixed-use allocation.

Of those consultees that disagreed with the mixed-use allocation and provided additional comment, many specifically objected to the development of Stanmore Country Park (STC004) and provided responses similar to those within 13 (a) and 13 (b). Other respondents expressed concerns about the impacts on the Green Belt and / or lack of capacity available within existing infrastructure as highlighted in responses to 13 (a) and 13 (b).

One respondent stated that the preferred site is severed by physical barriers which prevent access to services, while also forming part of the Green Belt. The consultee suggested that other sites should be explored first and specifically suggested Tasley. The remoteness of location was also cited as a factor which makes it unsuitable.

The Woodland Trust raised concern about the inclusion of site P56 as it could damage and deteriorate Hermitage Hill Coppice. Another respondent had concerns that site P58a is situated too close to the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), .

Another respondent stated that development pressure from West Midlands conurbation could be addressed by release of the western edge of the Green Belt, rather than the eastern edge.

Only a few consultees agreed with the preferred mixed-use allocation. One consultee highlighted that Shropshire Council has a case for demonstrating sufficient evidence to justify the removal of Green Belt due to the topographical, landscape and floodplain constraints around the rest of the town, as well as services being in the north of Bridgnorth. The respondent further highlighted that the preferred allocation should also include development between the southern boundaries of parcel STC004 / the Stanmore Industrial Estate and the A458 on Site STC003. The respondent provides alternative site details within their response. Another respondent stated that the proposed development is close to a significant land area of Bridgnorth Rugby Club and Swancote playing fields on the other side of the A454, which has the potential for investment and development.

Consultees who stated 'don't know / no opinion' or declined to answer did not provide any further comment or stated they did not have the time to submit a detailed response.

### 4.4. Question 13 (d)

Question 13 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred area(s) of safeguarded land in Bridgnorth. The majority of consultees disagreed with the preferred area(s) of safeguarded land in Bridgnorth.

A number of respondents highlighted that they disagreed with preferred areas but provided no further comment. Of those that did comment, respondents outlined that further development areas would be unsustainable and there would be further impacts on Green Belt which should not be built on. Others asked for clarity on the definition of safeguarding in this context. However, a number of respondents stated that the Green Belt is too restrictive and needs to be reviewed.

Respondents also commented on poor sustainability appraisal scores at P54 and P56 as factors which make potential development unsuitable.

Only a small number of respondents agreed with the preferred safeguarded areas; however most did not provide further comment.

It does appear that some respondents may have misunderstood the term 'safeguarding' as several respondents indicated they agreed with the safeguarded areas yet when providing comment refer to the protection of the Green Belt from further development. This may have resulted in more support for the safeguarded areas.

This is further demonstrated by some respondents requesting further context and explanation before a response could be provided to the question.

Consultees who stated 'don't know / no opinion' or declined to answer did not provide any further comment.

## 4.5. Question 14 (a)

Question 14 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Alveley as a Community Hub. The majority of the respondents who gave a response indicated they did not have an opinion or did not know and provided no further comment.

Reference was made by those that support Alveley's designation as a Community Hub to the sustainability of the settlement and availability of services and local employment.

Alveley and Romsely Parish Council commented that the local community understand development is to be expected, but want to ensure development proposals are in line with housing needs and are supported by infrastructure improvements.

Of those that disagreed, the following concerns were raised:

- Impacts on the character of the village.
- Infrastructure will not cope with increased traffic.
- A number of consultees opposed to the proposed Community Hub status questioned the accuracy of the hierarchy of settlements scoring methodology and suggested that the criteria for Community Hubs has been ignored for Alveley. A number of respondents requested the settlement be reassessed.

There were a number of respondents who outlined the lack of consultation and their lack of understanding of the question.

## 4.6. Question 14 (b)

Question 14 (b) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Alveley. Over half the respondents who gave a response indicated they did not have an opinion or did not know and provided no further comment.

A large amount of respondents disagreed with the guidelines and commented:

- Concern for the Green Belt and open countryside due to the size of the guidelines.
- Demand for housing in Alveley is low as people prefer to live closer to their place of work. Any increase in population will cause commuting, no extra employment is envisaged within the boundaries of the village and public transport is inadequate.
- Public transport options are limited.
- The housing needs survey did not include land by "The Cleckar".
- The housing guidelines are inadequately evidenced and are not needed.
- The location is not sustainable for rural development.

In contrast, a respondent that disagreed with the guidelines, suggested Alveley can accommodate a higher quantity of housing over the plan period.

Only a few respondents agreed with the housing guidelines. Alveley and Romsley Parish Council outline that the level is higher than that identified in the housing needs assessment therefore the Council would prefer less Green Belt loss. A consultant references the range of services, facilities and local employment in Alveley as adequate justification for the release of land from the Green Belt around Alveley to facilitate delivery of the proposed guideline.

#### 4.7. Question 14 (c)

Question 14 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary. Over half the respondents who gave a response indicated they did not have an opinion or did not know and provided no further comment.

A large amount of respondents disagreed with the boundary. Of those that provided specific comment, the following themes were raised:

- Green Belt should be protected from development as it protects the countryside and biodiversity.
- More appropriate sites, including the nearby trading estate, would be more appropriate.
- The location is not sustainable for rural development.
- ALV006 / 007 is an important recreation ground and event location.

Of the small number that agreed, no further comment was provided.

#### 4.8. Question 14 (d)

Question 14 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the allocation ALV006/ALV007 in Alveley. Over half of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion and provided no further response.

Of those respondents that support the allocation of the site, comments included:

- The proposals will provide community facilities and new housing.
- Consideration should be given to visual impacts on residents at nearby Maple Crescent.
- Concerns over traffic management issues given that the access from Daddlebrook Road will be near the existing junction with the A442.
- Minimal impact will be felt on wildlife due to regular events held on the field.
- The site is within the village boundary and the new build will complement current housing.
- Agree with the site for affordable and rental housing.

Of those that disagreed, comments included:

- Loss of Green Belt and urban sprawl into the countryside should not be permitted.
- The village amenity and character will be adversely affected.
- The site is very contentious as it is used throughout the year for various activities that bring income to the village.
- It is not a suitable or a sustainable location for significant rural development. In lieu of a preferred allocation, a cross-subsidy scheme would be best to address need.

#### 4.9. Question 14 (e)

Question 14 (e) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation ALV009 in Alveley. Over half of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion and provided no further response.

There was a higher rate of opposition to the preferred housing allocation ALV009. Concerns raised by those opposed to the allocation included:

- Concerns over the impact on the village arising from the infrastructure delivery required to facilitate housing development.
- Concerns over impacts on ecology, in particular Barn Owls.

- ALV009 was not included in the housing needs survey and was not identified as a site for building.
- Public transport is limited.
- No local employment opportunities.
- Not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development.
- The A442 is a busy main road therefore there will be safety implications.

Of those that agreed, comments included;

- ALV009 can be released from the Green Belt with very little harm to the purposes of the Green Belt; and
- ALV009 is suitable for development, being less vulnerable within the landscape than other sites around Alveley.

The site promoter confirmed the deliverability of the site, while another consultee confirmed deliverability of a parcel within the site.

#### 4.10. Question 14 (f)

Question 14 (f) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred area(s) of safeguarded land in Alveley. Over half of the respondents indicated they did not know / had no opinion and provided no further response.

A considerable number of respondents disagreed with the safeguarded land, comments included:

- There is insufficient land removed from the Green Belt and proposed to be safeguarded to meet Alveley's long-term development needs. At least a further one hectare of developable land is needed for safeguarding;
- This area encroaches too far north and damages the identity of Turley Green;
- The Green Belt should be protected from future development; and
- Some state there does not appear to be any logical reason for selection of this land.
- It is not a suitable or a sustainable location for significant rural development. Development pressure is a common circumstance and not exceptional circumstances to justify Green Belt release.

Of those that agreed one respondent commented that Alveley can accommodate more than the proposed housing figure over the 20-year plan period.

As with some other questions on safeguarding, some respondents appear to have misunderstood the term 'safeguarding'.

#### 4.11. Question 15 (a)

Question 15 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Ditton Priors as a Community Hub. The majority of respondents indicated they did not know / had no opinion and provided no further response.

Of those that disagreed, comment was raised that Ditton Priors should be a 'Rural Hub' as it is part of an AONB and to protect the Green Belt (Ditton Priors is not located in proximity of the Green Belt). Others stated that there is considerable potential for housing and leisure facilities around the settlement. One Consultee stated that the settlement lacks primary services and is an unsuitable and unsustainable location for significant rural development.

Of those that agreed, one respondent comments the natural beauty of the village should not be compromised.

#### 4.12. Question 15 (b)

Question 15 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Ditton Priors. The majority of respondents indicated they did not know / had no opinion and provided no further response.

Of those that disagreed, concerns were raised over the capacity of services in the area, namely schools and the local pre-school and additional pressure on the doctor's surgery. In addition, concerns were also raised on

whether local infrastructure could cope with a development of this size. One Consultee stated that it is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development.

Of those that agreed no further comments were provided.

### 4.13. Question 15 (c)

Question 15 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ditton Priors. The majority of respondents indicated they did not know / had no opinion and provided no further response.

Few specific comments were provided to this question. Of those that disagreed with the proposed development boundary, objection was received due to the loss of Green Belt (Ditton Priors is not located in proximity of the Green Belt), impacts on ecology and potential impacts on tourism and increased flood risk. One Consultee stated that it is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development.

Of those that agreed, no further comments were given except a complaint on the clarity of the map provided.

### 4.14. Question 15 (d)

Question 15 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation DNP009 in Ditton Priors. The majority of respondents indicated they did not know / had no opinion and provided no further response.

Of those that disagreed, one respondent commented the absence of public transport in Ditton Priors and the demand for housing makes the proposal better suited to a town. One Consultee stated that it is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development.

The consultant representing the landowner supported the allocation of the site and confirmed its deliverability. The respondent also referred to the ability of the site to meet the housing needs of the village and school while contributing to parking arrangements.

## 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 whether any of the existing 'Community Clusters' identified in the consultation document should be removed. The majority of those who responded indicated that they did not know / had no opinion on whether there were additional settlements suitable to be designated as Community Clusters.

Of those that stated they did not know / had no opinion, a handful of respondents comment they did not understand the question being asked.

Respondents proposed the addition of a number of settlements as Community Clusters. One respondent queried why Claverley is omitted, given its population size and array of services. One respondent commented that small developments in Hilton, Worfield and other surrounding hamlets and villages would be more advantageous than a new town. Whereas another respondent identified Hilton and Worfield as inappropriate to form Community Clusters.

Of those that responded "Yes – remove", one respondent went into detail and outlined there are a number of towns that would be suitable for development including; Stourport, Kidderminster, Bewdley, Bridgnorth and Telford. They continue to make comment that the current local infrastructure will not support growing villages. Other Consultees stated that the proposal should not go ahead due to the impact on resources/ services/infrastructure and landscape character. The scale of the proposed development is disproportionate to the size of Bridgnorth.

Of those that responded "No", one respondent stated that new developments would damage the character of the area.

## 5.2. Question 64

Question 64 sought any other views. A number of respondents to this question, who were interested in the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area, took this opportunity to provide further justification for their previous responses in the questionnaire. Where suitable, responses to this question have been consolidated into the relevant Bridgnorth-specific questions.

A number of respondents to questions about the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area suggested alternative sites for development. In particular a large number of these respondents promoted vacant industrial plots and offices at Chartwell Park and Stanmore Business Park with a consensus among respondents these brownfield sites should be developed prior to the development of new sites for employment land. Other alternative sites promoted include:

- BRD011 - 28 hectares and capable of holding 840 homes. The promoter confirmed that the site is not in the Green Belt is adjacent to the existing development boundary and would meet the needs of the majority of Bridgnorth's housing targets.
- Vacant industrial land opposite the recycling facility bounded by the A458 and Old Worcester Road.
- BRD023, which was promoted through the consultation.
- Sites adjacent to this and SAMDev allocations.
- The garage site on the A442 opposite ALV006/ALV007;
- Land at the Garden Settlement; or
- Allocation of land at Stanmore Country Park for employment.

One respondent promoted a number of alternative sites that are available for development and are deliverable should the current development proposals not go ahead which include, DNP005, DNP006, DNP007, DNP008, DNP010, DNP011.

Another respondent highlights land availability at Chartwell Business Park which is capable of accommodating many new industrial units. Behind the Business Park to the South East is an under developed area of land between Chartwell and the A442 Kidderminster Road. This area could provide residential housing development with much better links to the Town Centre and local employment.

Various comments are made on the value of Stanmore Country Park as a recreation asset which contributes to physical and mental health and wellbeing. Comments refer to the various attributes of the Country Park, including wildflower meadows and ponds which provide habitats for insects, reptiles, amphibians and various protected species. In addition, one respondent commented on the proposed alternative to Stanmore; Hermitage Ridge, stating the two spaces are not comparable and both should be preserved. The same respondent further states figures show that green space in Shropshire equates to 8 ha per 1000 head of population, whereas in Bridgnorth green space is only 5.8 ha per 1000 people.

A consultee queried whether Stanmore Country Park is within the Worfield boundary rather than the Bridgnorth boundary.

A key theme raised by a number of respondents relates to the lack of communication and availability of information during the consultation process and the confusing nature of the questions and planning terms in the questionnaire.

Other comments made by more than one respondent included:

- Respondents believe the employment levels in Bridgnorth are falling and there is no evidence to suggest that further employment development is necessary.
- Comments that impacts to the visual amenity and landscape have not been considered within the consultation document and greater consideration should be given to impacts.
- Concerns over the lack of guarantee that allocations will deliver affordable homes.
- No mechanism for ensuring local people will get first choice of new homes.
- Concerns raised over the pressure of overspill housing for Birmingham and the Black Country as part of negotiations with the West Midlands Combined Authority.

Unique comments made by single respondents include:

- The 'Garden Village' is more akin to a sustainable urban extension and is misleading.
- Comment highlights that a Community Governance Review for Bridgnorth is overdue.

- The proposed development is borne out of a financial incentive for Shropshire Council. There is also little evidence of local figures that warrant the proposals. The development is overspill for supporting the growth aspirations of the West Midlands Combined Authority.

# Appendices





# Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

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

## A.1. Question 3

Question 3 sought views on whether consultees 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 respondents that responded to this question, who were interested in the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 20% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 51% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 29% 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 a viability assessment undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review. Of the respondents that responded to this question, who were interested in the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 74% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option; and
- 26% 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 respondents that responded to this question, who were interested in the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area, and completed this question::

- 39% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 30% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 31% 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 respondents that responded to this question, who were interested in the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area, and completed this question::

- 31% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 23% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 46% 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 13 (a)

Question 13 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Bridgnorth. Of the respondents that completed this question:

- 7% agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Bridgnorth;
- 73% did not agree with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Bridgnorth; and
- 20% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Bridgnorth.

## A.6. Question 13 (b)

Question 13 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bridgnorth. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 6% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bridgnorth;
- 75% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Bridgnorth; and
- 19% don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Bridgnorth.

## A.7. Question 13 (c)

Question 13 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred mixed-use allocations P54 (part); P56 (part); P59a; STC002; STC004; STC005; and STC006 in Bridgnorth. Of the respondents that completed this question:

- 6% agreed with the preferred mixed-use allocations P54 (part); P56 (part); P59a; STC002; STC004; STC005; and STC006 in Bridgnorth;
- 72% did not agree with the preferred mixed-use allocations P54 (part); P56 (part); P59a; STC002; STC004; STC005; and STC006 in Bridgnorth; and
- 22% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred mixed-use allocations P54 (part); P56 (part); P59a; STC002; STC004; STC005; and STC006 in Bridgnorth.

## A.8. Question 13 (d)

Question 13 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred area(s) of safeguarded land in Bridgnorth. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 12% agreed with the preferred area(s) of safeguarded land in Bridgnorth;
- 64% did not agree with the preferred area(s) of safeguarded land in Bridgnorth; and
- 24% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred area(s) of safeguarded land in Bridgnorth.

## A.9. Question 14 (a)

Question 14 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Alveley as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 20% agreed with the identification of Alveley as a Community Hub;
- 24% did not agree with the identification of Alveley as a Community Hub; and
- 56% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Alveley as a Community Hub.

## A.10. Question 14 (b)

Question 14 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Alveley. Of the respondents that completed this question:

- 9% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Alveley;
- 32% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Alveley; and
- 59% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Alveley.

## A.11. Question 14 (c)

Question 14 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the Alveley development boundary. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 7% agreed with the Alveley development boundary;
- 35% did not agree with the Alveley development boundary; and
- 58% don't know/ no opinion on the Alveley development boundary.

## A.12. Question 14 (d)

Question 14 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the allocation ALV006/ALV007 in Alveley. Of the respondents that completed this question:

- 18% agreed with the allocation ALV006/ALV007 in Alveley;
- 22% did not agree with the allocation ALV006/ALV007 in Alveley; and
- 60% don't know/ no opinion on the allocation ALV006/ALV007 in Alveley.

## A.13. Question 14 (e)

Question 14 (e) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation ALV009 in Alveley. Of the respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing allocation ALV009 in Alveley;
- 33% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation ALV009 in Alveley; and
- 59% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation ALV009 in Alveley.

## A.14. Question 14 (f)

Question 14 (f) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred area(s) of safeguarded land in Alveley. Of the respondents that completed this question:

- 10% agreed with the preferred areas of safeguarded land in Alveley;
- 25.5% did not agree with the preferred areas of safeguarded land in Alveley;
- 64.5% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred areas of safeguarded land in Alveley.

## A.15. Question 15 (a)

Question 15 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Ditton Priors as a Community Hub. Of the respondents that completed this question:

- 13% agreed with the identification of Ditton Priors as a Community Hub;
- 15% did not agree with the identification of Ditton Priors as a Community Hub;
- 72% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Ditton Priors as a Community Hub.

## A.16. Question 15 (b)

Question 15 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Ditton Priors. Of the respondents that completed this question:

- 7% agreed with the preferred areas of safeguarded land in Alveley;
- 17% did not agree with the preferred areas of safeguarded land in Alveley;
- 76% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred areas of safeguarded land in Alveley.

## A.17. Question 15 (c)

Question 15 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ditton Priors. Of the respondents that completed this question:

- 7% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ditton Priors;
- 14% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Ditton Priors;
- 79% don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Ditton Priors.

## A.18. Question 15 (d)

Question 15 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation DNP009 in Ditton Priors. Of the respondents that completed this question:

- 6% agreed with the preferred areas of safeguarded land in Alveley;
- 18% did not agree with the preferred areas of safeguarded land in Alveley;
- 76% don't know/ on the preferred areas of safeguarded land in Alveley.

## A.19. 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. Of the respondents that responded to this question, who were interested in the Bridgnorth Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 3% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be added;
- 17% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be removed;
- 18% disagreed that additional Community Clusters should be added or removed; and
- 62% did not know / had no opinion.

**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