

# Appendix B.9. Shropshire Council- Local Plan Review- Preferred Sites Consultation

Highley

Shropshire Council

28 May 2019

# Notice

This document and its contents have been prepared and are intended solely as information for Shropshire Council and use in relation to 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 12 pages including the cover.

## Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Highley	TH	KD	VD	VD	03/05/2019
Rev 2.0	Draft Highley	TH	BN	VD	VD	28/05/2019

## Client signoff

Client	Shropshire Council	
Project	Appendix B.9. Consultation	Shropshire Council- Local Plan Review- Preferred Sites
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>5</b>
3.1. Question 5	5
3.2. Question 6	6
<b>4. Highley Place Plan Area</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1. Question 21 (a)	6
4.2. Question 21 (b)	6
4.3. Question 21 (c)	7
<b>5. Further Information</b>	<b>7</b>
5.1. Question 63	7
5.2. Question 64	7
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.</b>	<b>10</b>
A.1. Question 3	10
A.2. Question 4	10
A.3. Question 5	10
A.4. Question 6	10
A.5. Question 21 (a)	11
A.6. Question 21 (b)	11
A.7. Question 21 (c)	11
A.8. Question 63	11

## 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 Review. This document summarises the key issues raised by respondents to the consultation in the Highley Place Plan area.

# 1. Overview

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

There were three questions specifically relating to the Highley 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 Highley-specific questions.

A total of 66 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. Responses received to this question from respondents, who were interested in the Highley Place Plan Area, were mixed. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Those that supported the policy appreciated a need for delivery of affordable housing in the area, but also expressed a need to ensure that this is only used where the site is genuinely not viable otherwise, and when subsequent dwellings would be genuinely affordable.
- Those that opposed the policy raised concerns such as using the policy to justify building on Green Belt land, delivering associated infrastructure.

### 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 a viability assessment undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review. The responses received to this question from respondents, who were interested in the Highley Place Plan Area, supported the development mix being assessed on a site by site basis. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Strong preference for development mix to be assessed on a site by site basis.
- Respondents generally highlighted that a more flexible approach is needed to respond to the context-specific demands and constraints of any particular site/village.
- Made reference to the role of the local community and Parish Council as they would have a better understanding of the area's needs.

## 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. The responses to this question from respondents, who were interested in the Highley Place Plan Area, had mixed views about this policy. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Windfall developments are positive if approached with common sense and respond to the existing development pattern.
- Support in the case where this does not mean the loss of a community asset or amenity.
- Objection on the basis that windfall sites are not properly planned for – sites should be properly allocated to avoid manipulation of housing supply.

## 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 responses to the question from respondents, who were interested in the Highley Place Plan Area had mixed views about this policy.

Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Should not be a tick-box exercise, communities should be supported in identifying potential employers and help to promote the area.
- Any allowance should relate to infrastructure capacity in the area.
- Highley already has land available for employment, which has been underused for some time.

# 4. Highley Place Plan Area

## 4.1. Question 21 (a)

Question 21 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Highley. The majority of respondents did not agree with the guidelines. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Concerns over the capacity of local services, including schools and healthcare, to accommodate further residents and users as a result of housing growth.
- The housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Highley. Furthermore, existing employment land is adequate based on scaled back housing guideline. Existing imbalances should be included in calculations for housing and employment guidelines.
- The current infrastructure provision is inadequate, highly congested and further development will worsen this.
- There is a lack of employment opportunities in Highley. New residents would be forced to commute to jobs elsewhere.
- This constitutes overdevelopment for Highley, whose geographic position has left it relatively poorly connected in comparison to other towns.
- Concern was raised over references to Highley as “market town”, “village”, “key centre” and “commuter village”, which are contradictory.
- There is a lack of an up to date evidence base for sports facilities needed.
- Comments supporting the guidelines did so on the basis of belief that there is strong demand for market housing in the area.

## 4.2. Question 21 (b)

Question 21 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the development boundary for Highley. A majority of respondents did not support the amended development boundary. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Many objected on the basis that this would result in the loss of greenfield land on the edge of the town, including the loss of habitat for flora and fauna. Multiple comments referred to the land being within AONB boundaries, however this is not the case.
- There is inadequate transport infrastructure to accommodate an allocation of this scale, and inadequate public service provision for new residents.
- Site HNN016 is in a prominent position and would alter the local character and views. Site would contribute to iterative development creeping into the Severn Valley.

- Site HNN016 goes beyond the development boundaries adopted in the most recent SAMDev Plan.
- There is potential for ground contamination and land stability issues.

### 4.3. Question 21 (c)

Question 21 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation HNN016 (Land South of Oak Street) in Highley. A large majority of respondents were opposed to the site allocation. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Concerns raised over highway safety issues as a result of any new accesses and increased traffic and parking.
- The site would contribute to the destruction of the Severn Edge, the natural beauty of the area, and in general greenfield land.
- The allocation impacts on six public rights of way crossing the site. The site should be maintained as green corridors.
- Potential heritage impacts upon the nearby Grade II listed 'Hazelwells'.
- Potential need for further investigations due to historic mining or quarrying activities in the vicinity.
- Concerns over existing public service provision (including education, healthcare and public transport) and further pressures as a result of new residents.
- Questions were raised over the assessment for the housing need for the area, and whether this was excessive.
- Alternative sites have not been adequately considered or consulted upon.
- Some respondents expressed agreement with the 'extra care' element of the scheme.
- Development could secure investment to improve the Halo Severn Centre, rather than the provision of new open space on the site which could duplicate existing facilities.

## 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 to the question, who were interested in the Highley Place Plan Area, stated that they didn't know or had no opinion. Most remaining respondents, who had an opinion, did not agree that any 'Community Clusters' needed to be added or removed. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- General support that no Community Clusters are proposed in the Highley Place Plan Area.
- One respondent suggested that Community Cluster allocation would be better related to existing employment patterns and sustainable transport management.

### 5.2. Question 64

Question 64 sought any other views. Where suitable, responses on this question have been consolidated into the relevant part Highley specific questions. Respondents to this question, who were interested in the Highley Place Plan Area, made the following relevant comments:

- Some respondents took this opportunity to promote other sites in Highley, including HNN017, HNN004, HH006 and HH010, alongside potential highway improvements to lessen through-traffic.
- Comments referred to the lack of employment opportunities in the area and the subsequent unsustainable transportation patterns that arise as a result. Infrastructure investment (including telecoms and internet) should be a priority.
- The development would result in the destruction of key views and natural beauty, and due to the position of the site could result in overlooking of existing houses, particularly on Yew Tree Grove.
- Several comments received about the inadequate transport infrastructure and public service provision for Highley to support new dwellings.

- Multiple comments stated that they did not consider the public consultation process to have adequately taken into account the opinions or issues raised by the local residents who had contributed. A lack of transparency and opportunities for public participation/influence were cited.



# Appendices



# Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

This appendix details the responses provided to the multiple-choice questions posed for the Highley 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 Highley Place Plan Area and completed this question:

- 33% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 22% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 44% 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 Highley Place Plan Area and completed this question

- 81% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option;
- 19% 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 Highley Place Plan Area and completed this question:

- 38% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 20% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 42% 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 Highley Place Plan Area and completed this question:

- 38% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 20% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 42% 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 21 (a)

Question 21 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Highley. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 9% agreed that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Highley;
- 50% did not agree that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Highley; and
- 41% don't know/ no opinion that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Highley.

## A.6. Question 21 (b)

Question 21 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the development boundary for Highley. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the development boundary for Highley;
- 51% did not agree with the development boundary for Highley; and
- 38% don't know/ no opinion with the development boundary for Highley.

## A.7. Question 21 (c)

Question 21 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation HNN016 in Highley. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 4% agreed with the allocation HNN016 for Highley; and
- 59% did not agree with the allocation HNN016 for Highley.
- 37% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation HNN016 in Highley.

## A.8. 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 Highley Place Plan Area and completed this question:

- 4% agreed that a 'Community Cluster' needs to be formed;
- 4% agreed that a 'Community Cluster' needs to be removed;
- 35% do not agree 'Community Cluster' will be added or removed; and
- 58% 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