

Appendix B.15. Shropshire Council – Local Plan Review – Preferred Sites Consultation

Shifnal

Shropshire Council

31 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 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 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.to the summarising and analysis of consul

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

This document has 16 pages including the cover.

Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Shifnal	FH	VD	BN	VD	20/05/2019
Rev 1.0	Final Shifnal	FH	VD	BN	VD	31/05/2019

Client signoff

Client	Shropshire Council
Project	Shropshire Council – Local Plan Review – Preferred Sites Consultation
Job number	5188227
Client signature / date	

Contents

Chapter	Page
Introduction	4
1. Overview	5
2. Delivering Local Housing Needs	5
2.1. Question 3	5
2.2. Question 4	5
3. Windfall Development	6
3.1. Question 5	6
3.2. Question 6	7
4. Shifnal Place Plan Area	7
4.1. Question 45 (a)	7
4.2. Question 45 (b)	8
4.3. Question 45 (c)	9
4.4. Question 45 (d)	9
4.5. Question 45 (e)	9
4.6. Question 45 (f)	10
5. Further Information	11
5.1. Question 63	11
5.2. Question 64	11
Appendices	12
Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.	13
A.1. Question 3	13
A.2. Question 4	13
A.3. Question 5	13
A.4. Question 6	13
A.5. Question 45 (a)	14
A.6. Question 45 (b)	14
A.7. Question 45 (c)	14
A.8. Question 45 (d)	14
A.9. Question 45 (e)	14
A.10. Question 45 (f)	14
A.11. Question 63	14

Tables

No table of figures entries found.

Figures

No table of figures entries found.

Introduction

Following approval from Cabinet on the Shropshire Council Preferred Sites Consultation, consultation documents for this third stage of the Local Plan Review were published on 29th November 2018 and the consultation ran till the 9th February 2019.

This stage of consultation sought views from all parties on the Preferred Sites Consultation in Shropshire for the period 2016-36.

Specifically, the consultation sought views of all parties with an interest in the preferred development strategy and sites in these identified locations, so that relevant views and evidence can be taken into account in deciding the best way forward. The Consultation Document:

- Outlines a housing policy direction to improve the delivery of local housing needs;
- Establishes development guidelines and development boundaries for Shrewsbury, Principal and Key Centres and each proposed Community Hub;
- Sets out the preferred sites to deliver the preferred scale and distribution of housing and employment growth during the period to 2036;

These responses will be used to inform further development of the Local Plan Review. This document summarises the key issues raised by respondents to the consultation in the Shifnal Place Plan Area.

1. Overview

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

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

There were six questions relating to the Shifnal 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 the Shifnal-specific questions.

A total of 1,393 consultees responded to these questions.

The quantitative analysis of these 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 vast majority of respondents to this question, who were interested in the Shifnal Place Plan Area, did not agree with the policy. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- ‘Please refer to Policy SL1 of the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan’
 - Policy SL1 – Green Belt, Safeguarded Land and Shifnal Settlement Boundary’.
- Reiteration of the need to protect the Green Belt. Moreover, the proposals would threaten the Green Belt and negatively impact the character of Shifnal.
- Provides flexibility and responds to changing demands.
- Suggestions that recent housing developments had not provided the affordable housing numbers which had been promised by the developers. They also felt that this policy would provide an excuse for further development on the Green Belt.
- Recognition for the need for housing but suggested other areas of Shropshire should be used and that recent expansion should have provided additional affordable housing.

The Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan was referenced by many of the consultees. This was the most common recurring theme through all the questions relating to Shifnal and demonstrates the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan has significant support in Shifnal.

Protection of the Green Belt surrounding Shifnal was also an issue which was raised by a number of respondents throughout the questionnaires.

Prospective developers highlighted the issues around affordability of housing in Shifnal and that this could be alleviated with further housing allocations. However, it was also noted that financial viability of the schemes needed to be carefully considered and that an attractive return would need to be afforded to the developer and/or landowner.

The majority of respondents did not provide any comments.

2.2. Question 4

Question 4 sought views on whether respondents preferred the development mix to 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 respondents to this question, who were interested in the Shifnal Place Plan Area, did not comment on this question. Those who did answer expressed roughly equal levels of support for each option. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- 'Please refer to Policy SL1 of the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan'.
- More housing should be directed to Key Centres. However, Shifnal has limited opportunities for any windfall development.
- Shifnal Matters highlighted that the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan was voted for with 93% of the 1,660 cast votes in favour. This represented a 30.59% turnout of the electorate.
- There were also many respondents who stated that they preferred adherence to the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan.
- A desire not to build on Green Belt land was also a common response.

As with question 3, reference to the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan was common in responses to question 4. Similarly, a strong desire to protect the Green Belt was also given as an answer by several respondents.

The majority of the answers were left blank, although some respondents wrote 'neither option'. However, there were comments that some consultees were confused by the wording of the document.

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. Consultees responding to this question, who were interested in the Shifnal Place Plan Area, overwhelmingly disagreed with this approach.

Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- 'Please refer to Policy SL1 of the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan'.
- Windfall was disproportionate to Shifnal and would significantly impact the boundary of the town. It was suggested in several responses that 136 dwellings was too high and that 48 dwellings was more reasonable.
- Shifnal is one of the county's few settlements which is set within the Green Belt and therefore has limited opportunities for windfall developments of a significant scale. Instead, to deliver growth at Shifnal, sites need to be removed from the Green Belt through the Local Plan Review process.
- Infrastructure improvements were considered necessary before any further development in the town were to take place due to insufficient infrastructure and failing services, such as doctors, schools and roads.
- It was also considered that windfall sites were beneficial to developers and not the residents of Shifnal.
- One prospective developer stated that as 43% of housing was represented in the windfall allocation. More housing should be allocated to meet the remaining dwelling requirement of 316 rather than having a reliance on windfall allowances.
- Residents who did agree with this approach caveated their response with comments that windfall development should be limited and should not impact the character and setting of Shifnal. It was also highlighted that Green Belt should not be used.
- Windfall development would lead to loss of the Green Belt through encroachment which could lead to Shifnal merging with Telford or Wolverhampton.

Proposals for windfall sites were highly unpopular as residents were cautious over the effect that it would have on the settlement boundary and the Green Belt surrounding it. They also felt that the windfall allocation was disproportionate in comparison to other settlements in Shropshire using Bridgnorth as an example of using windfall provision of 7% - Shifnal's provision is 43%.

The majority of respondents did not provide any comments with their opposition.

Prospective developers and their representatives agreed with the use of windfall sites. However, they suggested that Shropshire Council should allocate a significant amount of land to relieve uncertainty arising from the high proportion of houses reliant on windfall sites coming forward.

Furthermore, Miller Homes argue that there has been limited windfall development since 2012, which is equal to 3.6 dwellings built per annum. As such, it would be prudent for the Shropshire Council to allocate further land to housing.

The following sites were suggested as alternative development options:

- Miller Homes and Wallace Land put forward a proposal to develop the areas of safeguarded land to the south and west of Shifnal for housing development with the addition of a bypass. They referred to the area as Lodge Hill.
- Beech House was also put forward as a development opportunity as it has been safeguarded for a long time and would help alleviate a reliance on windfall sites.

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 vast majority of consultees responding to questions about Shifnal Place Plan Area did not support a windfall allowance for employment. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- Shifnal Town Council's response recognises that no employment windfall sites are expected for the town.
- 'Please refer to Policy EC4, EC5 and EC6 of the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan':
 - Policy EC4 – Protection of Existing Employment Premises or Land;
 - Policy EC5 – Small-scale Employment Development; and
 - Policy EC6 – Rural Commercial Activities and Agricultural Land.
- A number of respondents did not think employment land was needed in Shifnal.
- Nervousness over whether any employment windfall sites could be used for housing after a few years of remaining undeveloped.
- Of those who agreed with the inclusion of employment windfall sites, reference was made to developing brownfield sites first.

Generally, respondents did not agree with this proposal, although some respondents identified that there was no employment windfall identified in Shifnal. However, these answers reflect the local opposition to development proposals which underpin the vast majority of responses throughout the questionnaire, not just this question.

The majority of respondents did not provide any comments with their opposition.

4. Shifnal Place Plan Area

4.1. Question 45 (a)

Question 45 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Shifnal. The vast majority of respondents did not support the proposals.

Consultees made the following comments:

- 'Please refer to Policy SL1, EC4, EC5 and EC6 of the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan'.
- Consultees felt that Telford should receive the housing and employment growth proposed for Shifnal.
- Shifnal lacks the appropriate infrastructure to deal with any further significant extensions.
- The housing targets do not reflect the Council's recognition of Shifnal as the largest 'Key Centre' in the County.
- Shifnal Town Council stated that windfall developments should be relied upon less and that the bulk of housing should fall within the existing development boundaries.
- Shifnal Town Council raised concerns over the 171% increase in employment land that has been proposed. They also highlighted discrepancies in figures in the Shifnal Place Plan Area.
- Existing infrastructure is not sufficient to support any further growth of Shifnal.
- It does not meet local needs and population growth. Furthermore, it would create a dormitory settlement and would encourage unsustainable commuting by car and rail.
- Those who agreed with the proposals stated that Shifnal's infrastructure needed to be improved.
- The scale of the guidelines risks impacting on the town's character.

- There is a lack of an up-to-date evidence base on the need for sports facilities to accommodate growth.
- Housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Shifnal. Existing employment land is adequate based on scaled back housing guideline.
- Services, such as doctors and schools are already at capacity and could not cope with further expansion.
- The town has experienced a significant level of development in recent years and it needs time to develop its infrastructure before further development can take place.
- Many respondents believed that developers and landowners are the most likely to benefit from windfall sites.

As with many of the other questions the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan was referenced by many of the consultees. There was a sense that the development boundary offered little room for development and would increase pressure on the Green Belt.

Responses demonstrated that there was a preference for housing and employment to be located in areas outside of Shifnal. The most popular alternative was Telford, but Wolverhampton was also mentioned.

Prospective developers made comments on allocating more land for housing so as not to rely on windfall sites. They believed that the proposals allow for more land to be allocated for housing to ensure windfall sites are not used.

The majority of respondents did not provide any comments with their opposition.

4.2. Question 45 (b)

Question 45 (b) asked consultees whether they agreed on the proposed development boundary for Shifnal. As with the previous Shifnal specific question the majority of respondents did not support the proposals. Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- 'Please refer to Policy SL1 of the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan'.
- Shifnal Town Council proposed the following alterations to the boundary:
 - Extend the boundary to include additional housing allocations.
 - Remove SHR032 as a preferred housing allocation and redraw the boundary accordingly.
 - Substitute preferred allocation SHF018b and SHF018d for Shifnal Town Council's preferred employment sites and redraw the boundary accordingly.
- Shifnal Town Council's proposed boundary alterations were popular amongst several responses.
- Shifnal's Green Belt is being unfairly targeted and would disappear.
- It is located in a Groundwater Management Unit where not water is available for licensing. Existing sources would need to be used. Underlying sandstone supports a strategically important source of public water supply.
- The proposed boundaries are unjustifiable as there are numerous vacant sites available for development in nearby settlements such as Telford, Wolverhampton, Dudley, Cannock and Stafford.

A similar consensus to 45 (a) was present throughout the answers in that alternative settlements, such as Telford, Stafford and Wolverhampton, were favoured options for expansion over any boundary extension to Shifnal. The Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan was also referred to many times by consultees demonstrating significant support for the document.

Developers who commented on the questionnaire did not agree with the proposed development boundary. Instead they suggested that the town should receive additional growth because it has been identified as a sustainable area for housing provision.

Many respondents, including Miller Homes, disagreed with the extension of SHF032 as it would be an isolated development on a plot of land and that it would not perform as well as other sites surrounding Shifnal.

Of those who commented, there was agreement between most respondents that the boundary needed to be redrawn. Many felt that the proposals significantly impacted on the Green Belt and Shifnal's character.

The majority of respondents did not provide any comments with their opposition.

4.3. Question 45 (c)

Question 45 (c) sought to identify whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHF022 and SHF023 in Shifnal. The majority of respondents did not agree with this allocation and made the following relevant comments:

- 'Please refer to Policy SL1 of the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan'.
- There is a lack of infrastructure at these sites and progressing with the proposals would likely cause significant traffic issues.
- The proposed sites are surplus to requirements as many houses have already been built in recent years.
- There is no convincing evidence that population growth in Shifnal and the surrounding areas justifies development of this scale. If this site is to be allocated, a high percentage of affordable starter homes should be required.
- Green Belt land would be affected by the proposals.

This question produced much of the same responses from consultees who felt that the site did not have sufficient infrastructure in place and would exacerbate traffic problems in the area. They also felt that there had been a lot of development in Shifnal in recent years and the town needed time to adjust to the increased population.

The majority of respondents did not provide any comments with their opposition.

One Consultee, however, stated that the sites are located within a key direction of growth and opportunity area. Another stated that SHR022 (assume they respondent meant SHF022) is deliverable and will be developed in conjunction with SHIF023.

4.4. Question 45 (d)

Question 45 (d) sought to identify whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHF032 in Shifnal. Respondents largely opposed the allocation. Relevant comments made by consultees included:

- 'Please refer to Policy SL1 of the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan'.
- Shifnal Town Council strongly opposed this development as it would be isolated and surrounded by Green Belt and would be isolated for a long period of time as the Green Belt is not scheduled for review until 2056.
 - Inadequate evidence given by Shropshire Council to justify the removal of Green Belt.
 - It does not represent a logical extension of the town.
- Coppice Green Lane acts as a natural boundary to Shifnal, if this site was developed it would set a precedent for development.
- Sports facilities at Isdall School, Shifnal Primary and Shifnal FC must be protected as per paragraph 97 of the NPPF.
- Coppice Green Lane already suffers from significant levels of traffic and the proposal would make matters worse.
- The Council's own evidence base demonstrates that the site does not perform as well as other sites surrounding Shifnal. The Site falls within the setting of Grade II* and Grade II listed buildings leading to heritage asset impacts.

Much like the previous questions the responses highlighted the lack of infrastructure for such a development and negative impact it would have on the Green Belt. Another comment stated that there is no convincing evidence that population growth in Shifnal and surrounding areas justifies development of this scale.

The majority of respondents did not provide any comments with their opposition.

4.5. Question 45 (e)

Question 45 (e) asked if consultees agreed with the preferred employment allocation SHF018b and SHF018d in Shifnal. Respondents were largely opposed to the proposals and made the following relevant comments:

- 'Please refer to Policy EC4, EC5 and EC6 of the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan'.

- Shifnal Town Council described the plans as illogical as they would leave land between Stanton Road and Lamledge Lane empty, thus causing a gap in development. They suggest that alternative employment land needs to be identified.
- Employment is not a major concern in Shifnal as it is largely a commuter town. There is no justification for employment allocations in Shifnal and it is isolated from the town by Green Belt.
- Employment land would be better located in the following areas:
 - Telford;
 - Halesfield;
 - Stafford Park; and
 - Wolverhampton.
- It would lead to further Green Belt encroachment.
- Commercial or employment uses represent a significant risk to strategic water supply.
- Shifnal lacked the appropriate infrastructure and this employment site would add to the pressure on the capacity of roads. Particular reference was made to the junction at Aston Road, Coppice Green Lane and Stanton Road as it already suffers from heavy traffic.

Shifnal Town Council did not understand how the significant increase of 171% of employment land had been calculated.

Reference to the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan's employment policies further demonstrated consultees preference for this policy document to be considered as part of Shropshire Council's plans for the future of Shifnal.

The majority of respondents did not provide any comments with their opposition.

4.6. Question 45 (f)

Question 45 (f) asked consultees whether they agreed on the preferred areas of safeguarded land in Shifnal. As with all of the other questions, the majority of respondents did not agree with this proposal. Consultees made the following relevant comments:

- 'Please refer to Policy SL1 and EC6 of the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan'.
- Shifnal Town Council provided a detailed response which opposed the proposals and expressed considerable concern over the loss of Green Belt land which was proposed despite little interaction with the local community.
- Development pressure is not sufficient justification for exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt. Development pressure from West Midlands conurbation might best be served by releasing land at the western edge of the Green Belt, rather than around Shifnal.
- Consideration has not been given to the presence of Telford which has new housing and industrial sites supported by better road infrastructure than Shifnal.
- SHF032 should not be a preferred allocation.
- SHF018a & P14 would adversely affect the playing fields for Hillcrest Shifnal School.
- Shifnal Town Council also questioned whether there was sufficient evidence to justify the development based on the proposed infrastructure improvements.
- The safeguarded areas will provide increased risk to the Green Belt beyond 2036.
- Concerns raised over safeguarded land being developed which would set a precedent for further development.

The proposals put forward were opposed by the bulk of respondents. The key concerns were similar to those expressed across all of the questions relating the Shifnal Place Plan Area proposals, these being the lack of appropriate infrastructure, the negative impact on Shifnal's Green Belt and the disproportionate level of development the town faced.

In a similar manner to previous questions, requests for Shropshire Council to consider the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan were the most common response received.

The majority of respondents did not provide any comments with their opposition.

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. Most respondents stated that a village within a cluster should be removed although they did not specify which village. It should be noted that there are currently no existing or proposed Community Clusters within the Shifnal Place Plan Area.

Several respondents commented on their experience of completing the questionnaire. The most common concern they raised was that they did not understand the language used in the consultation document.

The majority of comment boxes were left blank.

5.2. Question 64

Question 64 sought respondents to provide any further comments on the Consultation. This answers to this question consisted largely of consultees reiterating the points they had already made in their previous responses. The majority of those who chose to provide comments on this section commented on their concerns over the lack of reference to the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan.

Where relevant a summary of the responses to this question have been consolidated into the relevant Shifnal-specific questions.

Respondents made the following relevant comments:

- The removal of large areas of Green Belt land would significantly impact the character and setting of the town.
- Shifnal Town Council reiterated the negative impact the increased employment land would have on the Green Belt. They also raised concerns over how the employment land had increased substantially without any consultation.
- Shifnal does not possess sufficient infrastructure to support the proposals as it currently stands.
- Public services, such as schools and medical facilities, are at capacity and further development will only increase demand and apply further pressure. Many respondents stated that local schools were oversubscribed.
- Congestion in Shifnal is already a considerable problem and further development would only increase the amount of traffic on the road.
- The employment guideline is excessive and is not reflective of the town's needs.
- The town has already experienced significant levels of development in recent years and has been disproportionately targeted for housing development.
- The level of development will increase flooding in the area.

These comments demonstrate that the overwhelming majority of respondents either commented on the need for the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan to be considered or oppose the proposals entirely. Respondents were particularly concerned over the lack of reference to the Shifnal Neighbourhood Plan in the preferred sites consultation document for Shifnal's Place Plan Area.

There were several respondents who highlighted their inability to properly understand the wording used in the document and admitted that this led them to feel that the process unengaging. Many respondents also claimed that the inaccessibility of the document had meant that it had put off people they knew from engaging with the surveys.

The majority of responses were left blank.

Appendices



Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

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

A.1. Question 3

Question 3 sought views on whether respondents thought that Shropshire Council should introduce a cross-subsidy exception site policy allowing an element of open market housing to support the delivery of affordable housing. Of the unique respondents that responded to this question, who were interested in the Shifnal Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 96% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 1% 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 Shifnal Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 53% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option.
- 47% preferred a set development mix option.

It should be noted that approximately 7% of consultees responded to this question. The majority of people chose not to answer this question.

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 Shifnal Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 4% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 95% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 1% 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 Shifnal Place Plan Area, and completed this question: 3% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;

- 3% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 96% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 1% 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 45 (a)

Question 45 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Shifnal. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 1% agreed that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Shifnal;
- 98% did not agree that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Shifnal; and
- 1% don't know/ no opinion that the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Shifnal.

A.6. Question 45 (b)

Question 45 (b) asked consultees whether they agreed on the proposed development boundary for Shifnal. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 1% agreed with the development boundary for Shifnal;
- 98% did not agree with the development boundary for Shifnal; and
- 1% don't know/ no opinion with the development boundary for Shifnal.

A.7. Question 45 (c)

Question 45 (c) sought whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHF022 and SHF023 in Shifnal. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 4% agreed with this preferred housing allocation;
- 94% did not agree with this preferred housing allocation; and
- 2% know/ no opinion with this preferred housing allocation.

A.8. Question 45 (d)

Question 45 (d) sought whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHF032 in Shifnal. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 1% agreed with this preferred housing allocation;
- 97% did not agree with this preferred housing allocation; and
- 2% don't know/ no opinion with this preferred housing allocation.

A.9. Question 45 (e)

Question 45 (e) asked if consultees agreed with the preferred employment allocation SHF018b and SHF018d in Shifnal. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 1% agreed with this preferred employment allocation;
- 97% did not agree with this preferred employment allocation; and
- 2% don't know/ no opinion with this preferred employment allocation.

A.10. Question 45 (f)

Question 45 (f) asked consultees whether they agreed on the preferred areas of safeguarded land in Shifnal. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 2% agreed with the development boundary for Shifnal;
- 96% did not agree with the development boundary for Shifnal; and
- 2% don't know/ no opinion with the development boundary for Shifnal.

A.11. 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 Shifnal Place Plan Area, and completed this question: 1% agreed that a 'Community Cluster' needs to be formed;

- 70% agreed that a 'Community Cluster' needs to be removed;
- 25% do not agree 'Community Cluster' will be added or removed; and
- 4% 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