

Appendix B.14. Shropshire Council- Local Plan Review- Preferred Sites Consultation

Oswestry

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 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 34 pages including the cover.

Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Oswestry	TH	VD	BN	VD	20/05/2019
Rev 2.0	Final Oswestry	TH	VD	BN	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	6
1. Overview	7
2. Delivering Local Housing Needs	7
2.1. Question 3	7
2.2. Question 4	7
3. Windfall Development	8
3.1. Question 5	8
3.2. Question 6	8
4. Oswestry Place Plan Area	9
4.1. Question 33 (a)	9
4.2. Question 33 (b)	9
4.3. Question 33 (c)	10
4.4. Question 33 (d)	10
4.5. Question 34 (a)	10
4.6. Question 34 (b)	11
4.7. Question 34 (c)	11
4.8. Question 34 (d)	11
4.9. Question 34 (e)	11
4.10. Question 35 (a)	12
4.11. Question 35 (b)	12
4.12. Question 35 (c)	12
4.13. Question 36 (a)	12
4.14. Question 36 (b)	13
4.15. Question 36 (c)	13
4.16. Question 36 (d)	13
4.17. Question 37 (a)	13
4.18. Question 37 (b)	14
4.19. Question 37 (c)	14
4.20. Question 37 (d)	14
4.21. Question 38 (a)	15
4.22. Question 38 (b)	15
4.23. Question 38 (c)	15
4.24. Question 38 (d)	15
4.25. Question 39 (a)	16
4.26. Question 39 (b)	16
4.27. Question 39 (c)	16
4.28. Question 39 (d)	17
4.29. Question 40 (a)	17
4.30. Question 40 (b)	17
4.31. Question 40 (c)	17
4.32. Question 40 (d)	17
4.33. Question 40 (e)	18
4.34. Question 41 (a)	18
4.35. Question 41 (b)	18
4.36. Question 41 (c)	19

4.37.	Question 42 (a)	19
4.38.	Question 42 (b)	19
4.39.	Question 42 (c)	20
4.40.	Question 42 (d)	20
4.41.	Question 43 (a)	20
4.42.	Question 43 (b)	20
4.43.	Question 43 (c)	21
4.44.	Question 43 (d)	21
4.45.	Question 43 (e)	21
4.46.	Question 44 (a)	21
4.47.	Question 44 (b)	21
4.48.	Question 44 (c)	22
4.49.	Question 44 (d)	22
5.	Further Information	22
5.1.	Question 63	22
5.2.	Question 64	23
Appendices		24
Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.		25
A.1.	Question 3	25
A.2.	Question 4	25
A.3.	Question 5	25
A.4.	Question 6	25
A.5.	Question 33 (a)	25
A.6.	Question 33 (b)	26
A.7.	Question 33 (c)	26
A.8.	Question 33 (d)	26
A.9.	Question 34 (a)	26
A.10.	Question 34 (b)	26
A.11.	Question 34 (c)	26
A.12.	Question 34 (d)	27
A.13.	Question 34 (e)	27
A.14.	Question 35 (a)	27
A.15.	Question 35 (b)	27
A.16.	Question 35 (c)	27
A.17.	Question 36 (a)	27
A.18.	Question 36 (b)	27
A.19.	Question 36 (c)	28
A.20.	Question 36 (d)	28
A.21.	Question 37 (a)	28
A.22.	Question 37 (b)	28
A.23.	Question 37 (c)	28
A.24.	Question 37 (d)	28
A.25.	Question 38 (a)	28
A.26.	Question 38 (b)	29
A.27.	Question 38 (c)	29
A.28.	Question 38 (d)	29
A.29.	Question 39 (a)	29
A.30.	Question 39 (b)	29
A.31.	Question 39 (c)	29
A.32.	Question 39 (d)	30

A.33. Question 40 (a)	30
A.34. Question 40 (b)	30
A.35. Question 40 (c)	30
A.36. Question 40 (d)	30
A.37. Question 40 (e)	30
A.38. Question 41 (a)	30
A.39. Question 41 (b)	31
A.40. Question 41 (c)	31
A.41. Question 42 (a)	31
A.42. Question 42 (b)	31
A.43. Question 42 (c)	31
A.44. Question 42 (d)	31
A.45. Question 43 (a)	31
A.46. Question 43 (b)	32
A.47. Question 43 (c)	32
A.48. Question 43 (d)	32
A.49. Question 43 (e)	32
A.50. Question 44 (a)	32
A.51. Question 44 (b)	32
A.52. Question 44 (c)	33
A.53. Question 44 (d)	33
A.54. Question 63	33

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

1. Overview

This report provides a summary of the consultation comments received in response to questions posed as part of the Shropshire Council Local Plan Review Preferred Sites Consultation, specific to the Oswestry Place Plan Area.

The following sections set out the analysis of the qualitative comments from the consultation. Questions 3 and 4 sought views on the delivery of local housing need; questions 5 and 6 sought views on windfall development. The key issues and concerns raised in response to these questions by consultees that responded to Oswestry-specific questions are summarised in Sections 2 and 3 below.

There were 49 questions specifically relating to the Oswestry 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 Oswestry-specific questions.

A total of 268 consultees responded to these questions.

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

2. Delivering Local Housing Needs

2.1. Question 3

Question 3 sought views on whether respondents thought that Shropshire Council should introduce a cross-subsidy exception site policy allowing an element of open market housing to support the delivery of affordable housing. The respondents to this question, who were interested in the Oswestry Place Plan Area, demonstrated a mixed view on this proposed policy, but overall the majority supported it.

Respondents made the following relevant comments in support of the policy:

- Cross subsidy would enable affordable housing delivery, particularly for much needed owner-occupied housing.
- The policy would help to maintain a steady supply of site opportunities, reinforcing development and the local economy.
- Suggestion that the policy should allow a mix of tenures, particularly in rural areas where affordable housing need is high.

The key issues raised by respondents who did not support the cross-subsidy exception site policy, allowing an element of open market housing to support the delivery of affordable housing included:

- Concerns over how the policy would be implemented, with concern that it could lead to inappropriate development that is difficult to resist. Respondents felt that the policy could be manipulated by developers.
- Recommendation for an alternative approach which should consist of an Affordable Housing Contribution from developers.
- Through the rural exceptions policy, the NPPF already allows for this adequately and does so on a more discretionary basis. The option should only be used where the rural exceptions mechanism has been exhausted.
- Housing associations should be utilised to provide affordable housing as market housing supply is already adequate.

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 through a set development mix, which would be geographically defined and subject to the findings of the findings of a viability assessment. The majority of respondents to this question, who were interested in the Oswestry Place Plan Area, supported development mix being assessed on a site by site basis.

In support of a set development mix, the following comments were received:

- The policy should clearly set the required housing mix, this would allow all concerned stakeholders to be fully aware of the requirements before a planning application is submitted.
- With a set development mix the developers would be allowed to use a simple formula to establish viability across the County which would simplify the process.
- The county-wide standard would provide certainty for landowners and should act as a bench mark. Proposal would be in accordance with Para 77 of NPPF.
- Multiple respondents suggested what they considered to be appropriate balances for market and affordable housing percentages. Suggested affordable housing rates varied from 20% (suggested by Kinnerley Parish Council, although it is apparent that this was intended to represent commentary on the contribution expected from general open market development rather than cross-subsidy development), up to at least 80%, with rates of 40% also suggested.

In support of a site by site assessment, the following comments were received:

- A site by site approach is more appropriate to consider site-specific and local factors, including rural/urban differences, constraints and merits.
- Need for clarity on how the development mix, site viability and affordability of homes will be decided and by whom.
- Greater involvement for local communities and consultation with Parish Council's regarding development proposals for sites.
- This approach allows possibility to take account of one-off costs which may be incurred on one site and not on another. This includes flexibility as to affordable housing allocation.

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. Overall the majority of consultees that responded to this question, who were interested in the Oswestry Place Plan Area, supported a windfall allowance for housing.

Consultees that supported the inclusion of a housing windfall allowance commented:

- Support for windfall, although concern at the high volume of windfall allowance for some settlements, suggesting this should not be more than 10% of the total guideline.
- Suggestion that windfall within rural settlements should be limited to only rural exceptions sites.
- Windfall sites should only be considered as suitable, following discussion with local residents.
- Windfall allowances should only be used on former employment areas.
- Windfall sites should have limited numbers of dwellings and site areas.

Consultees that did not support the inclusion of a windfall allowance commented:

- A comprehensive long-term planning process should negate the need for 'windfall' development.
- Windfall allowances would be used as a hard limit to prevent further development.
- This is another way of allowing landowners to sell land at inflated prices.

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. Responses to this question from consultees, who were interested in the Oswestry Place Plan Area, were mixed but the majority supported the employment windfall allowance. Respondents made the following relevant comments in support of the policy:

- A windfall allowance would provide greater flexibility to the Local Planning Authority in decision making.
- The policy would support local start-up businesses.
- Suggestion of sharing windfall allowance across multiple settlements, for example with the Oswestry Orthopaedic Hospital (RJA), which employs people across the Place Plan Area.

- Local employment centres (particularly along A5) are key for local residents for the future.

Respondents made the following relevant comments in opposition to a windfall allowance for employment:

- Employment windfall sites do not address the more pressing need for homes for local workers.
- Demand for employment land in Shropshire is low and unlikely to benefit from a windfall allowance.
- Investment is needed in infrastructure, particularly to the west of the county, prior to such development.

4. Oswestry Place Plan Area

4.1. Question 33 (a)

Question 33 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Oswestry. The majority of respondents did not know or did not have an opinion, but a range of opinions were represented. Comments included:

- Support for the guidelines subject to suitable masterplanning, infrastructure upgrades, and provision of local services and facilities.
- Proposed housing numbers are excessive and would put pressure on local services such as health, education and transport.
- Proposals have allocated too much housing to the villages instead of the town which can better support it.
- There is a lack of employment opportunity for this level of development and its subsequent residents.
- Oswestry should have a greater windfall allowance, as this is currently just 1.6% of total allocation, compared to other towns in the area which have significantly higher levels. The area also shows a higher growth rate than would be provided for in the allocated housing numbers.
- The Local Plan Review should emphasise the need to utilise brownfield sites and vacant space in existing buildings before greenfield sites.
- Suggestion to focus development on the north and east boundaries of Oswestry, particularly along the A5 corridor which will help the town be sustainable in the future.
- Park Hall should be considered under Whittington's allocation as it is within Whittington Parish.
- Insufficient evidence base on sports facility provision.

4.2. Question 33 (b)

Question 33 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Oswestry. The majority of respondents did not know or had no opinion about the proposed development boundary, but a range of opinions were represented. The relevant comments included:

- Removal of the area north of Whittington Road, because it is adjacent to a site of national historic significance (Old Oswestry Hillfort Scheduled Monument) and any development in this location would be prominent and could impact on the setting of the heritage asset.
- Removal of land off Trefonen Road from within the proposed development boundary as it would be incompatible with the strategic corridors identified in Shropshire's adopted Economic Growth Strategy.
- Objection due to the lack of a comprehensive statutory plan for the "A5 Corridor" to establish long-term development boundaries.
- The proposed development boundary would result in over development at Park Hall, even with significant infrastructure investment. Other areas in Gobowen and Oswestry should be considered.
- In contrast, one consultee supports extending Oswestry's development boundary to include the growth of Park Hall as a sensible response to the environmental constraints around Oswestry.
- The boundary should not extend to include greenfield sites when undeveloped brownfield sites are available.
- The proposed development boundary should consider including sites for the provision of public services and facilities to support the growth of the town.
- Support for the decision not to extend town into Morda valley or towards the Hill Fort.

- Site remediation may be required on some of this land. Groundwater conditions must be taken into account.

4.3. Question 33 (c)

Question 33 (c) sought views on the preferred housing allocation Site OSW017 (Land at Trefonen Road) in Oswestry. The majority of respondents did not know or had no opinion about this preferred site allocation, but a mixture of opinions was expressed. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Support for site due to its location, however, there is scope for increasing the number of allocations.
- Concern over congestion, road safety and lack of adequate public transport links into Oswestry to support development of the site. The consultee refers specifically to exacerbation of traffic congestion on Upper Brook Street.
- Concern that increased pollution will arise from the congestion caused by the development of this site.
- The site is remote from key services including schools, libraries, leisure facilities and shops.
- The site has ecological constraints (high biodiversity value and Tree Preservation Orders) and would affect historic assets.
- Housing development would be incompatible with the existing industrial sites in proximity to the preferred allocation.
- Land to the east of Oswestry is significantly less sensitive than this site in terms of habitats and flooding.
- Support for allocation of other sites in place of OSW017.

4.4. Question 33 (d)

Question 33 (d) sought views on the preferred housing allocation Sites PKH002, PKH007 (part) and PKH031 in Park Hill to the east of Oswestry. The majority of respondents were did not know/had no opinion to the preferred allocations. Of the remaining respondents, the majority did not agree with the preferred allocation.

Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Supported the preferred allocation provided that the policy clearly establishes the supporting infrastructure and public transport requirements needed to support the development.
- Support for the site, however, there is scope for increasing the number of allocations.
- Site access onto Artillery Road and Inglis Road is poor.
- Concerned about land contamination including asbestos and unexploded ordinance during construction due its previous military use. Concern was raised for the safety of local residents during construction.
- The lack of existing facilities and public transport in Park Hall is highlighted by a range of respondents.
- Overdevelopment of a small village which would place too much pressure on existing facilities which would fail to cope with the demand.
- Potential issues regarding adequate drainage and flooding at the sites.
- Park Hall is within Whittington Parish and should therefore be considered under Whittington's guideline.
- Site is an opportunity for key worker accommodation and support for local businesses.
- No mechanism has been provided for key worker accommodation procurement.
- Issues will occur regarding how CIL monies be allocated between Oswestry, Whittington and Gobowen for this site.
- No clear proposal is given to meet the needs of this development for sports facilities. One respondent suggested investment in local sports clubs through proposed development.
- A number of alternative sites were suggested as suitable alternatives to the preferred housing allocation.

4.5. Question 34 (a)

Question 34 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Gobowen as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents did not know or have an opinion about d the status of this Community Hub, but a large amount of respondents did support the Community Hub states. Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- Appropriate status should be determined through a Development Plan for the A5 corridor.

- Gobowen has good road and rail links and a range of local public services which make it an ideal candidate for further development.
- There is a need for better inter-settlement transport connections between Gobowen, RJAH Orthopaedic Hospital, Park Hall and Oswestry.
- Support for Community Hub status, subject to the delivery of infrastructure improvements including parking and pedestrian links.

4.6. Question 34 (b)

Question 34 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Gobowen. Most of the respondents that responded to this question demonstrated support for the housing guideline, but most respondents did not know or have an opinion about the housing guidelines. Of the remaining respondents the majority agreed with the preferred housing guideline.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- Gobowen is a major settlement on the A5 corridor and is well placed to accommodate such housing numbers.
- These guidelines are insufficient and Gobowen should be accommodating a larger guideline, particularly considering the housing of staff working at the RJAH Orthopaedic Hospital.

4.7. Question 34 (c)

Question 34 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Gobowen. The majority of respondents did not know or had no opinion. Of those respondents that answered this question, most supported the development boundary or suggested it be extended, but most respondents did not know or have an opinion about the development. Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- The boundary should be extended further to accommodate further development.
- The development boundary should accommodate development associated with the RJAH Orthopaedic Hospital site.
- Not clear why boundary incorporates one of the allocated sites but not the other.

4.8. Question 34 (d)

Question 34 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation GWR009 (Land west of Agnes Hunt Memorial Bungalows) in Gobowen. Most respondents did not know or have an opinion about the preferred housing allocation. Of the remaining respondents, the majority demonstrated support for the preferred housing allocation.

Of those who responded, the following relevant comments were raised:

- Appropriateness of the site depends on the continued functionality of Derwen College and future social care funding.
- Recommendation to increase the number of dwellings at the site.
- A number of sites were suggested as suitable alternatives to the preferred housing allocation.

4.9. Question 34 (e)

Question 34 (e) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation GWR023 in Gobowen. Most respondents did not know or have an opinion about the preferred housing allocation. Of the remaining respondents, the majority demonstrated support for the preferred housing allocation.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- Emphasis of the importance of ensuring suitable site access arrangements onto Whittington Road.
- The sites proximity to the railway station and transport links makes it suitable for housing development.
- The prominence of development at this site makes it inappropriate as a housing allocation.
- A number of sites were suggested as suitable alternatives to the preferred housing allocation.

4.10. Question 35 (a)

Question 35 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Kinnerley as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents did not know or had no view on the status of this Community Hub. Of the remaining respondents, the majority supported the identification of Kinnerley as a Community Hub.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- Agreement with the classification as the village is large and supported by a school, sports pitches and good transport links.
- Objection on the basis that the village is not a sustainable location suited to further development.
- Suggestion that housing development should be located in larger towns where a greater array of employment opportunities are available.

4.11. Question 35 (b)

Question 35 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Kinnerley. Most of the respondents did not know or had no view on the housing guideline. Of the remaining respondents, the majority did not agree with the preferred guideline.

Of those who provided a response, the following relevant comments were received:

- Kinnerley is expected to accommodate a 40% increase in size compared to an average of 25% elsewhere.
- Only one of the two already allocated sites have been completed. This suggests that there should be a timeline for the process to ensure delivery.
- Given the high level of committed dwellings early in the plan period, the settlement guideline should be increased to ensure there is sufficient housing being delivered later in the plan period.
- Suggestion that there should be a further site allocation in Kinnerley.

4.12. Question 35 (c)

Question 35 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Kinnerley. Most respondents did not know or had no view on the proposed development boundary. Of the remaining respondents, the majority did not agree with the proposed development boundary.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- The development boundary is drawn too tightly.
- Greater consideration of the Conservation Area is required.
- The development boundary should include land off Church Lane to achieve one-way access.
- The development boundary should include sites MNN011 and KNN017 which the respondent is promoting as preferred allocations.
- Village is located in Groundwater Management Unit with restricted water available for licensing. Groundwater depth is shallow.

4.13. Question 36 (a)

Question 36 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Knockin as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the status of this Community Hub. Of the remaining respondents, the majority supported identification of Knockin as a Community Hub.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- Support for Community Hub status, as Knockin is conveniently placed for travel to Shrewsbury/Telford, and further development will help existing services.
- Objection to Community Hub status on the basis that future development should be concentrated in larger settlements to reduce the need to commute.
- Comments were received by respondents who claim that Knockin's existing public services and facilities provision merits the Community Hub designation. Other respondents directly contested this point, stating that there are insufficient public services and facilities in Knockin to constitute a Community Hub.

4.14. Question 36 (b)

Question 36 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Knockin. Most of the respondents did not know or had no view on the housing guideline. Of the remaining respondents, there were similar levels of agreement and disagreement with the proposal.

Of those that expressed an opinion, the following relevant comments were received:

- There are existing unfulfilled allocations which should be delivered first.
- Proposed numbers are suitable and would help sustain existing services and facilities in the village.
- Knockin is a suitable area for further housing due to its convenient location for access to larger settlements.
- Existing highways safety issues along the B4396 should be resolved before any further housing development occurs.
- Knockin is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant development. As the smallest community hub proposed, windfall sites should suffice without further allocations.

4.15. Question 36 (c)

Question 36 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Knockin. In general, respondents did not know or did not have a view on the proposed development boundary. A mix of support and opposition was demonstrated by the remaining respondents.

Of those that expressed an opinion, the following relevant comments were received:

- Support for the proposed boundary as it will allow sufficient land to accommodate housing development to support the local community.
- Site allocation is located in Groundwater Management Unit with restricted water available for licensing.

4.16. Question 36 (d)

Question 36 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation KCK009 in Knockin. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the preferred housing allocation site. The remaining respondents demonstrated a mix of support and opposition to the proposal. A number of specific comments were received from respondents, including:

- The housing would support essential village services and can be integrated with the existing permission for 17 houses on the site to the south-west.
- The Public Rights of Way present on-site should be retained.
- The Parish Council does not view this site as sustainable as it is prone to flooding and is without proper sewage management planning.
- The Parish Council suggested difficulties would be experienced in achieving safe site access onto the B4936.
- There is a lack of services, facilities and infrastructure to support this development.
- The site is at high risk of flooding and development would increase flood risk off-site.
- Access provided through the adjacent residential development site would result in a single large development out of character with the village. Development should be focused towards Kinnerley Road.
- It is unclear whether impacts on the Conservation Area has been considered and how development can respect the Conservation Area.

4.17. Question 37 (a)

Question 37 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Llanymynech as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the status of this Community Hub. Of the remainder, the majority supported the proposal.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- Support the Community Hub as there are good road links to larger towns in Oswestry, Welshpool and beyond. Further development could help in attaining a bypass around the town.
- Village has adequate services for Community Hub status, but not adequate infrastructure.
- Llanymynech and Pant should be considered as a combined Community Hub, as services are shared across the two.
- The settlement lacks certain public services and does not meet the definition of a hub set out in Table 2 of Page 4 of the Hierarchy of Settlements document.

4.18. Question 37 (b)

Question 37 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Llanymynech. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the housing guideline. Of the remaining respondents, there was a mix of those that agreed and those that disagreed with the proposal.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- The east of the village already has a large amount of housing using inadequate roads, facilities and local services, and the preferred guideline would exacerbate existing issues. As such the south-west side of the village is more suitable.
- Llanymynech is not a sustainable location as it is on the edge of being a commutable distance to surrounding settlements which form the key regional employment hubs, therefore the housing guideline is inappropriate.

4.19. Question 37 (c)

Question 37 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Llanymynech. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the development boundary. The remaining respondents expressed a mix of agreement and disagreement with the proposal.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- The development boundary should be extended to the south-west of the village where there is more capacity for future development.
- The proposed extension of the boundary would encroach negatively on the Montgomery Canal and Llanymynech Heritage Area. The canal footpath must be retained for future use, particularly as access is increasingly difficult.
- The development boundary should not be extended and instead other methods of housing delivery, such as barn conversions, should be considered.

4.20. Question 37 (d)

Question 37 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation LYH007 in Llanymynech. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the preferred housing allocation. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of those who responded, the following relevant comments were received:

- There have been problems in securing the development allocated at the previous (adjacent) site, including selling the site, which could be repeated, thus affecting delivery.
- Development would worsen the accident blackspot at Llyncllys crossroads and there is no plan to address this issue mentioned in the consultation documents.
- The access to this site is unsuitable, and increased traffic may affect junctions on the A483 and B4396.
- The existing sewerage system in Llanymynech is inadequate and cannot support further development.
- In contrast, a consultee suggested that the preferred allocation represents a logical and sustainable opportunity for proportionate residential growth in the locality which could be accessed through Barley Meadows.
- It is unclear whether impacts on the Llanymynech Village and Heritage, including the Conservation Area and nearby Scheduled Monument, has been considered and how development can respect the Conservation Area.
- Development would cut off the open space between the heritage canal and playing fields

4.21. Question 38 (a)

Question 38 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Pant as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the status of this Community Hub and those that did, demonstrated a mixture of agreement and disagreement. Of those who expressed a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- Llanymynech and Pant should be considered as a combined Community Hub, as services are shared across the two.
- Being a Community Hub could help the village's case for a bypass.
- The village benefits from a good range of facilities and services including public transport, primary school, community hall, public house, shop/post office and recreational facilities.
- Pant is a linear settlement with limited facilities and should not be considered as a Community Hub.
- The village should not be a Community Hub as there is limited employment in the area.
- There was an objection on the basis of a lack of schools, local facilities, services and public transport, and significant traffic congestion.
- There is a lack of employment in the area.

4.22. Question 38 (b)

Question 38 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Pant. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the housing guideline and those that did mostly disagreed with the proposal. A variety of concerns were raised regarding:

- Insufficient existing public services and facilities to support the housing guideline.
- Insufficient capacity on local roads to accommodate extra cars which would arise from the housing guideline.
- Existing development is built along unsuitable unadopted lanes.
- Landscape constraints result in no suitable sites being available for development in Pant.
- Improvements to drainage, traffic and sewage infrastructure must be delivered prior to further development in the interest of public safety.

4.23. Question 38 (c)

Question 38 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Pant. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the development boundary and those that did mostly disagreed with the proposal. Of the remaining respondents, the majority did not agree with the proposed development boundary.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- The development boundary should be extended as the site added and windfall sites would not deliver sufficient housing numbers.
- Disagreement with the proposed use of a greenfield site outside of the previous development boundary.
- The boundary would encourage ribbon development which would degrade the character of the village.
- Need for a bypass prior to the alteration of the boundary to accommodate new development.
- Need to ensure that Pant and Llyncllys don't coalesce

4.24. Question 38 (d)

Question 38 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation PYC021 in Pant. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the preferred housing allocation. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of those who responded, the following relevant comments were received:

- Objected to the site as it was outside of the already established development boundary.

- Density of houses within the site is too high and out of character with the existing village.
- Concerned about flooding on the site and in the wider area.
- Concerned about biodiversity impacts and loss of protected species within the site.
- The area has issues with water supply and sewage systems.
- Pennygarreg Lane is already a dangerous road, particularly for pedestrians.
- Existing noise and air pollution as a result of traffic on Pennygarreg Lane.
- Existing healthcare facilities and employment opportunities in the village are insufficient to support this development.
- Other smaller sites in the village would be suitable, would maintain the village character, and would have a better sustainability score.
- Suggestion to use the site instead for a new primary school.

One consultee suggested that more housing allocations should be proposed due to the historic lack of windfall development in the village.

4.25. Question 39 (a)

Question 39 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Ruyton XI Towns as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the status of this Community Hub. Of the remaining respondents the majority supported the proposal.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- Support for Community Hub status as the village has all the facilities capable of accommodating further development.
- Ruyton XI Towns has a settlement score in the top third of Community Hubs and further development would support the village's sustainability.
- In contrast, a consultee disagreed with Community Hub status due to poor accessibility to the Shottaton crossroad on the A5 where additional development would further increase highways issues.
- Concerned that windfall sites would impact surrounding countryside if identified as a Community Hub

4.26. Question 39 (b)

Question 39 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Ruyton XI Towns. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the housing guideline. Of the remainder the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- Support for the housing guideline provided that Shottaton crossroads are improved.
- The settlement could accommodate housing above the preferred guideline; however, the proportion to be provided as windfall development makes delivery of the housing guideline uncertain.
- Concern that commuter traffic will increase if there are not sufficient local job opportunities to support new housing

4.27. Question 39 (c)

Question 39 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ruyton XI Towns. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the development boundary. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

One comment stated that sites should be within the settlement boundary to avoid impacts on the countryside, also noting the impact of increased traffic on local lanes, particularly Shottaton Crossroads.

Another comment noted that the settlement is within a Groundwater Management Area.

4.28. Question 39 (d)

Question 39 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation RUY019 in Ruyton XI Towns. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the preferred housing allocation. Of the remaining respondents a similar level agreed and disagreed with the proposal.

Of those who responded, the following relevant comments were received:

- Objected to the allocation of an industrial site for housing.
- The dairy is currently operational, bringing into question the deliverability of the preferred allocation.
- Increased residential traffic associated with the development of the site for housing would be preferable to lorries accessing the dairy through the village.

4.29. Question 40 (a)

Question 40 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of St Martins as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the status of this Community Hub. Of the remainder, the majority supported the proposal. Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- St Martins is a sustainable and attractive town on the northern edge of the County bordering Wrexham. St Martin ranks 3rd out of the 40 Community Hubs in Shropshire and is the 20th most sustainable settlement in Shropshire.
- St Martins is served by a good range of services and good highway links to nearby employment centres, making it well suited to receiving further development.

4.30. Question 40 (b)

Question 40 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for St Martins. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the housing guideline. The remaining responded demonstrated a mix of agreement and disagreement with the proposal. Of those who expressed a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- The housing guideline of 355 dwellings over the plan period is considered to be appropriate taking account of existing commitments in the village and the high demand for housing in the area.
- Suggestion to consider additional housing allocations or expansion of the settlement boundaries.
- The guideline could be increased to 385, as the windfall allowance for the settlement is inadequate.

4.31. Question 40 (c)

Question 40 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for St Martins. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the development boundary. Of the remainder a similar level support and opposition to the proposed boundary was expressed. Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- The site is within the logical extent of the existing built settlement and there won't be any significant impact on the surrounding open countryside due to development.
- Inclusion of Stans Superstore and the existing residential housing sites on either side into the development boundary.
- Suggestion to include the existing (SAMDev) and proposed site allocations in the Consultation Document for St Martins.
- Further suitable extensions to the village can be made beyond those proposed.

4.32. Question 40 (d)

Question 40 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation SMH031 in St Martins. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the preferred housing allocation. Of the remaining respondents a similar level of agreement and disagreement was expressed to the proposal.

Of those who responded, the following relevant comments were received:

- There are no planning policy constraints in the site to prevent its development. It has been demonstrated that a high-quality development of about 60 units can be delivered on this site.

- The proposal removes the green gap which contributes significantly to the visual quality of the village. The respondent recommends allocating SMH024 instead.

4.33. Question 40 (e)

Question 40 (e) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation SMH038 in St Martins. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the preferred housing allocation. The remainder demonstrated an even mix of agreement and disagreement with the proposal.

Of those who responded, the following relevant comments were received:

- SMH038 will contribute less to the village than SMH037 which could offer an improved housing mix and provide attractive areas of public open space in the Cottage Lane area.
- A consultee expressed their support for the reuse of a brownfield site.
- Potential for employment/commercial development along site frontage.
- Loss of playing fields must be secured by a proposal at this site as per para 97 of NPPF

4.34. Question 41 (a)

Question 41 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Trefonen as a Community Hub. Most respondents did not know or did not have an opinion.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- Trefonen neither has any employment opportunities nor any peak-time public transport services to employment centres, therefore it should not be considered as a Community Hub.
- Trefonen is dependent on Oswestry for provision of its public services and facilities, unlike other proposed Community Hubs.
- A consultee compared Morda and Trefonen, stating that Morda offers a greater range of services and should replace Trefonen as a Community Hub.
- Trefonen should be designated as 'Countryside', encouraging an appropriate scale of development for the village.
- Designation as 'Countryside' would aid in the delivery of affordable homes through Rural Exception sites.

Comments submitted in support of Community Hub status were limited to:

- Trefonen is a suitable settlement for designation as a Community Hub, as there is adequate services and facilities such as a shop, public house, primary school, village hall, recreation fields and bus services etc.
- Community Hub status and the subsequent development will help to reinforce the viability of local businesses.

4.35. Question 41 (b)

Question 41 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Trefonen. The largest proportion of the respondents did not know or have an opinion, of those that did the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- Housing guidelines do not reflect the historic under-provision of housing in the village over preceding years. Suggestion that sites need to be formally allocated rather than relying on windfall.
- The number of homes proposed over the plan period is not sustainable for moderate growth in comparison to the existing size of the village.
- The village does not have the facilities or infrastructure to support the housing guideline.
- Local primary school and medical facilities are already oversubscribed.
- The guideline could result in further development on the hillside area of the village which would place significant traffic pressure on unsuitable, single-track country lanes.
- Existing congestion and parking problems on Upper Brook Street would be exacerbated.
- This level of development risks harming ecological and historic assets.

- Housing development in Trefonen should be infill only.
- Open market development in Trefonen is unlikely to be affordable enough to allow homes for local people or young families.
- Guideline should be left to the Parish Council who know the local needs.

The Parish Council stated that an appropriate level of development could be achieved under "Countryside" status, while addressing the preference of residents for "Affordable Homes" and smaller 1-2 bedroom bungalows.

4.36. Question 41 (c)

Question 41 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Trefonen. The largest proportion of the respondents did not know or did not have an opinion on the proposal.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- A suggestion was made that the inclusion of a number of plots with large open gardens could encourage infill development.
- A number of consultees expressed support, stating that the development boundary should remain unchanged. Whereas, other consultees stated that without an expansion of the development boundary, developments would be unaffordable to young people.
- A consultee raised concern about the inclusion of local tourism and heritage sites within the development boundary. Another raised concern over the rural nature of a number of the sites which fall within the preferred development boundary.
- Consultants representing landowners used this question to call for the proposed development boundary to incorporate the sites they were promoting.

4.37. Question 42 (a)

Question 42 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of West Felton as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the status of this Community Hub. Of the remaining respondents, the majority supported the proposal.

Of those who had a view, the following relevant comments were received:

- West Felton is ideally placed for road travel through direct access to the A5, to employment centres in Shrewsbury and beyond.
- West Felton has enough facilities and services to support new housing development and the new housing development will also support and maintain the current level of services and facilities.
- Changes to the existing junctions on the A5 may be required to support the increased vehicle numbers which might occur due to further development resulting from Community Hub status.
- West Felton has long term potential for growth if policies and strategies to manage and protect environmental and heritage assets are introduced.
- Objections to Community Hub status were made on the basis that locals would prefer West Felton to have Countryside status over Community Hub status.

4.38. Question 42 (b)

Question 42 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for West Felton. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the housing guideline. The remainder provided a mix of support and opposition to the guideline.

Comments from respondents in support of the housing guideline included:

- West Felton and its surrounding hinterland can accommodate the preferred guideline without affecting the character of the village.
- West Felton needs housing allocations up to 2036 to sustain the existing level of services within the settlement. The consultee also suggests housing for the elderly through the provision of a care home facility.

- Support for the guideline subject to compliance with a policy requiring affordable housing to meet local needs.
- Consultants promoting sites for housing development suggested that the housing guideline should be increased to accommodate further sites.
- Settlement is located in Groundwater Management Unit with restricted water available for licensing.

4.39. Question 42 (c)

Question 42 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for West Felton. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the development boundary. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

A number of comments were received recommending other sites for inclusion within the boundary. Additionally, comments were received suggesting that the settlement boundary include built form within the village which lies to the west of the A5.

A consultee argued that West Felton should remain as Open Countryside and have no development boundary as the addition of the development boundary would create future pressure on the village to grow.

4.40. Question 42 (d)

Question 42 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEF025 (Land at West Felton) in West Felton. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the preferred housing allocation. The remaining respondents demonstrated an relatively even mix of support and opposition for the proposal.

Comments in support of the preferred housing allocation included:

- Suggestion to ensure a commitment to providing a formal and permanent recreation ground on adjacent land as part of the allocation.
- Site is available and deliverable, and access has been retained through the development site to the south west. It also has access on foot via Oak Lane to the village Primary School and other services and facilities within the village.
- The site is in a prominent position in the landscape and to the east and south-east approaches to West Felton which might be affected. The housing allocation should ensure that the development of the site would not result in an adverse impact.

Comments of opposition included:

- More suitable sites which are proximate to public facilities and services are available and these should be preferred allocations instead of this site.
- Alternative sites suggested include WEF020, WEF024, WEF026, WEF30 and WEF031.

One comment was received stating that the allocation refers to extended formal and permanent recreation grounds on adjacent land. Respondent states that this cannot be seen on the plan.

4.41. Question 43 (a)

Question 43 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Weston Rhyn as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the status of this Community Hub. Of the remaining respondents, the majority generally demonstrated support for the proposal. Comments received in response to this question were limited. Queries were raised over the approach taken to the hierarchy of settlements scoring, with suggestions that the village lacks the facilities, services and infrastructure to merit its designation as a Community Hub.

In contrast, comments made in support of Community Hub status, referred to a good range of local services and facilities, local employment opportunities, a regular bus service and good road links with Oswestry, Shrewsbury, Wrexham, Mid Wales, and Cheshire and the wider North West.

4.42. Question 43 (b)

Question 43 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Weston Rhyn. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the housing guideline. Of the remainder the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Only a small number of respondents provided comments and these tended to be respondents who opposed the housing guideline; although the reasons for disagreement varied:

- Weston Rhyn is capable of accommodating a higher housing guideline than currently proposed.
- Major investment in existing and new infrastructure is required prior to any further development in the village.
- The need for affordable housing in Weston Rhyn was acknowledged.

4.43. Question 43 (c)

Question 43 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Weston Rhyn. Most of the respondents did not know or did not have a view on the development boundary. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal. Comments received in response to this question included a suggestion that the development boundary should be extended to include additional sites in order to provide greater certainty that developments will come forward.

4.44. Question 43 (d)

Question 43 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation WRP017 in Weston Rhyn. Most respondents did not have a view on the preferred housing allocation site and those that did mostly disagreed with the proposal. The key concerns raised were:

- Existing sewerage system is inadequate.
- Existing traffic congestion in the area would be exacerbated, affecting the safety of school children.
- Uncertainty over ownership and deliverability of the site.
- No proposal has been put forward for relocation of existing school playing fields within the site.
- Council confirms consultation with Primary School and Local Housing Association to develop a scheme for the site and improve parking for the school

4.45. Question 43 (e)

Question 43 (e) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation WRP001 (Land off Trehowell Lane) in Weston Rhyn. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the preferred housing allocation. The remaining respondents demonstrated a mixture of agreement and disagreement with the proposal.

A comment in support, highlighted existing traffic congestion in the area. This was also a concern raised by a number of respondents as a reason for removing the preferred housing allocation from the Plan. Other concerns raised by those who opposed the site included:

- Encroachment into the countryside.
- Site access would be via a single track road.
- Existing sewerage problems.

4.46. Question 44 (a)

Question 44 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Whittington as a Community Hub. Most respondents did not know or have an opinion, but of those that did respond most agreed with the proposal. Reasons provided for why Whittington should not be a Community Hub included:

- The existing road network is insufficient to support the growth that would arise from Community Hub status.
- Off-peak public transport is insufficient.
- Existing schools are insufficient.

A consultee referred to Whittington's good road links with Ellesmere, Oswestry and Shrewsbury and the range of public services available which make it well suited to be a Community Hub.

4.47. Question 44 (b)

Question 44 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Whittington. Most respondents did not know or had no opinion on the housing guideline. The small number of

remaining responses demonstrated a mixed response to the housing guideline, although the majority disagreed.

Concern was raised over the preferred housing guideline being in-addition to the 80 dwellings already planned in the area. The capacity of existing schools to cope with growth of the scale proposed was another concern.

Several respondents referred to the potential that Whittington has for further growth, with specific reference made to employment opportunities to the east side of Oswestry. A respondent suggested that the guideline would assist the village to retain its vitality while contributing to the supply of a range of homes to meet the demand for market housing in the local area.

Another respondent requested that the Park Hall development should form part of the Whittington housing guideline.

4.48. Question 44 (c)

Question 44 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Whittington. Most respondents did not know or did not have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents the majority disagreed with the proposal.

The following relevant comments were received:

- The development boundary should be extended to incorporate a number of promoted sites.
- The proposed development boundary focuses future development northwards which will shift the centre of the village.
- Development should be spread more evenly across the settlement rather than being concentrated in one area.
- The proposed development boundary will impact the rural, historic character of the village.
- The proposed development boundary is the most sustainable expansion option for the village.
- Settlement is located within a Groundwater Management Unit with no water available for licensing.

4.49. Question 44 (d)

Question 44 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHN024 in Whittington. Most respondents did not know or did not have a view on the preferred housing allocation. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

The following key comments were provided:

- The site is not in scale with this part of the village.
- Great importance should be given to the design of the road network and traffic management as the existing access road to the site is too narrow to facilitate access to a housing development of 70 houses.
- Existing infrastructure, services and facilities are inadequate and at capacity so could not support this housing allocation.
- Query over the appropriate procedure for site selection process.
- Unclear whether impacts on the Halston Hall and the nearby Whittington Castle Scheduled Monument and Conservation Area have been considered and how development can respect them.
- The site cannot be delivered via Donnet Close as proposed. Whereas with WHN019 access can be easily achieved.
- Several other respondents suggested the inclusion of further sites.

5. Further Information

5.1. Question 63

Question 63 sought views on whether respondents thought any additional 'Community Clusters' to those identified within the Preferred Sites Consultation should be formed or any of the existing 'Community Clusters' identified in the consultation document should be removed.

Respondents demonstrated a mix of opinions. A substantial proportion stated that they did not consider that any Community Clusters needed adding or removing or did not know / had no opinion.

Respondents recommended the addition of the following settlements:

- Maesbury Marsh / Maesbury.
- Queens Heath.
- Dovaston and Knockin Heath should be considered alongside Kinnerley.
- Aston Square / Aston.
- Trefonen, Treflach and Nantmawr should be considered as a group.

Respondents recommended the downgrading of:

- Trefonen.
- Park Hall (including some calls for it to be included within Whittington boundary).
- Pant.
- Knockin.

Several respondents commented that they believed the Community Cluster and Community Hub status should be determined by the communities themselves instead of the Council. The scoring system for Community Hubs was also criticised as being flawed and not sufficiently community-focused.

A number of comments were received expressing support for the decision to designate certain settlements as Community Clusters.

5.2. Question 64

Question 64 sought any other views. Where suitable, responses on this question have been consolidated into the relevant Oswestry specific questions. A number of respondents took this opportunity to discuss Oswestry and the various Community Hubs within this Place Plan Area.

Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Commonly held concerns among residents that there is a shortage of affordable homes and rent-to-buy opportunities which must be addressed through the Local Plan Review.
- The consultation document fails to properly consider road and infrastructure links, flooding issues, heritage assets, tourism and the Offa's Dyke Trail.
- Sites should be allocated specifically for retirement home developments.
- Land should be allocated for new community services.
- Brownfield sites should be prioritised, the Consultation document shows preferred allocations primarily on greenfield sites.
- Housing allocations are required in rural settlements to enhance the vitality of the rural communities.
- The distribution of preferred housing allocations is too focused on urban sites. There are several sustainable Community Hubs which could accommodate more dwellings to better distribute development.
- Development in the countryside would result in a higher level of carbon emissions which contradicts government policy which seeks a low carbon economy.
- A lack of consideration and provision for self-build homes which should be addressed in the Local Plan Review.
- A number of comments were received promoting the allocation of alternative sites including KNN011, KNN017 and TRF006.
- Site PKH013 has been incorrectly assessed in Site Selection; access will be from the Primoris site. It should be reconsidered on this basis.
- Housing should be allocated on retail sites as the retail sector shrinks
- A number of sites were promoted.
- Information on the consultation and Local Plan Review was very difficult to access for those without internet.

Appendices



Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

The following quantitative analysis looks at the standard questions provided for Bishop's Castle, it illustrates the percentage answers 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 this question, who were interested in the Oswestry Place Plan Area and completed this question:

- 46% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 37% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 17% 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 through 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. Of the unique respondents that responded to this question, who were interested in the Oswestry Place Plan Area and completed this question:

- 66% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site basis;
- 34% preferred a set development mix.

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 Oswestry Place Plan Area and completed this question:

- 53% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 29% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 18% don't know/ no opinion whether 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 Oswestry Place Plan Area and completed this question:

- 42% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 27% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 31% don't know/ no opinion whether it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline.

A.5. Question 33 (a)

Question 33 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Oswestry. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 20% agreed that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Oswestry;

- 33% did not agree that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Oswestry; and
- 47% don't know/ no opinion that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Oswestry.

A.6. Question 33 (b)

Question 33 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the development boundary for Oswestry. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 14% agreed with the development boundary for Oswestry;
- 38% did not agree with the development boundary for Oswestry; and
- 48% don't know/no opinion about the development boundary for Oswestry.

A.7. Question 33 (c)

Question 33 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation OSW017 in Oswestry. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 14% agreed with the allocation OSW017 in Oswestry;
- 37% did not agree with the allocation OSW017 in Oswestry; and
- 49% don't know/ no opinion with the allocation OSW017 in Oswestry.

A.8. Question 33 (d)

Question 33 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocations PKH002, PKH007 (part) and PKH031 in Park Hill. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the allocations PKH002, PKH007 (part) and PKH031 in Park Hill;
- 27% did not agree with the allocations PKH002, PKH007 (part) and PKH031 in Park Hill; and
- 63% don't know/ no opinion with the allocations PKH002, PKH007 (part) and PKH031 in Park Hill.

A.9. Question 34 (a)

Question 34 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Gobowen as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 40% agreed with Gobowen as a Community Hub;
- 2% did not agree with Gobowen as a Community Hub; and
- 58% don't know/ no opinion with Gobowen as a Community Hub.

A.10. Question 34 (b)

Question 34 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Gobowen. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 22% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Gobowen;
- 11% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Gobowen; and
- 67% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Gobowen.

A.11. Question 34 (c)

Question 34 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Gobowen. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 17% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Gobowen;
- 13% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Gobowen; and
- 70% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Gobowen.

A.12. Question 34 (d)

Question 9 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation GWR009 in Gobowen. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 25% agreed with the preferred housing allocation GWR009 in Gobowen;
- 5% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation GWR009 in Gobowen; and
- 70% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation GWR009 in Gobowen.

A.13. Question 34 (e)

Question 34 (e) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation GWR023 in Gobowen. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 24% agreed with the preferred housing allocation GWR023 in Gobowen;
- 6% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation GWR023 in Gobowen; and
- 70% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation GWR023 in Gobowen.

A.14. Question 35 (a)

Question 10 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Kinnerley as a Community Cluster. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 19% agreed with the identification of Kinnerley as a Community Hub;
- 4% did not agree with the identification of Kinnerley as a Community Hub; and
- 77% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of Kinnerley as a Community Hub.

A.15. Question 35 (b)

Question 10 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Kinnerley. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 4% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Kinnerley;
- 10% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Kinnerley; and
- 86% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Kinnerley.

A.16. Question 35 (c)

Question 10 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Kinnerley. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Kinnerley;
- 11% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Kinnerley; and
- 84% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for Kinnerley.

A.17. Question 36 (a)

Question 36 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Knockin as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 16% agreed with the identification of Knockin as a Community Hub;
- 9% did not agree with the identification of Knockin as a Community Hub; and
- 75% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of Knockin as a Community Hub.

A.18. Question 36 (b)

Question 36 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Knockin. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Knockin;
- 8% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Knockin; and

- 84% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Knockin.

A.19. Question 36 (c)

Question 36 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Knockin. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 7% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Knockin;
- 11% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Knockin; and
- 82% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for Knockin.

A.20. Question 36 (d)

Question 36 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation KCK009 in Knockin. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8.5% agreed with the preferred housing allocation KCK009 in Knockin,
- 8.5% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation KCK009 in Knockin, and
- 83% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation KCK009 in Knockin.

A.21. Question 37 (a)

Question 37 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Llanymynech as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 22% agreed with the identification of Llanymynech as a Community Hub;
- 6% did not agree with the identification of Llanymynech as a Community Hub; and
- 72% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of Llanymynech as a Community Hub.

A.22. Question 37 (b)

Question 37 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Llanymynech. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 10.5% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Llanymynech;
- 10.5% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Llanymynech; and
- 79% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Llanymynech.

A.23. Question 37 (c)

Question 37 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Llanymynech. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 9.5% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Llanymynech;
- 9.5% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Llanymynech; and
- 81% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for Llanymynech.

A.24. Question 37 (d)

Question 37 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation LYH007 in Llanymynech. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing allocation LYH007 in Llanymynech,
- 13% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation LYH007 in Llanymynech, and
- 79% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation LYH007 in Llanymynech.

A.25. Question 38 (a)

Question 38 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Pant as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 21% agreed with the identification of Pant as a Community Hub;
- 14% did not agree with the identification of Pant as a Community Hub; and
- 65% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of Pant as a Community Hub.

A.26. Question 38 (b)

Question 38 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Pant. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 7% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Pant;
- 23% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Pant; and
- 70% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Pant.

A.27. Question 38 (c)

Question 38 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Pant. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 10% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Pant;
- 22% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Pant; and
- 68% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for Pant.

A.28. Question 38 (d)

Question 38 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation PYC021 in Pant. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the preferred housing allocation PYC021 in Pant,
- 25% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation PYC021 in Pant, and
- 70% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation PYC021 in Pant.

A.29. Question 39 (a)

Question 39 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Ruyton XI Towns as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 21% agreed with the identification of Ruyton XI Towns as a Community Hub;
- 7% did not agree with the identification of Ruyton XI Towns as a Community Hub; and
- 72% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of Ruyton XI Towns as a Community Hub.

A.30. Question 39 (b)

Question 39 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Ruyton XI Towns. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 6% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Ruyton XI Towns;
- 13% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Ruyton XI Towns; and
- 81% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Ruyton XI Towns.

A.31. Question 39 (c)

Question 39 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ruyton XI Towns. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 10% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ruyton XI Towns;
- 9% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Ruyton XI Towns; and
- 81% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for Ruyton XI Towns.

A.32. Question 39 (d)

Question 39 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation RUY019 in Ruyton XI Towns. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 9% agreed with the preferred housing allocation RUY019 in Ruyton XI Towns,
- 5% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation RUY019 in Ruyton XI Towns, and
- 86% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation RUY019 in Ruyton XI Towns.

A.33. Question 40 (a)

Question 40 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of St Martins as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 23% agreed with the identification of St Martins as a Community Hub;
- 2% did not agree with the identification of St Martins as a Community Hub; and
- 75% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of St Martins as a Community Hub.

A.34. Question 40 (b)

Question 40 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for St Martins. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for St Martins;
- 5% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for St Martins; and
- 87% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for St Martins.

A.35. Question 40 (c)

Question 40 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for St Martins. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 7% agreed with the proposed development boundary for St Martins;
- 6% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for St Martins; and
- 87% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for St Martins.

A.36. Question 40 (d)

Question 40 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation SMH031 in St Martins. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 9% agreed with the preferred housing allocation SMH031 in St Martins,
- 5% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation SMH031 in St Martins, and
- 87% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation SMH031 in St Martins.

A.37. Question 40 (e)

Question 40 (e) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation SMH038 in St Martins. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 10% agreed with the preferred housing allocation SMH038 in St Martins,
- 5% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation SMH038 in St Martins, and
- 85% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation SMH038 in St Martins.

A.38. Question 41 (a)

Question 41 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Trefonen as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 16% agreed with the identification of Trefonen as a Community Hub;
- 34% did not agree with the identification of Trefonen as a Community Hub; and

- 50% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of Trefonen as a Community Hub.

A.39. Question 41 (b)

Question 41 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Trefonen. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 4% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Trefonen;
- 42% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Trefonen; and
- 54% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Trefonen.

A.40. Question 41 (c)

Question 41 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Trefonen. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 7% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Trefonen;
- 37% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Trefonen; and
- 56% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for Trefonen.

A.41. Question 42 (a)

Question 42 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of West Felton as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 22% agreed with the identification of West Felton as a Community Hub;
- 8% did not agree with the identification of West Felton as a Community Hub; and
- 70% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of West Felton as a Community Hub.

A.42. Question 42 (b)

Question 42 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for West Felton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 10% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for West Felton;
- 12% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for West Felton; and
- 78% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for West Felton.

A.43. Question 42 (c)

Question 42 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for West Felton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the proposed development boundary for West Felton;
- 14% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for West Felton; and
- 78% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for West Felton.

A.44. Question 42 (d)

Question 42 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEF025 in West Felton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEF025 in West Felton,
- 11% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation WEF025 in West Felton, and
- 78% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation WEF025 in West Felton.

A.45. Question 43 (a)

Question 43 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Weston Rhyn as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 18% agreed with the identification of Weston Rhyn as a Community Hub;
- 7% did not agree with the identification of Weston Rhyn as a Community Hub; and
- 75% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of Weston Rhyn as a Community Hub.

A.46. Question 43 (b)

Question 43 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Weston Rhyn. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 6% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Weston Rhyn;
- 11% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Weston Rhyn; and
- 83% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Weston Rhyn.

A.47. Question 43 (c)

Question 43 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Weston Rhyn. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

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

A.48. Question 43 (d)

Question 43 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation WRP017 in Pant. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing allocation WRP017 in Weston Rhyn,
- 11% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation WRP017 in Weston Rhyn, and
- 81% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation WRP017 in Weston Rhyn.

A.49. Question 43 (e)

Question 43 (e) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation WRP001 in Weston Rhyn. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 7% agreed with the preferred housing allocation WRP001 in Weston Rhyn,
- 7% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation WRP001 in Weston Rhyn, and
- 86% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation WRP001 in Weston Rhyn.

A.50. Question 44 (a)

Question 44 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Whittington as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 27% agreed with the identification of Whittington as a Community Hub;
- 8% did not agree with the identification of Whittington as a Community Hub; and
- 65% don't know/ no opinion with the identification of Whittington as a Community Hub.

A.51. Question 44 (b)

Question 44 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Whittington. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 10% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Whittington;
- 20% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Whittington; and
- 70% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing guideline for Whittington.

A.52. Question 44 (c)

Question 44 (c) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the proposed development boundary for Whittington. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Whittington;
- 19% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Whittington; and
- 70% don't know/ no opinion with the proposed development boundary for Whittington.

A.53. Question 44 (d)

Question 44 (d) sought views on whether consultees agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHN024 in Whittington. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHN024 in Whittington,
- 18% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation WHN024 in Whittington, and
- 71% don't know/ no opinion with the preferred housing allocation WHN024 in Whittington.

A.54. Question 63

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

- 16% agreed that a 'Community Cluster' needs to be formed;
- 10% agreed that a 'Community Cluster; needs to be removed;
- 43% do not agree 'Community Cluster' will be added or removed; and
- 31% 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