

# Appendix B.7. Shropshire Council- Local Plan Review- Preferred Sites Consultation

Craven Arms

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 11 pages including the cover.

## Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Craven Arms	VD	FH	BN	VD	3rd May 2019
Rev 2.0	Final Craven Arms	VD	FH	BN	VD	30th May 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>4</b>
<b>1. Overview</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Delivering Local Housing Needs</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Question 3	5
2.2. Question 4	5
<b>3. Windfall Development</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1. Question 5	6
3.2. Question 6	6
<b>4. Craven Arms Place Plan Area</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1. Question 19 (a)	6
4.2. Question 19 (b)	7
<b>5. Further Information</b>	<b>7</b>
5.1. Question 63	7
5.2. Question 64	7
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.</b>	<b>9</b>
A.1. Question 3	9
A.2. Question 4	9
A.3. Question 5	9
A.4. Question 6	9
A.5. Question 19 (a)	10
A.6. Question 19 (b)	10
A.7. Question 63	10

## 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 9<sup>th</sup> February 2019.

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

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

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

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

# 1. Overview

This report provides a summary of the consultation comments received in response to the Craven Arms 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 Craven Arms specific questions are summarised in Sections 2 and 3.

There were two questions specifically relating to the Craven Arms 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 Craven Arms-specific questions.

A total of 36 consultees responded to these questions.

The quantitative analysis of these 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 to this question, who were interested in the Craven Arms Place Plan Area opposed the policy. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- One respondent recommended that the 'exception site' policy should be deliverable in all identified settlements and not restricted solely to Community Hubs and Clusters, as there are plenty of sustainable sites and this would not restrict delivery;
- Highlights the undersupply and need for affordable housing in the county. Therefore, in sustainable locations there should not be a requirement to prove local need and this part of the policy should be removed to be more consistent with Paragraph 71 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);
- Support a policy explicitly that enables a mix of owner-occupied housing on exception sites;
- The policy accords with Paragraph 77 of the NPPF and highlights that it will allow landowners to bring forward sites; and
- The need for community agreement in these types of situations.

### 2.2. Question 4

Question 4 sought views on whether respondents preferred (subject to viability assessment) the development mix to 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. Most respondents to this question, who were interested in the Craven Arms Place Plan Area, did not comment on this question, although those who did favoured a set development mix. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- In the interest of transparency and fairness, there should be a clear policy to set out the housing mix so all that are concerned are aware of what is required before a planning application is submitted.
- There was a recommendation for a county wide viability standard within the Local Plan Review, which could act as a benchmark for viability. When issues are presented on a site, another viability assessment could be undertaken. These could also act as thresholds for affordable housing, which would give certainty to land owners and support more land to come forward for affordable housing.

## 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. Respondents to this question, who were interested in the Craven Arms Place Plan Area, had mixed views on a windfall allowance for housing.

Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Some supported windfall development but were concerned that the allowance was not currently deliverable and housing numbers in each community should not be exceeded.
- There is a low number of affordable housing exception sites, with a low number of approvals outside the development boundary. Therefore in delivering the cross-subsidy exception sites, there will need to be a more flexible approach to windfall outside the development boundary.
- Unclear how the Council has arrived at the windfall allowance for each settlement. In order to accord with Paragraph 70 of the NPPF, there needs to be compelling evidence that windfall will provide a reliable source of supply. In the absence of justification, the respondent thinks a cautious approach must be taken to the contribution it will make to each overall settlement.
- There is no definition in the document of how close windfall development must be to a settlement in order to 'count' against its guideline figure. The Plan's housing and employment development figures will be more deliverable if the geographical extent of 'windfall' includes land within ½ km of the settlement development boundary. Another respondent said within 1 km.
- There was a number of recommendations to include a definition in the Plan's Glossary of what 'counts' towards windfall and the geographical distance of inclusion to demonstrate the plan is deliverable.

### 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 consultees responding to this question, who were interested in the Craven Arms Place Plan Area, did support a windfall allowance for employment but did not make any specific comments.

## 4. Craven Arms Place Plan Area

### 4.1. Question 19 (a)

Question 19 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Craven Arms. Most respondents did not know or have an opinion, but of those that did most supported the guidelines. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Some supported the guidelines, stating it was necessary to support regeneration and enable investment in the town's community facilities and infrastructure whilst delivering both market and affordable housing.
- Another highlighted the need to clarify whether the housing guidelines were a maximum or minimum figure. Stating if maximum this would risk failure against the delivery test and would be at odds with the recent Ellesmere Road Appeal Decision, NPPF and the Inspectors Report for the adopted Site Allocations and Management of Development DPD. By providing a minimum figure, it would give the Council flexibility across the whole of Shropshire to deliver the County's housing requirements, as some settlements may struggle to meet their requirements.
- Concern that windfall alone will not deliver the housing numbers, therefore sound alternative sites should be provided.
- Housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Craven Arms. Existing employment land is adequate based on a scaled back housing guideline. Existing imbalances should be included in calculations for housing and employment guidelines.

## 4.2. Question 19 (b)

Question 19 (b) sought views on the development boundary for Craven Arms. Most respondents did not know or had no opinion, but of those that did most supported the proposed development boundary, but a greater number of comments were made by respondents that did not support the development boundary. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Concerns raised about windfall allowance and its delivery, therefore consider alternative sites should be identified. Ask for further consideration of CRA033.
- A number of respondents thought that the development boundary should be extended to the west of the town, west of Watling Street), which has seen recently approved sites and other sites built out (15/01054/REM). They suggest that the development boundary is amended and extended further out to the west around the recently developed site. Sites including CRA023,024, 025 and 015 have been promoted in this Western Area, with agents promoting sites that are available and considered to have good access.
- Provide reference to the Council's Landscape Sensitivity Study stating the west side of Craven Arms is less sensitive than east and south sides, and the additional sites would be more natural.
- Cemetery facilities must consider groundwater conditions. Site Investigation of abattoir site should confirm deliverability of site.

# 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 stated that a village within a Community Cluster should be removed from the Craven Arms Place Plan Area. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- A petition signed by 31 residents asked for the removal of Corfton from the Bache Mill, Bouldon, Corfton, Middlehope, Peaton, Seifton, (Great/Little) Sutton, Westhope Community Cluster (also known as the Diddlebury Parish Cluster).
- The petition and a number of individual respondents raised that in the adopted SAMDev Plan each of the developments in the Community Cluster were to have 5 additional dwellings but not exceeding 10 dwellings. The petition provides a breakdown of granted residential permissions since 2015. It highlights that 14 dwellings have been granted in Corfton and 3 dwellings have outstanding applications. Therefore, the petition is highlighting that Corfton has already committed to providing more than double the number of housing units than is expected in the whole plan period, stating that no more permissions should be granted for residential development before end of 2026, unless in the most exceptional circumstances. One respondent stated that Corfton's removal would enable other settlements in the Community Cluster to take new dwellings.
- Another respondent supported the allocation of Wistanstow as a Community Cluster.

## 5.2. Question 64

Question 64 sought any other views. Where suitable, responses to this question have been consolidated into the relevant Craven Arms-specific questions. Respondents to this question about the Craven Arms Place Plan Area made the following relevant comments:

- Site WNW003 was promoted in the Wistanstow Community Cluster. The respondent provided a range of reasons why the site is still appropriate and provided a settlement function score to illustrate that it possesses a range of services within the settlement, is sustainable and suitable for development.
- Site CRA015 was promoted, stating it is available, suitable and deliverable and should be included in the Development Boundary for Craven Arms.

# Appendices





# Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

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

## A.1. Question 3

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

- 22% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 67% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 11% don't know/ no opinion on the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy.

## A.2. Question 4

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

- 0% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option;
- 100% preferred a set development mix option.

## A.3. Question 5

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

- 40% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 50% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 10% don't know/ no opinion that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline.

## A.4. Question 6

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

- 89% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 0% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 11% 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 19 (a)

Question 19 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Craven Arms. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 27% agreed that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Craven Arms;
- 3% did not agree that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Craven Arms; and
- 70% don't know/ no opinion that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Craven Arms.

## A.6. Question 19 (b)

Question 19 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the development boundary for Craven Arms. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 23% agreed with the development boundary for Craven Arms;
- 10% did not agree with the development boundary for Craven Arms; and
- 67% don't know/ no opinion with the development boundary for Craven Arms.

## A.7. Question 63

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

- 11% agreed that a 'Community Cluster' needs to be formed;
- 67% agreed that a 'Community Cluster' needs to be removed;
- 0% do not agree 'Community Cluster' will be added or removed; and
- 22% 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