

Appendix B.13. Shropshire Council - Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation

Much Wenlock
Shropshire Council

30 May 2019

Notice

This document and its contents have been prepared and are intended solely as information for Shropshire Council and use in relation to the summarising and analysis of consultation responses to the recent Preferred Sites Consultation and to provide a number of key deliverables to support the Council in moving forward the review of the Local Plan.

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

This document has 19 pages including the cover.

Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Much Wenlock	NC	BN	VD	VD	14/05/2019
Rev 2.0	Final Much Wenlock	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
Introduction	5
1. Overview	6
2. Delivering Local Housing Needs	6
2.1. Question 3	6
2.2. Question 4	7
3. Windfall Development	7
3.1. Question 5	7
3.2. Question 6	8
4. Much Wenlock Place Plan Area	8
4.1. Question 31 (a)	8
Question 31 (b)	9
4.2. Question 31 (c)	10
4.3. Question 32 (a)	11
4.4. Question 32 (b)	11
4.5. Question 32 (c)	11
4.6. Question 32 (d)	12
4.7. Question 32 (e)	12
5. Further Information	13
5.1. Question 63	13
5.2. Question 64	13
Appendices	15
Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.	16
A.1. Question 3	16
A.2. Question 4	16
A.3. Question 5	16
A.4. Question 6	16
A.5. Question 31 (a)	17
A.6. Question 31 (b)	17
A.7. Question 31 (c)	17
A.8. Question 32 (a)	17
A.9. Question 32 (b)	17
A.10. Question 32 (c)	17
A.11. Question 32 (d)	18
A.12. Question 32 (e)	18
A.13. Question 63	18

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; 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 the preparation of the further development of the Local Plan Review. This document summarises the key issues raised by respondents to the consultation in the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area.

1. Overview

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

There were eight questions specific to the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area separated into four questions on the Much Wenlock Key Centre and four on the Cressage Community Hub. The responses to these questions are summarised in Section 4. Section 5 summarises the other comments raised by consultees that responded to Much Wenlock-specific questions.

A total of 359 responses were received for this Place Plan Area, of which 259 respondents submitted an identical response primarily concerned with Cressage. These respondents, often Cressage residents, included whole families, children as well as those who had relatives in Cressage but did not live there themselves. The identical responses represent the vast majority of the responses received for Much Wenlock and has therefore had a significant influence on the emerging themes in the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area. This has been considered in this analysis.

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 Much Wenlock Place Plan Area, did not support the policy. There were several reasons:

- The most common reason (cited in the identical response) was a lack of available information about the policy in the consultation document and therefore a lack of clarity.
- Concerns that the policy would neglect local needs and be overridden by commercial pressure.
- One respondent did not consider affordable housing suitable in open countryside developments where access to employment and transport is worse.
- Other respondents opposed the policy with the view that greenfield development is not environmentally sustainable (some respondents also referenced Green Belt, which is not present within this Place Plan Area, within their response).

A minority of respondents to the question about the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area supported the cross-subsidy exception site policy and made the following comments:

- The importance of delivering more affordable housing to address local housing need, in particular for younger people who cannot afford to live where they grew up.
- To address the shortage of affordable housing across the south of the County and the imbalanced population leading to more sustainable communities.
- The consultant representing the landowner for CES005 supported the policy because it complies with NPPF paragraph 77.
- Two responses qualified their support for the policy only if it was permitted by the Neighbourhood Plan.

One respondent who checked don't know/ no opinion made a comment, supporting affordable housing as long as it wasn't used as a vehicle for developers to exploit exception site policy.

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 consultees that responded to this question, who were interested in the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area, stated that the development mix should be assessed on a site by site basis, and made the following comments:

- A site by site approach was favourable because it allows for more flexibility which is considered more important than a rigid framework.
- The site by site approach should still set a minimum level and mix of affordable housing. The mix should be in excess of minimum standards.
- The most common comment was a lack of information or explanation for the policy (this was cited in the identical response).
- Several respondents felt that the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan's policies were being ignored, although no specific policies were referenced.
- A respondent stated that viability assessments are not sensitive enough to local market conditions such as the amount of land owned by few people.

The respondents to this question, who were interested in the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area, who preferred a set development mix made the following comments:

- There was a recommendation for a county-wide viability standard within the Local Plan Review, which could act as a benchmark for viability. When issues are presented on a site, another viability assessment could be undertaken. These could also act as thresholds for affordable housing, which would give certainty to land owners and support more land to come forward for affordable housing.
This respondent also suggested that the 'exception site' policy should be deliverable in settlements that are categorised as Other rural settlements but may have a latent supply of land.
- Other respondents' support for a set development mix was dependent on the policies of the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan.

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. There was overwhelming support for the housing windfall allowance from consultees that responded to this question and were interested in the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area.. Respondents made the following comments:

- Windfall development tends to form small-scale development which was viewed as appropriate in rural settlements.
- A response from a consultant, promoting their client's site in Much Wenlock, had no objection to the principle of the allowance; however, stated that the proposed quantum was too high. The respondent commented that historic windfall rates would not be achievable with the current development boundary in Much Wenlock. The respondent asked the Council to be flexible and consider including sites adjoining the development boundary.
- A respondent stated that windfall sites on brownfield land within Much Wenlock's boundary will be better integrated into the settlement and more sustainable than developing on greenfield sites.
- Another respondent agreed with the windfall allowance if it was supported by the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan.

- Two respondents supported the windfall allowance in Cressage and believed there were sufficient sites available to meet the proposed allowance.

The respondents who submitted the identical response misunderstood the definition of housing windfall allowance, mistaking it for a funding allowance for settlements. They commented that it should be spent locally on improving Cressage. It is uncertain what level of support would have been identified for the proposed windfall allowance had these respondents understood the term.

The respondents to questions about the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area who did not support the proposed housing windfall allowance made the following comments:

- One respondent did not support the allowance in Cressage because there were no employment opportunities. They further stated that windfall development should only be considered where there are direct employment opportunities.
- Another respondent commented that they did not receive sufficient information but nonetheless opposed housing expansion in rural areas because of the environmental impacts.

One comment was received who checked don't know/ no opinion:

- In order to accord with Paragraph 70 of the NPPF, there needs to be compelling evidence that windfall will provide a reliable source of supply. In the absence of justification, the respondent thinks a cautious approach must be taken to the contribution windfall numbers will make to each overall settlement. A definition was requested from the Council of the distance windfall sites can be from the development boundary, the respondent suggested 1km.

3.2. Question 6

Question 6 sought views on whether respondents thought that it was appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guidelines.

The majority of consultees responding to questions, who were interested in the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area, did not support the proposed employment windfall allowance. All of the comments from respondents were about Cressage; however, no employment allowance is proposed for Cressage.

- Several respondents did not think the employment guideline was appropriate for Cressage due to its size and character.
- The respondents who submitted the identical response also misunderstood the definition of the employment windfall allowance, again mistaking it for a source of funding.

One comment was made supporting the allowance, provided that it was not for industrial uses. No comments were made by those who responded don't know/no opinion.

4. Much Wenlock Place Plan Area

4.1. Question 31 (a)

Question 31 (a) sought views on the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Much Wenlock. Generally, respondents checked 'don't know/ no opinion' and did not make any comment.

A small proportion of respondents disagreed with the proposed housing and employment guidelines for Much Wenlock and made the following comments:

- One response from a consultant called for a larger housing guideline appropriate for a key centre such as Much Wenlock with its broad range of services and facilities. The respondent suggested a figure of 10 dwellings per annum thus 200 dwellings over the plan period.
- Respondents also criticised the proposed housing guideline because it contradicted the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan. Some of these comments thought the proposed quantum of housing was reasonable but objected to it being delivered in one large development site. A steadier pace of delivery was preferred which would maintain the character and setting of the town. One response suggested that any development should be smaller than the Hunters Gate site (67 units).

- Several respondents questioned the lack of consideration for the Ironbridge Power Station housing development in the housing guideline and raised concern for the impact on local infrastructure.
- Concern was also raised about the impact of additional housing on flood risk with some respondents referring to the inadequate measures at Hunters Gate.
- One respondent objected to the proposed housing guideline because Much Wenlock would turn into a 'Bed and Breakfast' town without corresponding employment provision.
- Two respondents asked for greater environmental protection in these housing guidelines. One of these respondents suggested that housing development on greenfield sites should be refused. The other respondent asked for brownfield sites to be prioritised and developments limited to 25 units per site. This response also referenced the Planning Inspectorate's previous decision to protect the unique landscape setting of the town against unsustainable development although no specific details were provided.
- One respondent considered that the allocation was above housing need and should be scaled back by 10%.

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

- One respondent supported the proposed guidelines but called for a cautious approach to the contribution windfall development should make; stating that the use of guidelines as a maximum figure contradicted 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 guidelines.
- Other respondents made general comments supporting the housing guidelines for matching the town's nature and needs.
- One respondent stated that the Council's assumptions for EMP1 were incorrect because the actual parcel of land is too small to support the proposed employment guidelines. A full review of employment land in Much Wenlock to identify 2ha of employment land was requested.

One respondent who checked don't know/ no opinion commented that they didn't understand the question.

Question 31 (b)

Question 31 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Much Wenlock. The majority of respondents checked don't know/ no opinion and made no comment. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposed development boundary.

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

- The proposed development boundary omits the recent exception site to the south of settlement adjacent to Oakfield Park.
- The proposed development boundary would encourage further development towards Merrywell Lane and change the character of Much Wenlock.
- Extending the boundary would lead to residents living further away from the town centre; increase reliance on cars and exacerbate parking and congestion issues which would discourage people from visiting the town centre.
- Several respondents opposed the development boundary being extended to include site allocation MUW012. Other respondents used this question to express their concerns towards this site.
- Several respondents objected to the proposed development boundary because it would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and encroach on open space. One respondent considered there to be sufficient brownfield sites within the current boundaries to fulfil their requirements.
- Extending the development boundary would encourage development which would increase pressure on the drainage system.

The respondents who supported the proposed development boundary welcomed the inclusion of unconstrained deliverable and developable land. One comment supported development provided school and sports facilities were protected.

4.2. Question 31 (c)

Question 31 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation MUW012 in Much Wenlock. The majority of the respondents who gave a response checked don't know/no opinion and made the following comments:

- One respondent was disappointed with the one housing allocation and feared that over-reliance on one site would compromise deliverability of the housing guideline.
- Any housing needs to address flooding and the A458 roundabout must be a necessity.

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

- Respondents objected to site MUW012 because it contradicted the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan which advocates smaller developments, on brownfield sites.
- Multiple water issues were identified:
 - Several respondents commented that the development would exacerbate flood risk and questioned the developer's previous record of flood defence provision, referring to the flood defences at Hunter's Gate which they state were not inspected by the Environment Agency or Severn Trent.
 - One respondent questioned how drainage would be implemented on land not owned by the applicant.
 - Sewage and wastewater capacity were also a concern as respondents stated that the local sewage works were at capacity and no mitigation had been identified.
 - Several respondents also expressed concerns about the development further reducing water pressure.
- Increased traffic from the development would increase congestion and pollution. It was acknowledged that the proposed A458 roundabout could help to reduce speeding, but not congestion or the fact that there are insufficient pedestrian crossings. Congestion concerns were exacerbated by the lack of employment opportunities in Much Wenlock and therefore increased commuter traffic.
- The impact of the Ironbridge Power Station and development in Telford on services and infrastructure need to be acknowledged before site MUW012 is developed.
- Respondents stated that the development would further stretch local services in Much Wenlock including the Doctors and Schools.
- One response stated that the site has heritage value as the location of first Wenlock Olympian Games in 1851. The Value of Olympian Games extends well beyond its tourism income and is an irreplaceable asset making reference to NPPF paragraph 126.
- Other respondents considered the design unimaginative and detrimental to the integrity of Much Wenlock as a unique town.

There were less responses supporting the site allocation MUW012 and the following comments were made:

- Respondents supported the proposed flood risk infrastructure and roundabout on the A458.
- A response from the owners of site MUW012 confirmed their commitment to working proactively with the Council, and other stakeholders, to deliver a housing scheme that meets the needs of the settlement.
- Other respondents caveated their support, suggesting a 20% affordable housing provision or a 65 dwelling scheme with 13 affordable units, compliance with Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan policies and consideration of school and healthcare facilities.

4.3. Question 32 (a)

Question 32 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub. The majority of respondents disagreed with the proposed designation of Cressage and made the following comments:

- The majority of responses in objection, criticised the functional scoring for Cressage in the Settlement Hierarchy document for being too high. In particular, respondents commented that a dispensary should not be considered a pharmacy; the convenience shop is due to close; there is no post office or pub; the church and library run a limited service that is not comparable with equal-scoring services in Bayston Hill.
- Other respondents considered the existing facilities inadequate to support additional development.
- Concerns were also raised that new development would exacerbate traffic on the A458.
- One respondent commented that new development would detract from the character of the village.

In contrast, one respondent representing a primary school considered Cressage's amenities adequate for additional development but commented that the primary school would need additional funding to accommodate growth.

A number of respondents were conflicted by this question, they see Cressage's designation as the only way of securing a development boundary and an element of control against speculative development; however, disagree with the development principles for a Community Hub.

4.4. Question 32 (b)

Question 32 (b) asked respondents if they agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cressage. The majority of respondents disagreed with the preferred housing guideline. The following comments were made:

- One response suggested that residents had been informed at an earlier consultation event that the Council would not allocate any further land for housing because of the development at the Ironbridge Power Station and Shrewsbury Barracks.
- The existing services in Cressage are not sufficient to cope with expansion. Specific mention was made to health services.
- Respondents questioned whether sewage issues had been considered and also suggested that Severn Trent should be consulted based on the proposed level of expansion.
- Increased traffic and safety concerns were also highlighted, with one respondent also commenting that pedestrian facilities were insufficient in Cressage.
- The proposal does not represent a sustainable location for significant development.
- One objection was received on the basis that the guideline figure was too low, considering the historic lack of housing delivery in the area.

Fewer comments were submitted supporting the preferred housing guideline with all respondents' support dependent on traffic and drainage issues being addressed.

Two respondents objected to the proposals for developing land at Sheinton Road.

4.5. Question 32 (c)

Question 31 (c) asked respondents if they agreed with the proposed development boundary for Cressage. The majority of respondents disagreed with the proposed development boundary and made the following comments:

- The respondents who submitted the identical response considered the development boundary to be flawed because site CES005 cannot accommodate 60 dwellings and the development boundary cannot accommodate 80 dwellings as a whole.
- Another respondent suggested it would be more sensible to extend the boundary eastwards beyond the Severn Way with access via the Sheinton Road and questioned why the dwelling north of the boundary was permitted if it falls outside the boundary.
- One respondent commented that there was no assurance that the village boundary won't be changed again in 5 years' time.

- Other respondents opposed development on greenfield land.
- One respondent suggested that the boundary should include additional community amenity land.

The respondents who agreed with the proposed development boundary welcomed the opportunity to prevent further development into the open countryside but also suggested that the East of Cressage site (developing land on Sheinton Road) should be removed. Another respondent expressed concern that the development boundary could change overnight.

4.6. Question 32 (d)

Question 32 (d) asked respondents if they agreed with the preferred housing allocation CES005 in Cressage. The majority of respondents disagreed with preferred housing allocation CES005 in Cressage and made the following comments:

- 60 dwellings on this site is unrealistic and there are safety issues with a new junction on the A458 as the road is already too narrow. The proposal to link the site into Cressage's existing footway network was considered impossible and the site was previously assessed as unsuitable although no further details were provided for this.
- Concerns with construction traffic and damage to historic properties.
- Any housing development would create additional pressure on medical services.
- Several respondents commented that the development would destroy Green Belt land (it is assumed that this is a concern about loss of a greenfield site, as it is not located within the Green Belt) and introduce additional, noise, light & air pollution.
- Respondents also commented that the area has environmental importance for local flora, fauna and wildlife habitats.
- One response suggested that the site should have 50% affordable housing provision.

The respondents who agreed with preferred housing allocation CES005 in Cressage made the following comments:

- The site was supported on the basis that highway improvements, traffic calming and a roundabout were provided on the A458.
- A representation on behalf of the owner of CES005 indicated that the development would meet local aspirations as a sustainable site on the edge of the settlement, enhance the Wood Lane Wildlife Site and Plocks Brook, through the provision of native hedgerows, bird and bat boxes, have good access to services in Cressage and provide good access onto Harley Road without increasing traffic. A second representation supported this opportunity to strengthen the buffer to the Local Wildlife Site and stream valley to the west.

4.7. Question 32 (e)

Question 32 (e) asked respondents if they agreed with the preferred housing allocation CES006 in Cressage. The vast majority of respondents agreed with preferred housing allocation CES006 in Cressage and made the following comments:

- The current building is an eyesore.
- Utilises a brownfield site.
- Opportunity to deliver traffic improvements on the A458. Some respondents suggested that pedestrian crossings and footpaths could also be improved.
- Other respondents who welcomed the allocation, lamented the loss of a pub and one respondent suggested that future development should incorporate a pub.

The respondents who disagreed with preferred housing allocation CES006 criticised the proposal for residential development at this location on a dangerous junction with one respondent suggesting that employment uses would be more suitable at this location. One comment was also received objecting on the basis that development of the site would have significant harm to heritage assets and settlement character, resulting in the loss of a public house.

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. Most respondents to this question about the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area did not consider that any Community Cluster settlements need to be added or removed. Respondents to this question, who were interested in the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area, made the following comments:

- The respondents who submitted the identical response stated that it is the responsibility of local communities to decide a settlement's status and asking others to judge Community Clusters leads to conflict.
- Respondents suggested that development in Community Clusters should not be limited to infill development because this can be inappropriate, whereas small sites on the periphery of settlements might be more suitable.
- Other responses also suggested that greater thought needs to be given to those development sites in areas between Community Clusters.
- One respondent noted that Cressage, Sheinton and Harley have joint Parish Council meetings and share a local magazine. The three villages should therefore act as a Community Cluster.
- Two respondents commented that Buildwas should be removed as a Community Cluster.

5.2. Question 64

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

- Several respondents felt that their views had not been represented by or were wrongly represented by their Town Council.
- The respondents who submitted the identical response stated that information from Shropshire Council has been vague and hard to find, another respondent stated that there were issues with online form compatibility.
- Misinformation was also a key issue raised by respondents, stating that they had been misinformed about the implications of a settlement being designated as a Community Hub.
- Respondents commented that they found the consultation confusing, technical planning terms were considered jargon and a deterrent to understanding.
- One respondent questioned whether the Council will consider bidding for the Housing Infrastructure Fund for Much Wenlock which has a critical affordability issue and whether the ONS's dampened household projections and their subsequent influence on the standard method of calculating housing land supply have been factored into Much Wenlock's projections.
- One response was submitted which brought attention to the submission of the identical responses.

Respondents used this question as an opportunity to promote alternative sites.

- A representation was made on behalf of the landowners to promote site MUW010 on the western edge of Much Wenlock adjacent to the proposed employment land EMP1 for an unspecified quantum of residential development. The accompanying statement demonstrates why the applicant considers the site to be a more suitable location than MUW012 in terms of location and Flood Risk.
- A representation was made for site MUW016 on the south western boundary of Much Wenlock, the proposed site is adjacent to an exception site for 12 affordable homes and under the same land ownership. The 5.75ha site could accommodate circa. 50 dwellings.
- A representation and Masterplan were submitted on behalf of the landowners for the consented scheme at the Ironbridge Power Station.

Appendices



Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

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

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 Much Wenlock Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 88% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 4% 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 Much Wenlock Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 96% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option;
- 4% 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 Much Wenlock Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 94% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 3% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 3% 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 the Much Wenlock Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 9% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 87% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 4% 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 31 (a)

Question 31 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Much Wenlock. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Much Wenlock;
- 7% did not agree with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Much Wenlock; and
- 90% responded don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Much Wenlock.

A.6. Question 31 (b)

Question 31 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Much Wenlock. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 2% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Much Wenlock;
- 11% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Much Wenlock; and
- 87% responded don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Much Wenlock.

A.7. Question 31 (c)

Question 31 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation MUW012 in Much Wenlock. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 2% agreed with the preferred housing allocation MUW012 in Much Wenlock;
- 10% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation MUW012 in Much Wenlock; and
- 88% responded don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation MUW012 in Much Wenlock.

A.8. Question 32 (a)

Question 32 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub;
- 82% did not agree with the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub; and
- 12% responded don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Cressage as a Community Hub.

A.9. Question 32 (b)

Question 32 (b) asked respondents if they agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cressage. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cressage;
- 84% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cressage; and
- 11% responded don't know/ no opinion on preferred housing guideline for Cressage.

A.10. Question 32 (c)

Question 31 (c) asked respondents if they agreed with the proposed development boundary for Cressage. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 6% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Cressage;
- 82% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Cressage; and
- 12% responded don't know/ no opinion to the proposed development boundary for Cressage.

A.11. Question 32 (d)

Question 32 (d) asked respondents if they agreed with the preferred housing allocation CES005 in Cressage. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with preferred housing allocation CES005;
- 83% did not agree with preferred housing allocation CES005; and
- 12% responded don't know/ no opinion on preferred housing allocation CES005.

A.12. Question 32 (e)

Question 32 (e) asked respondents if they agreed with the preferred housing allocation CES006 in Cressage. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 86% agreed with preferred housing allocation CES006;
- 2% did not agree with preferred housing allocation CES006; and
- 12% responded don't know/ no opinion on preferred housing allocation CES006.

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

- 1% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be added;
- 1% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be removed;
- 90% disagreed that additional Community Clusters should be added or removed; and
- 8% responded don't 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