

# Appendix B.11. Shropshire Council - Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation

Market Drayton

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 analysing and summarising the consultation responses from the recent Preferred Sites Consultation and to provide a number of key deliverables to support the Council in moving forward the review of the Local Plan.

Atkins Limited assumes no responsibility to any other party in respect of or arising out of or in connection with this document and/or its contents.

This document has 21 pages including the cover.

## Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Market Drayton	NC	BN	VD	VD	20/05/2019
Rev 2.0	Final Market Drayton	NC	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. Market Drayton Place Plan Area</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1. Question 25 (a)	7
4.2. Question 25 (b)	8
4.3. Question 25 (c)	8
4.4. Question 25 (d)	9
4.5. Question 25 (e)	9
4.6. Question 25 (f)	10
4.7. Question 26 (a)	10
4.8. Question 26 (b)	10
4.9. Question 26 (c)	10
4.10. Question 26 (d)	11
4.11. Question 27 (a)	11
4.12. Question 27 (b)	11
4.13. Question 27 (c)	11
4.14. Question 27 (d)	12
4.15. Question 28 (a)	12
<b>5. Further Information</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1. Question 63	12
5.2. Question 64	12
<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 25 (a)	18
A.6. Question 25 (b)	18
A.7. Question 25 (c)	18
A.8. Question 25 (d)	18
A.9. Question 25 (e)	18
A.10. Question 25 (f)	18
A.11. Question 26 (a)	19
A.12. Question 26 (b)	19
A.13. Question 26 (c)	19
A.14. Question 26 (d)	19

A.15. Question 27 (a)	19
A.16. Question 27 (b)	19
A.17. Question 27 (c)	20
A.18. Question 27 (d)	20
A.19. Question 28 (a)	20
A.20. 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 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 Market Drayton Place Plan Area.

# 1. Overview

This report provides a summary of the consultation comments received in response to the Market Drayton 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 by consultees that responded to Market Drayton-specific questions are summarised in Sections 2 and 3.

There were fifteen questions specific to the Market Drayton 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 Market Drayton-specific questions.

A total of 159 responses were received for this Place Plan Area, of which 70 respondents submitted an identical response, primarily concerned with Fordhall Farm in Market Drayton. The identical responses represent the majority of the responses received for Market Drayton and has therefore had a significant influence on the emerging themes in the Market Drayton Place Plan Area.

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 Shropshire Council should introduce a cross-subsidy exception site policy allowing an element of open market housing to 'cross subsidise' affordable housing on the same site which would otherwise be unviable. The majority of respondents to this question, who were interested in the Market Drayton Place Plan Area, specified that they 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not provide any comments. Of the remaining respondents the majority supported the policy.

The respondents who agreed with introducing the policy made the following comments:

- The cross-subsidy policy would boost the supply of affordable housing in line with the Council's aims.
- The policy will help maintain a steady supply of sites and benefit the local and wider construction industry. Exception sites should be available within identified settlements similar to the Single Plot exception site policy.
- One consultant who made multiple representations for different landowners within Market Drayton, supported the policy but warned that it must ensure viability and attractive returns to incentivise land owners to release their land.
- Another consultant commented that large greenfield sites are suitable for cross-subsidy and also provide CIL contributions.

Of the respondents who disagreed with the policy, one commented that no subsidy should be provided, and affordable housing should be charged at a commercial rate.

### 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 the respondents to this question, who were interested in the Market Drayton Place Plan Area, stated that the development mix should be assessed on a site by site basis. The respondents who provided a comment believed this approach would respond better to the needs of local communities.

The respondents who preferred a set development mix commented that this approach would create transparency and certainty for developers. One respondent suggested that there should be three areas of housing mix to reflect the three areas of affordable housing (10%, 15%, 20% - the highest free market being the 10% area).

## 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 majority of respondents to this question, who were interested in the Market Drayton Place Plan Area indicated that they don't know/ no opinion.

One comment was submitted stating that in order to accord with Paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), there needs to be compelling evidence that windfall development will provide a reliable source of supply. In the absence of such justification, the respondent thinks a cautious approach must be taken to the contribution windfall sites will make to the guideline for each settlement. Another respondent was concerned that windfall sites would be used to make up the minimum requirement rather than as contingency.

A quarter of respondents supported the proposal and made several contrasting responses:

- Windfall is a proven way of delivering housing.
- No objection in principle to include a windfall allowance; however, the quantum of windfall development was too high without expansion to the settlement boundary.
- Other respondents stated that windfall sites should be confined within the settlement boundary to preserve the open countryside.
- Windfall allowance should be based on clear need and must not be over-estimated or seen as a means for supplementing the housing supply as they are not a replacement for properly planned housing.

Two respondents asked the Council to define the distance a windfall site can be from the development boundary and still contribute toward the Housing guideline figure. One respondent, who agreed to a windfall allowance, suggested 1km whereas a respondent who did not support the allowance suggested 0.5km.

### 3.2. Question 6

Question 6 sought views on whether respondents thought that it was appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guidelines. The majority of respondents to this question, who were interested in the Market Drayton Place Plan Area, stated that they don't know/ no opinion and did not provide any comments. Of the remaining respondents, the majority supported the use of an employment windfall allowance.

The respondents who did support an employment windfall allowance commented that there needs to be evidence to support delivery and sufficient planned housing development to provide a balance. Another respondent stated that it must be realistic and based on historic windfall delivery rates / future trends.

The respondents who did not support the proposal did not make any comment.

## 4. Market Drayton Place Plan Area

### 4.1. Question 25 (a)

Question 25 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Market Drayton. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not provide any comments. Of the remaining respondents, a higher proportion supported the proposal.

A small proportion of respondents disagreed with the proposed housing and employment guidelines for Market Drayton and the following comments were received:

- Housing delivery should be proportionate to the sustainability of settlements. Market Drayton's housing figure of 1,200 units over the plan period seems arbitrary and if there are sustainable and deliverable

sites that will enable housing beyond this figure then they should be delivered at the expense of less sustainable settlements.

- The housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Market Drayton. Furthermore, the existing employment land is adequate based on scaled back housing guideline.

The respondents who supported the proposed housing and employment guideline made the following comments:

- The proposed housing guideline is supported but higher levels of housing could be achieved because of the service provision in Market Drayton and to match the planned employment growth.
- The proportion of housing allocated to principal centres is unclear.
- The housing figure should be treated as a guideline and not a ceiling, allowing for flexibility and residential development to assist the delivery of aspirational projects such as the marina.
- The guidelines are broadly in line with the Neighbourhood Plan.

One respondent who stated 'don't know/no opinion' believed that guidelines should support all plans and be in favour of sustainable development.

## 4.2. Question 25 (b)

Question 25 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Market Drayton. The majority of respondents supported the proposed development boundary and made the following comments:

- The respondents who submitted the identical response supported the proposed development boundary because it excluded Fordhall Farm which was considered an important community asset.
- One respondent supported the development boundary in the Local Plan as opposed to the Market Drayton neighbourhood plan version.
- The use of this land as organic farmland and its association with the Fordhall Community Land Initiative provides many benefits to the local area that cannot afford to be lost.

The respondents who did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Market Drayton made the following comments:

- The development boundary is too tight around the settlement to achieve windfall targets, subtle changes will open up several sustainable sites for development.
- Development boundaries are artificial, restrictive and impede flexibility or proper planning.
- Concerns that the development boundary would result in further development along the A529 north of the Market Drayton bypass.
- The owners of site MDR016 have asked for it to be included in Market Drayton's development boundary as it affords the opportunity to allow the comprehensive redevelopment of the Greenfields Sports Centre and rounds off the settlement.
- Several other respondents suggested that the development boundary should be expanded to include sites that they are promoting.
- Further work needs to be undertaken relating to flood risk, wastewater infrastructure and groundwater quality for preferred allocations.
- Opposition to expansion of the development boundary towards the River Tern and west of the town in the Fordhall area.

## 4.3. Question 25 (c)

Question 25 (c) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR012 in Market Drayton. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not provide any comments.

The proportion of respondents who supported the preferred housing allocation thought that it was suitable and did not object to the development in principle. There were concerns about the marina development which would add to the complexity of the project and delay the delivery of housing. One respondent suggested these elements should be separated. Another stated that it constitutes a logical spatial extension to the town, though is not the most sustainable option available.



Two respondents stated that the allocation is located in SPZ3, with potential impacts on land use/design. It is also located in a Groundwater Management Unit.

Two respondents stated that the site should be treated jointly with MDR034 and developed in accordance with a masterplan, however the site should not be progressed before their client's site.

One respondent stated that it is a logical spatial extension, albeit not the most sustainable option available.

#### 4.4. Question 25 (d)

Question 25 (d) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR034 in Market Drayton. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not provide any comments.

All the comments on this site were identical to MDR012 in Q. 25(c).

#### 4.5. Question 25 (e)

Question 25 (e) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR039/MDR043 in Market Drayton. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not provide any comments.

The respondents who disagreed with the preferred site allocation felt that the site was incongruous with other development in the settlement and also unduly based on the Market Drayton Neighbourhood Plan.

A similar number of respondents supported the proposal but expressed concern with the access and relying on third party ownership to relocate the sports facilities which adds complexity to the development process. A supporting statement was submitted on behalf of the landowner for MDR043. Technical reports are currently being undertaken to ensure that a robust development proposal can be made for this site and MDR039. The landowner is willing to discuss options for acquiring the site to facilitate the relocation of the sports facilities subject to a reasonable land value.

One comment stated that MDR039 could come forward separate to MDR043 It is deliverable in the short-term, with no deliverability constraints and could support the relocation of Greenfield Sports Facility.

Another comment stated that the development of the site for housing is supported, provided the Greenfield Sports Facility is relocated and enhanced as part of the proposals.

Five comments were received by consultees who did not check a response:

- The land fronting Longford Road should be designated for recreational use as the site is too far away from the town centre and local services. The vehicular access beneath the bypass is inadequate and unsuitable for an additional 150 houses. The access to the replacement Greenfields sports centre is more appropriate on the land north east of Longford Road and the land opposite Brookfields is ideal for relocating sports facilities.
- A consultant representing a landowner near site MDR009/MDR043 indicated that relocating the Greenfields Sports Facility was supported, and their client intends to work with the Council to facilitate an access and provide road links. Their client has put forward suggestions as to how the sports facility's outline approval will dovetail with future development and is currently awaiting feedback from Council officers.
- The Market Drayton Sports Association commented that the proposal must clearly detail the enabling works that will be undertaken to support the new recreational development and how it will improve public safety. This development makes no sense without a substantial contribution toward access arrangements for the new recreational site and should only be considered after the new recreation site has been acquired.
- The Council should clarify that allocations with areas of Flood Zone 2 or 3 have sufficient areas in Flood Zone 1 to accommodate the housing numbers.

Those who stated 'don't know/no opinion' made comments such as:

- The allocation impacts on open countryside, is isolated and it only adjoins the urban area to the south.
- The proposed new sports facility needs to meet the needs of people as a suitable replacement.

## 4.6. Question 25 (f)

Question 25 (f) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR006 in Market Drayton. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not provide any comments. Similar numbers of respondents supported and disagreed with the preferred site allocation.

The respondents who supported MDR006 made the following comments:

- A representation was made on behalf of the landowner for site MDR006 including supporting technical information and a statement demonstrating the site's compliance with planning policy.
- Other respondents questioned the proximity to the A53 and another requested further detail of the development's impact on traffic safety on the A53.

The respondents who disagreed with the preferred site allocation felt the development was unnecessary and would lead to further development along the A53 and A529. Moreover, development along a bypass was contradictory to the purpose of a bypass.

Another comment stated that the allocation will result in 2 boundaries to open fields and will also impact open countryside and will be isolated to Site MDR015. MDR015 outperforms the site in the Sustainability Appraisal.

## 4.7. Question 26 (a)

Question 26 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Hinstock as a Community Hub. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not provide any comments. Of the remaining respondents, a higher proportion agreed with the identification of Hinstock as a Community Hub.

Hinstock Parish Council's response opposed the proposal, stating that they see little benefit to further development. The Parish Council are considering downgrading to a Community Cluster.

A small proportion of respondents supported Hinstock's designation as a Community Hub for several reasons:

- Hinstock is strategically located between Newport to the south, Market Drayton to the north and has an adequate range of services.
- One respondent supported Hinstock's Community Hub designation provided that a range of public transport improvements were delivered.

## 4.8. Question 26 (b)

Question 26 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hinstock. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not provide any comments. Of the remaining respondents a similar number agreed and disagreed with the preferred housing guideline.

The respondents who disagreed with the proposed housing guideline for Hinstock made the following comments:

- The preferred housing guidelines do not consider the Chester Road/Marsh Lane development (16/00790/REM) of 47 houses.
- The existing services in Hinstock are not sufficient to cope with expansion.
- Housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Hinstock.
- Conversely, one respondent thought that Hinstock could accommodate more housing.

Two comments were received from the few respondents who supported the proposed guidelines for Hinstock:

- Hinstock Parish Council commented that they had little choice but to accept limited development in Hinstock and stated that 35 dwellings and 14 unit windfall allowance was a non-negotiable maximum.
- Conversely, another respondent, supported a steady supply of new housing because it will support local services.

## 4.9. Question 26 (c)

Question 26 (c) asked respondents if they agreed with the proposed development boundary for Hinstock. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion'. Of the remaining respondents a similar number agreed and disagreed with the proposed development boundary.

One respondent stated that housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Hinstock.

## 4.10. Question 26 (d)

Question 24 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation HKW009 in Hinstock. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not provide any comments.

The respondents who disagreed with the preferred site allocation made the following comments:

- The scale of development will alter the character of the village and its historic core. A smaller allocation and expansion of the development boundary would be considered more appropriate.
- Greater consideration needs to be given to the size and location of the development.
- Housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Hinstock.
- Several respondents' thought the proposed access was unsafe, and the site has been previously refused planning permission for this reason. Furthermore, the development would result in increased vehicular traffic which poses safety risks to school children because of inadequate footway provision. One respondent submitted photos of a crash at the Chester Road junction to Ellerton, to evidence their concerns with the potential site access.
- One respondent commented that the site would restrict the primary school from growing.
- Other respondents cited loss of privacy owing to the position of the site on elevated ground.

The respondents who supported the preferred site allocation made the following comments:

- The site should be extended to 4ha for safer access, increased open space and playing field provision. The proposed quantum of development should include an additional 29 dwellings.
- Hinstock Parish Council requested to be consulted if the site is developed and for the footway on School Bank Road to be widened.

One respondent questioned whether the development will remove trees lining the road which are currently used by local wildlife.

## 4.11. Question 27 (a)

Question 27 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Hodnet as a Community Hub. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not provide any comments.

One comment was received in support of the designation, stating that the settlement is highly sustainable - ranking as the 13<sup>th</sup> most sustainable Community Hub out of 40, it should act as a focus for new development.

One comment was provided in opposition to the designation. It stated that Hodnet does not have sufficient employment opportunities and fails to meet the criteria for a Hub in Table 2 of Page 4 of hierarchy of settlements document. The settlement lacks primary services, is an unsuitable and unsustainable location for significant rural development and should be reclassified as 'Other Rural Settlement'.

## 4.12. Question 27 (b)

Question 27 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guidelines for Hodnet. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and no comments were submitted for this question.

One comment was received which stated that Hodnet is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant development. As such it should not have a housing guideline.

## 4.13. Question 27 (c)

Question 27 (c) asked respondents if they agreed with the proposed development boundary for Hodnet. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not make any comments.

One comment was made by a consultant representing a landowner in Hodnet. They suggested that sites HOD009, HOD010 and HOD011, and planning permission 13/03452/FUL should be maintained within the development boundary. The proposed development boundary should also be extended to include their client's site HHH013, Land off Drayton Road.

Another comment stated that Hodnet is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant development.

## 4.14. Question 27 (d)

Question 27 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation HHH001/HHH014 in Hodnet. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and no comments were submitted for this question.

Those who disagreed made comments such as:

- It is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant development and should not have any housing allocations.
- There is restricted water available for licensing.
- It is unclear whether impacts on Hodnet Conservation Area has been considered and how development can respect the Conservation Area..

## 4.15. Question 28 (a)

Question 28 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Woore, Irelands Cross and Pipes Gate as a Community Hub. The majority of respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not provide any comments.

One comment was made by a consultant representing a landowner in the settlement recommending their client's site, PIP004 in Pipe Gate for allocation.

One respondent stated that adequate drainage, water supply and fuel provision are considerations for the deliverability of developments. Furthermore, there is no water available for licensing.

# 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 respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not make any comments.

Respondents who asked for additional settlements to be designated as Community Clusters, identified the following places:

- Two respondents suggested that Colehurst should be a Community Cluster with one respondent specifying that it should be designated for specialist local and self-build housing.
- Moreton was identified by a respondent who was representing a client with 3 potential development sites in the village.
- Longslow was recommended to be a Community Cluster.
- Wollerton was recommended to be a Community Cluster, stating that the potential development boundary should include the whole village and bowling club.
- One respondent proposed two options for a Community Cluster comprised of:
  - Wistanwick and Stoke on Tern
  - Stoke Heath, Wistanwick and Stoke on Tern.

One respondent commented that Cheswardine's removal doesn't reflect its sustainability or its strategic location in the local area. The response asked the Council to reconsider designating Cheswardine as a Community Cluster as a minimum. This respondent also submitted a representation for development site, CHS014, in Cheswardine.

No respondents asked for a designated settlement to be removed.

## 5.2. Question 64

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

- Natural England submitted a response to the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) in the Woore Neighbourhood Plan and note that the Council has screened the Plan for significant effects. Natural England concurs with view that significant effects are unlikely to occur. They also cite two recent Rulings made by EU Court of Justice over interpretation of Habitats Directive relating to the treatment of mitigation measures at the screening stage of an HRA when deciding if an appropriate assessment of a plan is required.
- Cheswardine Parish Council would like to understand the implications of opting-in as a Community Cluster.
- The use of housing guidelines as a maximum figure contradicts the recent Ellesmere Road Appeal Decision, NPPF and the Inspectors Report for the adopted Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev Plan) 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.
- The housing guidelines should be 'broken down' to expressly state the requirement for specialist retirement housing as indicated in paragraph 61 of the NPPF and a policy should be included which expresses support or a presumption in favour of specialist retirement accommodation.
- Even with windfall allowance, the Council's expected delivery rate will not deliver the minimum housing requirement. The Council needs to plan for 10-20% of permissions not materialising as per DCLG guidance. There is a lack of justification to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances required to amend Green Belt boundaries. Shropshire Council must demonstrate that all other reasonable options for meeting identified development needs have been examined, including demonstrating Shrewsbury and other towns are incapable or unsuitable for additional development. Market Drayton can take further growth.
- There should be greater flexibility for the quantum of housing delivery in higher tier settlements. The proportional housing allocation of 24.5% for Principal Centres should not be explicitly applied.
- The respondents who submitted the identical response reaffirmed their support for the continued use of the Fordhall Organic Farm and any initiative to purchase land adjacent to the site.
- Several respondents also support the relocation of the Greenfields sports centre.
- There should be a specific policy giving protection to the Green Belt around Community Clusters within the Green Belt.

Several respondents commented on the consultation process:

- One respondent asked for more robust reporting processes and information sharing for future consultation, in particular the respondent was concerned that information was lost or misinterpreted due to a lack of planning knowledge.
- The same respondent asked for greater clarity/transparency surrounding the Parish Council opt-in process and for Parish Council to record the consultation they have undertaken.
- Market Drayton Town Council support the Local Plan Review and reserve the right to restart the Market Drayton Neighbourhood Plan at a later date.

Multiple respondents used this question to promote potential development sites across the Market Drayton Place Plan Area. A total of twenty-three sites were promoted.

#### Market Drayton

- A representation was made on behalf of the landowners to promote site MDR011 Land off Walkmill Drive on the southern side of Market Drayton. The site is a small parcel of land on the border of the development boundary and the promoters consider it would make a logical inclusion for residential development.
- A representation was made on behalf of the landowners to promote site MDR013 land north-west of Adderley Road traffic island. The parcel of land has been excluded from the development boundary which the respondent states is illogical as land to the north MDR006 is a preferred site for 125 dwellings. The respondent has contacted the owners of MDR006 to suggest a joint development. At this stage no discussions have been held.
- MDR014 Land at Fordhall Farm and MDR031 Longford Turning were promoted for residential and commercial development respectively.

- A site, presumed to be MDR015 (response stated MRR015) is outside the development boundary, scoring 'good' in the Sustainability Appraisal with long term potential. This was proposed for residential development and aims to contribute to affordable housing and other community betterment. (The respondent has inconsistently labelled this site through the response).
- A representation was made on behalf of the landowners to promote site MDR016, a parcel of land bound to the north by the A53.
- Site representation on behalf of the landowner for land south of Beresford Close on the south-eastern border of the development boundary, 500m from Market Drayton town centre. 60 dwellings are proposed and illustrated on a masterplan.
- A representation was submitted on behalf of a retirement housebuilder for Land off Stafford Street in Market Drayton for specialist retirement accommodation.
- MDR041 in Market Drayton was promoted for housing. The site has good access and no need for non-motorised Users to cross the A53. The respondent suggested they would also consider the site to be used for relocating the Greenfields Sports Centre.
- A Consultee promoted MDR042 for 300 dwellings and referred to a submitted location plan. The site has no constraints to deliverability, is sustainably located and has good potential access.
- Representation for a non-vehicular route through the disused Railway line adjacent to Greenfields Lane which could be turned into an important non-vehicular route into town for existing and future housing. The land requires minimum expenditure to make it serviceable and could be delivered through developer contribution.
- United Utilities suggested policy related wording for a range of water related issues. The Council should consider a policy specific to new development in Market Drayton to ensure surface water is discharged in accordance with the surface water hierarchy. The Consultee commented that existing assets in the County could require upgrades or expansion to meet projected growth and requests that policy recognises utilities sites in rural areas are appropriate for development for operational purposes. The consultee also commented that the site selection process should consider sites located away from Groundwater Source Protection Zones as being more appropriate for development, especially SPZ1.

#### Hinstock

- Technical information and a site layout plan for HKW016 in Hinstock was promoted by the respondent who considers the site more suitable than HKW009.
- A supporting statement and illustrative masterplan was submitted for residential development at the Old Malthouse off Marsh Lane in Hinstock village. The site lies just outside the development boundary.
- Land east of Newport Road in Hinstock was promoted for housing.

#### Hodnet

- HHH013 is promoted for 34 dwellings at Land off Drayton Road. The site was previously proposed as part of the 'Call for Sites' in 2017 with accompanying technical information. It is also requested that the Sustainability Appraisal score for the site is amended to -8.

#### Woore, Irelands Cross and Pipes Gate

- PIP004 in Pipe Gate is promoted for housing. The respondent states that the site was previously assessed as having little potential for housing and separated from the built form of Pipe Gate. The Parish Council wants the Site Allocations and Managing Development Plan (SAMDev Plan) to recognise that Woore, Irelands Cross and Pipe Gate are closely linked. Development at PIP004 would support this and still retain open space between the three settlements.

#### Other settlements

- A representation was made on behalf of the landowners to promote site CHS014. A large parcel of land on the southern boundary of Cheswardine for residential development.
- CHT002 in Colehurst is designated as open countryside. The landowner promoting the site is willing to consider a cross-subsidy housing scheme with a smaller proportion of open market housing. The respondent notes that applications for ad-hoc development have previously been approved in Colehurst.
- Sites MES006, MES007 and MES008 are promoted for housing development in Moreton Say.

- A supporting statement was submitted for Land Opposite the Red Lion Public House in Wistanswick. The statement establishes the site's compliance with local policy for a development of up to 7 dwellings, the site also lies above a Severn Trent Water main. Site plans, views and a pre-application letter from 2014 are attached to the statement.
- Land south of Mill Road is promoted as a potential windfall site in Wollerton.
- Fordhall Organic Farm should not be included in the development boundary. It has various community and employment uses.

# Appendices





# Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

The following quantitative analysis looks at the standard questions provided for Market Drayton Place Plan Area. It illustrates the percentage answers to each of the following questions:

## A.1. Question 3

Question 3 sought views on whether 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 Market Drayton Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 25% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 2% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 73% responded 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 Market Drayton Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 60% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option;
- 40% 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 Market Drayton Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 24% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 2% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 74% responded 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 Market Drayton Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 14% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 2% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 84% responded 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 25 (a)

Question 25 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Market Drayton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 19% agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Market Drayton;
- 3% did not agree with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Market Drayton; and
- 78% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Market Drayton.

## A.6. Question 25 (b)

Question 25 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Market Drayton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 72% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Market Drayton;
- 8% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Market Drayton; and
- 20% don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Market Drayton.

## A.7. Question 25 (c)

Question 25 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR012 in Market Drayton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR012 in Market Drayton;
- 3% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation MDR012 in Market Drayton; and
- 86% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation MDR012 in Market Drayton.

## A.8. Question 25 (d)

Question 25 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR034 in Market Drayton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR034 in Market Drayton;
- 3% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation MDR034 in Market Drayton; and
- 86% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation MDR034 in Market Drayton.

## A.9. Question 25 (e)

Question 25 (e) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR009/MDR043 in Market Drayton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR009/MDR043 in Market Drayton;
- 7% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation MDR009/MDR043 in Market Drayton; and
- 85% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation MDR009/MDR043 in Market Drayton.

## A.10. Question 25 (f)

Question 25 (f) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR006 in Market Drayton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing allocation MDR006 in Market Drayton;
- 6% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation MDR006 in Market Drayton; and
- 86% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation MDR006 in Market Drayton.

## A.11. Question 26 (a)

Question 26 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Hinstock as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 13% agreed with the identification of Hinstock as a Community Hub;
- 1% did not agree with the identification of Hinstock as a Community Hub; and
- 86% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Hinstock as a Community Hub.

## A.12. Question 26 (b)

Question 26 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hinstock. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 6% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hinstock;
- 6% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Hinstock; and
- 88% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Hinstock.

## A.13. Question 26 (c)

Question 26 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Hinstock. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 4% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Hinstock;
- 5% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Hinstock; and
- 91% don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Hinstock.

## A.14. Question 26 (d)

Question 26 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation HKW009 in Hinstock. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the preferred housing allocation HKW009 in Hinstock;
- 9% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation HKW009 in Hinstock; and
- 86% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation HKW009 in Hinstock.

## A.15. Question 27 (a)

Question 27 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Hodnet as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 4% agreed with the identification of Hodnet as a Community Hub;
- 1% did not agree with the identification of Hodnet as a Community Hub; and
- 95% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Hodnet as a Community Hub.

## A.16. Question 27 (b)

Question 27 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hodnet. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 2.5% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hodnet;
- 2.5% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Hodnet; and
- 95% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Hodnet.

## A.17. Question 27 (c)

Question 27 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Hodnet. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

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

## A.18. Question 27 (d)

Question 26 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation HHH001/0014 in Hodnet. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the preferred housing allocation HHH001/0014 in Hodnet;
- 2% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation HHH001/0014 in Hodnet; and
- 95% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation HHH001/0014 in Hodnet.

## A.19. Question 28 (a)

Question 27 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Woore, Irelands Cross and Pipe Gate as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the identification of Woore, Irelands Cross and Pipe Gate as a Community Hub;
- 0% did not agree with the identification of Woore, Irelands Cross and Pipe Gate as a Community Hub; and
- 95% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Woore, Irelands Cross and Pipe Gate as a Community Hub.

## A.20. 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 question about the Market Drayton Place Plan Area and completed this question:

- 5% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be added;
- 1% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be removed;
- 9% disagreed that additional Community Clusters should be added or removed; and
- 85% 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