

Appendix B.12. Shropshire Council- Local Plan Review- Preferred Sites Consultation

Minsterley and Pontesbury
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 analysing and summarize 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 16 pages including the cover.

Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Author-ised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Minsterley and Pontesbury	KD	BN	VD	VD	3 rd May 2019
Rev 2.0	Final Minsterley and Pontesbury	KD	BN	VD	VD	28 th 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
Introduction	5
1. Delivering Local Housing Needs	6
1.1. Question 3	6
1.2. Question 4	6
2. Windfall Development	6
2.1. Question 5	6
2.2. Question 6	7
3. Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area	7
3.1. Question 29(a)	7
3.2. Question 29(b)	7
3.3. Question 29(c)	8
3.4. Question 29(d)	8
3.5. Question 30(a)	8
3.6. Question 30(b)	8
3.7. Question 30(c)	9
3.8. Question 30(d)	9
4. Further Information	10
4.1. Question 63	10
4.2. Question 64	10
Appendices	12
Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.	13
A.1. Question 3	13
A.2. Question 4	13
A.3. Question 5	13
A.4. Question 6	13
A.5. Question 29(a)	14
A.6. Question 29(b)	14
A.7. Question 29(c)	14
A.8. Question 29(d)	14
A.9. Question 30(a)	14
A.10. Question 30(b)	14
A.11. Question 30(c)	14
A.12. Question 30(d)	15
A.13. Question 63	15

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 9th 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 Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan area.

1. Delivering Local Housing Needs

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

In total there were eight questions specifically relating to the Minsterley and Pontesbury 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 Minsterley and Pontesbury-specific questions.

A total of 47 consultees responded to these questions.

The quantitative assessment of the comments is set out in Appendix A.

1.1. 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. Half of the responses to this question from respondents interested in the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area supported the policy. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- A county-wide viability benchmark standard should be included and where further viability issues are present, a viability assessment can be undertaken by the applicant.
- A county-wide set percentage zone for each Place Plan Area would allow a level of certainty for landowners.
- The exception site policy should be deliverable in all identified settlements and not just Community Hubs and Community Clusters.
- Only developments of 15+ dwellings should be liable to pay subsidies.
- This policy could damage the policy of restricted development in the countryside.
- The need for affordable housing outweighs consideration for all other types of housing.

1.2. 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. The responses to this question from respondents interested in the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area tended to prefer development mix being assessed on a site by site basis. The following relevant comments were made:

- Affordable housing should be for developments of 15+ dwellings as developers are then in a better position to afford these costs.
- There should be a clear policy setting out the required housing mix for transparency and fairness.
- A set development mix is necessary to encourage developers to meet the demand for low cost, affordable and/or social housing.

2. Windfall Development

2.1. 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 responses from

respondents interested in the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area supported a windfall allowance. The following relevant comments were made:

- It is unclear how the Council has arrived at the windfall allowance.
- Some settlements seemingly rely heavily on an untried/tested exception site policy to allow windfall development outside of the development boundary.
- The final plan needs to clarify geographic areas that will count towards the windfall allowance. If development outside boundaries does not count towards windfall this poses a risk to the deliverability of housing and employment development. Respondent suggested inclusion of a 1km zone around the settlement boundary in which windfall development is acceptable.
- All developments should be assessed equally.
- Windfall development should be allowed, providing it does not detract from the existing amenities to existing properties.
- Windfall development should be allowed for families with one large dwelling on a large site so that they can erect suitable homes for other family members within the site.

2.2. 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 responses from respondents interested in the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area supported an employment windfall allowance. The following relevant comments were made:

- All developments should be assessed equally.
- Windfall development should be allowed providing it does not detract from the existing amenities to existing properties.
- Windfall development currently should not be permitted as public transport services are being reduced and lack of employment opportunities in the Rea Valley means people on low incomes would incur travelling costs and produce pollution.

3. Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area

3.1. Question 29(a)

Question 29a sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Minsterley as a Community Hub. There were mixed responses to this question, but the majority did not know or have an opinion. The following relevant comments were made:

- Minsterley has a high settlement function score. The settlement should take more development proportionate to its sustainability.
- The settlement is sustainable with a good range of services and employment.
- Housing is needed to retain the next generation and provide for those working in local businesses.
- Existing public service provision is insufficient to warrant Community Hub status.

3.2. Question 29(b)

Question 29b sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Minsterley. There were mixed responses to this question, but the majority did not know or have an opinion. The following relevant comments were made:

- Minsterley could take additional housing.
- The proposed guideline housing figure is not high enough given it is one of the most sustainable settlements.
- Minsterley has above average affordable housing numbers and requires more market housing to provide a balanced population and variety of housing.

- There is a high risk of flooding, poor access and speeding in the area around the preferred housing allocation and as such any new development would experience these issues.
- Housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Minsterley.

3.3. Question 29(c)

Question 29c sought views on whether consultees agree with the proposed development boundary for Minsterley. Responses to this question were mixed, but the majority did not know or have an opinion. The following relevant comments were made:

- Site MIN019 (or part of) should be included within the development boundary as it is deliverable and accessible. The site has potential for future expansion, parking for the school and is a natural infill.
- Suggested boundary amendments to allow for inclusion of land which could either be allocated for housing development or brought forward as windfall development.
- Suggested boundary amendment to include the field to the east side of Horsebridge Road and south of The Grove for residential development and flood alleviation works.
- The development boundary should remain as it is at present and not be altered as proposed.

3.4. Question 29(d)

Question 29d sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation MIN018 in Minsterley. Respondents mostly answered 'don't know/no opinion' however of the respondents that did have an opinion most did not prefer the allocation. The following relevant comments were made:

- MIN019 should be allocated as it has no significant constraints, is immediately available and has had interest from developers. The site has a favourable sustainability rating and has fewer highways implications than the preferred site MIN018.
- The Parish Council does not support the preferred site allocation due to concerns about cumulative flooding from the site and the Linden Fields development, other flooding issues and suspicion over the performance of water attenuation solutions.
- Concerns over proximity of the site to nearby poultry unit which impacts air quality and noise from commercial traffic.
- Concerns over highway drainage and safety at the sites entrance and pedestrian access.
- Supports the preferred site allocation to provide for the village's needs. It is a natural extension of recent adjoining development with a suitable mix of housing. The site will be providing a suitable entrance to the village and the presence of new housing will reduce traffic speeds at the entrance to the village. The site will include footpath improvements.

3.5. Question 30(a)

Question 30a sought views on whether consultees agree with the identification of Pontesbury as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents did not know or have an opinion, but of those that did favoured the Community Hub and the following relevant comments were made:

- Pontesbury has a high settlement function score and should take proportionate additional development.
- Pontesbury is self-contained with all the necessary amenities.
- Provision of planned housing will support this status and provide a critical mass of residents to make local services viable.
- This status ties in with the development of Pontesbury's Neighbourhood Plan to ensure future development takes place on appropriate sites.
- Pontesbury only provides limited services and employment with retail needs being fulfilled in the Shrewsbury area. It provides education, but one school is at full capacity.

3.6. Question 30(b)

Question 30b sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Pontesbury. The majority of respondents did not know or have an opinion. The following relevant comments were made:

- Overall proposed growth of 26% but Pontesbury's proposed growth is only 21%; proposed growth for Pontesbury should be higher given its high function score and size.

- The guideline should be treated as a minimum rather than a maximum so that the plan conforms with the NPPF and meets delivery requirements.
- The scale of development as a whole is right but small single plots should be included as large plots favour national builders and small-scale infill plots are needed for local tradespeople to develop. A cautious approach should be taken to the contribution that windfall development will make to the proposed growth of Pontesbury due to the absence of detailed justification for the settlements windfall allowance.
- Pontesbury has already had large development at Hall Bank which is enough housing for the village. More housing will put strain on GP services, schooling, traffic and policing.

3.7. Question 30(c)

Question 30c sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Pontesbury. Most respondents did not know or have an opinion on the proposed development boundary. The following relevant comments were made:

- Four alternative sites were promoted by consultees (No reference numbers were provided), with plans submitted showing sites that should be included within the development boundary for the following reasons:
 - There is development on three sides of some of the proposed sites that have been excluded from the plan review and therefore they should be considered for development.
 - Further amendments to the development boundary should be undertaken to ensure consistency with previous approaches (an amendment has already been undertaken with Willow House and paddock to the north west of the Hall Bank site and the suggested development boundary amendment would be consistent with this approach).
 - Objection to the inclusion of the “site to the north-east of the Hall Bank development” in lieu of an alternative site promoted for inclusion.
 - Proposed boundary does not include a promoted site and the sites promoter identifies that their site’s sustainability score was ‘good’ as opposed to the ‘poor’ score of the preferred site allocations.
- Site PON001 forms a more natural infill than the outlying PON008.
- Should not include PON008, PON017 and PON030 as there are concerns of contamination of lead in the ground, the high ecological value of the land, flooding and cumulative impact with the recommencement of quarry blasting and associated traffic.
- The development boundary should include pool bank which is sustainable and forms part of the main settlement. Infilling in this area would be beneficial to meeting housing targets and provide opportunities for small scale projects.
- Pontesbury’s boundary should remain where the Ashford estate road enters onto the Minsterley Road, before the quarry entrance and the 30mph limit ends.
- The boundary should extend as far as the old railway line.

3.8. Question 30(d)

Question 30d sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation PON008, PON017 and PON030 in Pontesbury. The majority of respondents did not know or have an opinion. The following relevant comments were made in support of the preferred allocation:

- Pontesbury and its services can cater for further growth which is necessary due to no opportunities being provided in neighbouring villages.
- Promoting site PON002 instead – PON002 has no significant constraints, has been identified as having long term potential, is accessible, deliverable and achieved a Sustainability Appraisal score of Good – one of the better ratings in Pontesbury.
- Supports the allocations as they offer a natural extension to Pontesbury, they’re considered infill development, and are well bounded.
- Objection as preferred allocations will fulfil the housing guideline and leave no opportunities for smaller developers /landowners.

- Multiple objections due to concerns over historic lead contamination in the ground, the high ecological value of the land, flooding and cumulative impact with the recommencement of quarry blasting and associated traffic.
- Preferred allocations have been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal as having a score of 'Poor'; whereas the respondent has promoted a site with score of 'Good'.
- For PON008 a density of 20-28 would be more appropriate due to rural nature and surface water flooding but the site is well serviced, has no constraints and is flat, sustainable, achievable and supported by developers.
- Site PON001 forms a more natural infill of the town than outlying PON008. PON001 has good services, is readily available and has a better sustainability rating.
- There is inadequate drainage and public transport facilities. Consultee had traffic concerns and concerns over cumulative impact with current Hall Bank development.
- Support sites as they fall within the boundary up to the old railway line.

4. Further Information

4.1. 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. Of the respondents to this question, who were interested in about the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area, the following relevant comments were received:

- Some respondents felt that Habberley, Asterley, Plealey, Lea Cross, Stapleton, Clungunford, Horsebridge, Wagbeach, Pontesford and Water Wheel should be added, but no justification was given.
- Two respondents considered Pontesford should become a Community Cluster due to the services and employment opportunities available and to allow sustainable infill development including sites PTF001, PTF008 and PTF010.
- One respondent considered that the area is rural and within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty with ancient woodlands and monuments to preserve. It was also expressed that it is a farming community with inadequate poorly maintained roads and that any increase in traffic from the designations of Community Clusters would be catastrophic.

4.2. Question 64

Question 64 sought any other views. A number of respondents to this question, who were interested in the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area took this opportunity to promote sites in Minsterley and Pontesbury as shown on plans submitted alongside the representations.

The following relevant comments were also made by these respondents:

- Concerns were expressed about traffic risks to children crossing roads around local schools with more housing, more commuters and more drop offs at the schools.
- Concerns were raised about capacity of schools, doctors' surgery and local services.
- Respondent claimed that Shropshire Council said that infrastructure improvements would be made as part of development in the village. The Parish requires improvements to the A488, drainage, flood alleviation, changing facilities for the playing field, road improvements and provision of a new school as the existing school is at capacity.
- Proposed growth for Minsterley and Pontesbury is too low at 9% considering the sustainability of the settlement.
- The local knowledge of Parish Councils means that they should have a vital role in future development proposals including increased powers regarding exemption sites.
- The maintenance of development boundaries is crucial in preventing indiscriminate development.

- Minsterley's flooding issues need to be addressed through maintenance of the riverside banks.
- Error identified in the SA – Site MIN018 is in landscape zone 41MNY-B and for accuracy and consistency with other sites should have a positive score against this measure in the EA. The SA also reports that the site is prone to flooding but is entirely out of flood zone 3 and only slightly 'clipped' by flood zone 2.

Appendices



Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

The following quantitative analysis looks at the multiple choice questions provided for Minsterley and Pontesbury, it illustrates the percentage answers (rounded to the nearest percentage) to each of the questions:

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 the question, who were interested in the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 50% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 36% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 14% 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 the question, who were interested in the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area, and completed this question

- 73% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option;
- 27% 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 the question, who were interested in the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 73% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 7% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 20% 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 the question, who were interested in the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 64.5% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 14% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 21.5% 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 29(a)

Question 29a sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Minsterley as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 34% agreed with the identification of Minsterley as a Community Hub;
- 5% did not agree with the identification of Minsterley as a Community Hub; and
- 61% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Minsterley as a Community Hub.

A.6. Question 29(b)

Question 29b sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Minsterley. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 16% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Minsterley;
- 18% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Minsterley; and
- 66% did not know/had no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Minsterley.

A.7. Question 29(c)

Question 29c sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Minsterley. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Minsterley.
- 14% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Minsterley; and
- 75% did not know/had no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Minsterley.

A.8. Question 29(d)

Question 29d sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation MIN018 in Minsterley. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 6% agreed with the preferred housing allocation MIN018 in Minsterley;
- 11% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation MIN018 in Minsterley; and
- 83% did not know/had no opinion on the preferred housing allocation MIN018 in Minsterley.

A.9. Question 30(a)

Question 30a sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Pontesbury as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 45% agreed with the identification of Pontesbury as a Community Hub;
- 5% did not agree with the identification of Pontesbury as a Community Hub; and
- 50% did not know/had no opinion on the identification of Pontesbury as a Community Hub.

A.10. Question 30(b)

Question 30b sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Pontesbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 25.5% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Pontesbury;
- 21% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Pontesbury; and
- 53.5% did not know/had no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Pontesbury.

A.11. Question 30(c)

Question 30c sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Pontesbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Pontesbury;
- 31% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Pontesbury; and

- 58% did not know/had no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Pontesbury.

A.12. Question 30(d)

Question 30d sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation PON008, PON017 and PON030 in Pontesbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 20% agreed with the preferred housing allocation PON008, PON017 and PON030 in Pontesbury;
- 11% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation PON008, PON017 and PON030 in Pontesbury; and
- 69% did not know/had no opinion on the preferred housing allocation PON008, PON017 and PON030 in Pontesbury.

A.13. 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 the question, who were interested in the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 36% agreed that a 'Community Cluster' needs to be formed;
- 0% agreed that a 'Community Cluster; needs to be removed;
- 14% do not agree 'Community Cluster' will be added or removed; and
- 50% 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