

# Appendix B.10. Shropshire Council - Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation

Ludlow

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 144 pages including the cover.

## Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Ludlow	JL	VD	BN	VD	11 <sup>th</sup> April 2019
Rev 2.0	Final Ludlow	JL	BN	VD	VD	28 <sup>th</sup> 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>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>6</b>
3.1. Question 5	6
3.2. Question 6	6
<b>4. Ludlow Place Plan Area</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1. Question 22 (a)	7
4.2. Question 22 (b)	7
4.3. Question 22 (c)	7
4.4. Question 22 (d)	7
4.5. Question 22 (e)	7
4.6. Question 23 (a)	8
4.7. Question 23 (b)	8
4.8. Question 24 (a)	8
4.9. Question 24 (b)	8
4.10. Question 24 (c)	8
4.11. Question 24 (d)	8
<b>5. Further Information</b>	<b>8</b>
5.1. Question 63	8
5.2. Question 64	9
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.</b>	<b>11</b>
A.1. Question 3	11
A.2. Question 4	11
A.3. Question 5	11
A.4. Question 6	11
A.5. Question 22 (a)	12
A.6. Question 22 (b)	12
A.7. Question 22 (c)	12
A.8. Question 22 (d)	12
A.9. Question 22 (e)	12
A.10. Question 23 (a)	12
A.11. Question 23 (b)	13
A.12. Question 24 (a)	13
A.13. Question 24 (b)	13
A.14. Question 24 (c)	13
A.15. Question 24 (d)	13
A.16. Question 63	13

## 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; 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 Ludlow Place Plan area.

# 1. Overview

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

There were eleven questions specifically relating to the Ludlow 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 Ludlow-specific questions.

A total of 42 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 responses to this question from respondents, who were interested in the Ludlow Place Plan Area, supported the policy. No respondents explicitly opposed the policy. Of the few responses received to Question 3 the only comment noted that the policy was long established by the National Planning Policy Framework but nonetheless disregarded.

### 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 majority of responses to this question from respondents, who were interested in the Ludlow Place Plan Area, stated that the development mix should be assessed on a site by site basis, but no specific comments were provided. Many of the respondents declined to comment on a preference to either option.

## 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. Generally, responses to this question from respondents, who were interested in the Ludlow Place Plan Area, did not support a windfall allowance for housing, with several respondents noting that any windfall allowance should be used as a contingency.

The key issues raised by consultees that provided comments were:

- Housing supply should be based on over allocation of deliverable sites; and
- Changes in policy framework and 5 year housing supply position should be considered.

### 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 the responses to this question from respondents, who were interested in to the Ludlow Place Plan Area, did support an employment windfall allowance.

One respondent commented that all employment sites should be allocated to provide certainty to landowners and encourage investment.

## 4. Ludlow Place Plan Area

### 4.1. Question 22 (a)

Question 22 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Ludlow. The majority of respondents who provided a response to this question did not agree with the guidelines.

Two consultees suggested the need for additional sites for residential development to aid delivery. A third consultee expressed concern over the ability of the preferred allocations to deliver their housing guidelines.

One consultee suggested that housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Ludlow.

### 4.2. Question 22 (b)

Question 22 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ludlow. Majority of respondents did not know or have an opinion. The following relevant comments were received.

- The proposed development boundary is drawn too tightly and artificially depresses the supply of housing;
- The proposed development boundary should extend to include LUD047, LUD048 and LUD049 due to their sustainable location;
- The proposed development boundary should include 'The Garden'.
- One respondent noted potential ground contamination issues.

### 4.3. Question 22 (c)

Question 22 (c) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation LUD056. The majority of the respondents who gave a response indicated they did not have an opinion or did not know.

The deliverability and developability of preferred allocation LUD056 was questioned by a consultee.

### 4.4. Question 22 (d)

Question 22 (d) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation LUD057 in Ludlow. The majority of the respondents who gave a response indicated they did not have an opinion or did not know.

One respondent commented that preferred allocation LUD057 should not be allocated but retained within the development boundary and considered as a windfall site.

### 4.5. Question 22 (e)

Question 22 (d) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation LUD052. The majority of the respondents who gave a response indicated they did not have an opinion or did not know. The other respondents agreed with this preferred housing allocation.

One response was received, expressing concerns over the long term effects of the A49 on the setting of Caynham Camp, suggesting that low-rise development would be appropriate.

## 4.6. Question 23 (a)

Question 23 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Burford as a Community Hub. The majority of respondents did not know or have an opinion. A single response was provided to this question. The respondent supported the identification, recognising the contribution Burford could make as a Community Hub.

## 4.7. Question 23 (b)

Question 23 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Burford. The majority of those who responded either agreed or had no opinion / didn't know. One respondent offered a comment on this question, suggesting that the housing guideline could be significantly increased. Conversely, one respondent suggested that housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10%.

## 4.8. Question 24 (a)

Question 24 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Clee Hill as a Community Hub. The majority of those who responded either agreed or had no opinion / didn't know.

One respondent commented that drainage, water supply and fuel provision should be considerations in the delivery of sites in Clee Hill.

## 4.9. Question 24 (b)

Question 24 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Clee Hill. The majority of those who responded either agreed or had no opinion / didn't know. One comment made in response to this question suggested residential development in Clee Hill should be self-build affordable and open market schemes for local people. Another respondent suggested that housing targets should be reduced by 10%.

## 4.10. Question 24 (c)

Question 24 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Clee Hill. The respondents provided a mixed response with no clear majority being formed.

The respondents did not provide specific comments on this question.

## 4.11. Question 24 (d)

Question 24 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation CHK002 in Clee Hill. The majority of those who responded either agreed or had no opinion / didn't know.

One respondent flagged up that there may be potential impacts upon public rights of way as a result of development at this 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 whether any of the existing 'Community Clusters' identified in the consultation document should be removed. The majority of responses to this question from those who responded to question, who were interested in the Ludlow Place Plan Area indicated that they believed there to be additional settlements suitable to be designated as Community Clusters. Suggested settlements to be added include:

- Ashford Bowdler;
- Ashford Carbonel;
- Bitterly;
- Caynham;
- Clunton;



- Greete;
- Hints;
- Knowbury;
- Middleton; and
- Whitton

A consultee commented that Community Clusters should be determined by Shropshire Council rather than by Parish Councils.

## 5.2. Question 64

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

The key issues raised by these respondents which are not covered in the preceding questions were:

- Reference to the National Planning Policy Framework and the need for the plan to promote sustainable development in rural areas to enhance vitality of rural communities. Alternative sites were identified by respondents on these grounds.
- Concern was also raised regarding the lack of a clear strategic plan for housing allocations. This is emphasised by one respondent who referred to the £3 million public infrastructure investment in a new school in Caynham and the suitability of the settlement for housing development.
- Various alternative sites were proposed for a number of differing reasons, including:
  - HTS002 for a mix of affordable and open market housing;
  - KWY001 for a self-build unit.
  - BUR008 was identified as having favourable topography and being at low risk of flooding, making it suitable to accommodate employment or residential;
  - The area of the proposed employment site LUD052 should be extended in a block along the edge of the A49; and
  - The LUD012 site being put forward for smaller low-cost market dwellings for elderly people wishing to downsize.
- Caynham was identified as being suitable as a Community Hub, due to the site relating well to the settlement pattern, being serviced with a highway frontage and being located in a sustainable location.
- It was suggested by a Ludlow Town Councillor that Ludlow needs to attract and keep a younger population to ensure the town thrives in the future and allocating sufficient employment land was key to this. As such, the consultee suggests the A49 as a corridor for economic growth. The consultee expressed a desire to work with Shropshire Council to find the best ways to achieve positive long-term outcomes.
- One Consultee described confusion as to the purpose of the revised Development Plan, in terms of its conflict with the existing Plan.

# Appendices



# Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

This appendix details the responses provided to the multiple choice questions posed for the Ludlow 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 questions, who were interested in the Ludlow Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 80% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 0% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 20% 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 questions, who were interested in the Ludlow Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 75% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option;
- 25% 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 questions, who were interested in the Ludlow Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 18% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 55% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 27% 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 questions, who were interested in the Ludlow Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 70% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 10% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 20% 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 22 (a)

Question 22 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Ludlow. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 14% agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Ludlow;
- 14% did not agree with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Ludlow; and
- 72% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Ludlow.

## A.6. Question 22 (b)

Question 22 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ludlow. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 14% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ludlow;
- 14% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Ludlow; and
- 72% don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Ludlow.

## A.7. Question 22 (c)

Question 22 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation LUD056 in Ludlow. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 18% agreed with the preferred housing allocation LUD056 in Ludlow;
- 4% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation LUD056 in Ludlow; and
- 78% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation LUD056 in Ludlow.

## A.8. Question 22 (d)

Question 22 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation LUD057 in Ludlow. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the preferred housing allocation LUD057 in Ludlow;
- 4% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation LUD057 in Ludlow; and
- 85% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation LUD057 in Ludlow.

## A.9. Question 22 (e)

Question 22 (e) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation LUD052 in Ludlow. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing allocation LUD052 in Ludlow;
- 0% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation LUD052 in Ludlow; and
- 92% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation LUD052 in Ludlow.

## A.10. Question 23 (a)

Question 23 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Burford as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 21% agreed with the identification of Burford as a Community Hub;
- 0% did not agree with the identification of Burford as a Community Hub; and
- 79% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Burford as a Community Hub.

## A.11. Question 23 (b)

Question 23 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Burford. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 4% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Burford;
- 8% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Burford; and
- 88% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Burford.

## A.12. Question 24 (a)

Question 24 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Clee Hill as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 18% agreed with the identification of Clee Hill as a Community Hub;
- 0% did not agree with the identification of Clee Hill as a Community Hub; and
- 82% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Clee Hill as a Community Hub.

## A.13. Question 24 (b)

Question 24 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Clee Hill. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Clee Hill;
- 4% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Clee Hill; and
- 88% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Clee Hill.

## A.14. Question 24 (c)

Question 24 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Clee Hill. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 12% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Clee Hill;
- 0% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Clee Hill; and
- 88% don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Clee Hill.

## A.15. Question 24 (d)

Question 24 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation CHK002 in Clee Hill. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing allocation CHK002 in Clee Hill;
- 0% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation CHK002 in Clee Hill; and
- 92% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation CHK002 in Clee Hill.

## A.16. Question 63

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

- 80% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be added;
- 0% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be removed;
- 0% disagreed that additional Community Clusters should be added or removed; and
- 20% 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