

Appendix B.16. Shropshire Council - Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation

Shrewsbury Place Plan Area

Shropshire Council

04 June 2019

Notice

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

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

This document has 40 pages including the cover.

Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Shrewsbury	JL	BN	VD	VD	29/05/2019
Rev 2.0	Final Shrewsbury	JL	JL	VD	VD	04/06/2019

Client signoff

Client	Shropshire Council	
Project	Appendix B.16. Consultation	Shropshire Council - Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites
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	9
4. Shrewsbury Place Plan Area	10
4.1. Question 46 (a)	10
4.2. Question 46 (b)	10
4.3. Question 46 (c)	11
4.4. Question 46 (d)	11
4.5. Question 46 (e)	12
4.6. Question 46 (f)	13
4.7. Question 46 (g)	13
4.8. Question 47 (a)	14
4.9. Question 47 (b)	14
4.10. Question 47 (c)	14
4.11. Question 47 (d)	15
4.12. Question 47 (e)	15
4.13. Question 48 (a)	16
4.14. Question 48 (b)	16
4.15. Question 48 (c)	16
4.16. Question 48 (d)	17
4.17. Question 48 (e)	17
4.18. Question 49 (a)	18
4.19. Question 49 (b)	18
4.20. Question 49 (c)	19
4.21. Question 49 (d)	19
4.22. Question 50 (a)	19
4.23. Question 50 (b)	20
4.24. Question 50 (c)	20
4.25. Question 50 (d)	20
4.26. Question 50 (e)	21
4.27. Question 51 (a)	21
4.28. Question 51 (b)	21
4.29. Question 51 (c)	21
4.30. Question 51 (d)	22
4.31. Question 52 (a)	22
4.32. Question 52 (b)	22
4.33. Question 53 (a)	23
4.34. Question 53 (b)	23
4.35. Question 53 (c)	23
4.36. Question 53 (d)	24

4.37.	Question 54 (a)	24
4.38.	Question 54 (b)	24
4.39.	Question 54 (c)	24
4.40.	Question 55 (a)	25
4.41.	Question 55 (b)	25
4.42.	Question 55 (c)	26
4.43.	Question 56 (a)	26
4.44.	Question 56 (b)	26
4.45.	Question 56 (c)	27
5.	Further Information	27
5.1.	Question 63	27
5.2.	Question 64	28

Appendices **30**

Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis. **31**

A.1.	Question 3	31
A.2.	Question 4	31
A.3.	Question 5	31
A.4.	Question 6	31
A.5.	Question 46 (a)	31
A.6.	Question 46 (b)	32
A.7.	Question 46 (c)	32
A.8.	Question 46 (d)	32
A.9.	Question 46 (e)	32
A.10.	Question 46 (f)	32
A.11.	Question 46 (g)	32
A.12.	Question 47 (a)	33
A.13.	Question 47 (b)	33
A.14.	Question 47 (c)	33
A.15.	Question 47 (d)	33
A.16.	Question 47 (e)	33
A.17.	Question 48 (a)	33
A.18.	Question 48 (b)	34
A.19.	Question 48 (c)	34
A.20.	Question 48 (d)	34
A.21.	Question 48 (e)	34
A.22.	Question 49 (a)	34
A.23.	Question 49 (b)	34
A.24.	Question 49 (c)	34
A.25.	Question 49 (d)	35
A.26.	Question 50 (a)	35
A.27.	Question 50 (b)	35
A.28.	Question 50 (c)	35
A.29.	Question 50 (d)	35
A.30.	Question 50 (e)	35
A.31.	Question 51 (a)	36
A.32.	Question 51 (b)	36
A.33.	Question 51 (c)	36
A.34.	Question 51 (d)	36
A.35.	Question 52 (a)	36
A.36.	Question 52 (b)	36

A.37. Question 53 (a)	37
A.38. Question 53 (b)	37
A.39. Question 53 (c)	37
A.40. Question 53 (d)	37
A.41. Question 54 (a)	37
A.42. Question 54 (b)	37
A.43. Question 54 (c)	37
A.44. Question 55 (a)	38
A.45. Question 55 (b)	38
A.46. Question 55 (c)	38
A.47. Question 56 (a)	38
A.48. Question 56 (b)	38
A.49. Question 56 (c)	38
A.50. Question 63	39

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 until 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 Shrewsbury Place Plan Area.

1. Overview

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

There were 45 questions specifically relating to the Shrewsbury Place Plan Area, the responses to this question are summarised in Section 4. Section 5 summarises the other comments raised by consultees that responded to the Shrewsbury-specific questions.

A total of 498 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 majority of respondents, who were interested in the Shrewsbury Place Plan area, opposed the policy.

The reasons for supporting a cross-subsidy exception site policy included:

- It provides a useful mechanism for delivering affordable housing.
- It encourages suitable sites to come forward due to greater certainty.
- It is in line with national planning policy.
- Allowing some market housing on these sites would help to facilitate the delivery of affordable housing.
- Financial viability of sites should be considered, and attractive returns afforded to the landowner and developer.
- The policy may enable younger people to reside in the village they grew up in.
- Site HWD005 is suitable for the cross-subsidy housing.

The key issues raised by respondents who opposed the policy included:

- Insufficient affordable housing is currently being delivered.
- The policy would be exploited by developers to deliver less affordable housing.
- The open market has failed to deliver sufficient quantities of affordable housing.
- It would be an inappropriate policy for the countryside.
- The policy should aim to provide housing that is in short supply.
- House prices will increase as a result of the policy.
- Local communities should be encouraged to decide for themselves the mix of appropriate housing.
- This may lead to increased development outside of existing development boundaries.

A smaller proportion of respondents stated 'don't know / no opinion' but declined to provide further comment.

2.2. Question 4

Question 4 sought views on whether respondents preferred (subject to viability assessment) if development mix should be assessed on a site by site basis or a set development mix, which would be geographically defined and subject to the findings of a viability assessment undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review. The vast majority of respondents, who were interested in the Shrewsbury Place Plan area, stated a preference towards a development mix which is assessed on a site by site basis.

Those respondents who indicated a preference for a set development mix provided comments which included:

- Landowners, developers, local residents and the Town Council should be fully aware of the required mix of housing before a planning application is submitted. A county-wide standard would provide certainty for all and should act as a bench mark.
- Developers should prepare site-specific viability assessments where further viability issues are present at a particular site.
- Greater certainty will allow more sites to come forward for affordable housing.
- It ensures that an appropriate amount of affordable housing is provided within the development mix.
- The intention to maximise the emphasis on local needs and delivery of affordable housing should not be sacrificed in the interests of developer profits.

The comments above can broadly be split into reasons for supporting the option and further suggestions for the policy. Support for the policy centred around certainty in terms of the set development mix, as well as the positive aspect of a geographical spread of low cost/rented and high cost private housing. Those that provided further suggestions highlighted the appropriateness and character of locations to take development and accountability of developers to provide affordable housing.

The respondents who preferred a mix based on a site-by-site assessment provided comments which included:

- It would ensure that the proposal is viable and deliverable by having consideration to the specific circumstances of the site.
- The delivery of affordable housing will be at risk if landowners and developers are not able to achieve reasonable returns.
- The minimum number of market houses needed to deliver a viable exception site in one area may be insufficient in another where market values are lower.
- Using a Neighbourhood Plan delivery model, communities that are to be affected by the proposed Local Plan will have significantly more involvement in the process of development of their communities.
- The assessment should take into account one-off costs which may be incurred on one site and not on another.
- Overarching principles should be set to ensure developers do not deliver the wrong balance of affordable and open-market homes.
- There should be a balance maintained between open market housing and affordable housing.

Support for the policy centred around site context and the requirement to make decisions based on that context. Those that provided further suggestions included taking into account the difficulty in obtaining a market value for properties and the effect this can have on delivering affordable housing.

Some respondents stated that another option should be provided as they did not agree with either of the two options proposed in the Consultation.

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 for respondents, who were interested in the Shrewsbury Place Plan area, there was a fairly even split between those that supported and opposed the windfall allowance for housing.

Respondents that supported the inclusion of a windfall allowance commented:

- It would enable the redevelopment of brownfield sites which are not preferred allocations.
- Windfall development can help fulfil the remaining housing requirements for the county as a whole.
- Many respondents stated that a windfall allowance of 20% of the overall housing guideline would be considered appropriate.

Among the supporters of including a windfall allowance for housing, many of the respondents caveated their responses with concerns and further suggestions. This included concern regarding the proportion of the housing guideline reliant on windfall sites. Several Respondents questioned whether Shropshire Council's

proportion of windfall housing is too high and suggested that further sites are allocated to ensure more certainty in housing delivery. Respondents also expressed a preference to avoid windfall development on greenfield sites. Many respondents stated the importance of the local community being consulted as part of the process. Another respondent stated that if the Local Plan seeks to protect employment land and to avoid over-development of gardens, it may have difficulty in demonstrating that its windfall development expectations are realistic.

Respondents that opposed the inclusion of a windfall allowance commented:

- Windfall should be counted in addition to the housing guideline number and should not be used to artificially raise the 5-year supply of housing.
- Developments should be carefully and logically planned for.
- All allocations should be delivered through one development site.
- Windfall development would encourage development on inappropriate sites such as greenfield sites or land in Conservation Areas.

The comments against the inclusion of a windfall allowance appear to mirror the caveats and concerns raised by the supporters.

In terms of those who did not know or had no opinion, three respondents commented that windfall development within 1 kilometre of the development boundary should be allowed and count towards a settlement's housing guideline and this should be defined in the Plan's Glossary as this would increase the scope for windfall development by creating more opportunities for development.

3.2. Question 6

Question 6 sought views on whether respondents thought that it was appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guidelines. The majority of the respondents, who were interested in the Shrewsbury Place Plan area, opposed a windfall allowance for employment development.

The reasons for support were:

- To support smaller-scale businesses in the community.
- It is appropriate to use unplanned opportunities when they arise if they comply with planning policies.
- It can provide flexibility on the delivery of employment development.
- It is a sustainable option.

Among the supporters of including a windfall allowance for employment, concern was raised regarding the potential for sites to be proposed which are outside of and separate from the development boundary. Similarly, respondents highlighted their expectation that proposals for employment windfall development must respect the surrounding area. It was also stated by many respondents that the community should be given sufficient opportunities to consult on proposals arising on windfall sites. Another suggested consideration of proposals for employment windfall development is the need to ensure the developments integrate with and are supported by increased housing provision which will both retain the existing workforce while also attracting the required workforce.

Comments which opposed the inclusion of a windfall allowance for employment included:

- Windfall development should be counted in addition to the employment guideline numbers.
- Windfall should not be used to artificially raise the 5-year supply as it is unlikely to comply with the NPPF delivery test requirements.
- There is no employment guideline to fill.
- There are few employment opportunities.
- Employment sites usually require infrastructure to enable its delivery.
- Uncertainty as to how building windfall development sites will deliver long term employment opportunities.
- Neighbourhood Plans better inform the community of issues.

A smaller proportion of respondents stated 'don't know / no opinion'. Comments from these respondents included issues such as there being no employment guidelines as there is no significant employment provision and significant commuting takes place. Some respondents stated confusion relating to the meaning of the

question. Some stated that they were in favour as long as adequate consultation with the community takes place.

4. Shrewsbury Place Plan Area

4.1. Question 46 (a)

Question 46 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Shrewsbury. Most respondents stated 'don't know / no opinion' on the subject. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposed guidelines.

Those who agreed with the housing and employment guidelines provided comments which included:

- Shrewsbury is Shropshire's most sustainable location with excellent road, rail and bus transport, a wide range of employment opportunities, and a high-quality environment.
- Support for Shrewsbury's continued role as the strategic focus for the county's growth.

Among the comments stating support were concerns and caveats relating to the need for caution in applying the figures in a flexible manner. Consideration of neighbouring properties and infrastructure was highlighted as a requirement by a number of respondents, as was the requirement for development to be sustainable and enhance green infrastructure and connectivity.

Opposition to the housing and employment guidelines included concerns that:

- The guideline is too high.
- Insufficient employment land is proposed and should be significantly increased to consider growth in the storage and distribution sector post Brexit.
- There is an over-reliance on windfall development in Shrewsbury, given the residual requirement for dwellings.
- Existing infrastructure and services are at capacity.
- Housing development should not take place on greenfield sites or areas at risk of flooding.
- The 'high growth' strategy for both the county and the county town is not appropriate to the area's needs.
- Recent developments have been intensive and detrimental to the character of the area therefore the Council needs to consider the existing character of the area.

It was suggested that focusing on high density and affordable urban housing would help to avoid the need for more low density, car-based developments.

In terms of those who stated, 'don't know / no opinion', key comments related to the view that the methodology for determining the employment requirements of Shrewsbury was over-simplified and failed to recognise a number of significant factors, including the size, economic growth aspirations and employment needs of Shrewsbury. Another comment referred to the risk that the housing requirement of the Preferred Strategy will not be met due to a substantial reliance upon windfall developments. Another respondent stated that additional assessment of flood risk on the Severn should be undertaken in agreement with the Environment Agency.

4.2. Question 46 (b)

Question 46 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Shrewsbury. Most respondents disagreed with the proposed development boundary.

Those who agreed with the proposed development boundary for Shrewsbury provided comments including:

- It correctly excludes the undeveloped fields around the town, preserving biodiversity and community assets.
- It includes preferred site allocations and opportunities for windfall development and will contribute towards the housing requirement for Shrewsbury.
- Development should be restricted to the area bounded by the A5, A49 and the proposed new North West Relief Road.

Respondents disagreed with the proposed development boundary for Shrewsbury on the basis that:

- Little consideration has been given to loss of green space and habitats.
- The existing boundary should remain unchanged.

- The boundary should only be extended in exceptional circumstances.
- Extension of the town by 300 houses and the Northern relief road (SHR216) is undesirable for residents and is not contained in the 'Shrewsbury Big Town Plan'.
- The boundary should be redrawn to allow greater opportunity to deliver against the windfall allowance and/or to reflect one or more of a range of other sites promoted by respondents.
- The proposed development boundary will encourage over-development to the north of Shrewsbury and impact on the wider landscape and access to the countryside and the Severn Way.
- The development boundary would encourage development on unsustainable sites with a lack of infrastructure.
- Various alternative sites were proposed by respondents to be included in the development boundary, with the Proposed Northern Relief Road particularly seen as a mechanism which could open up the north-west of Shrewsbury for development.
- Development boundaries prevent housing supply and prevent sustainable sites coming forward.

Of the respondents who stated; 'don't know / no opinion', a key response stated that there is a need to consider the provision of additional, unconstrained and deliverable employment land and that this should be included within the proposed development boundary.

4.3. Question 46 (c)

Question 46 (c) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred mixed-use allocation SHR158/SHR060/SHR161. The majority of the respondents who gave a response indicated they did not have an opinion or did not know. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Those who agreed with the preferred housing allocations SHR158/SHR060/SHR161 did so on the basis that:

- The existing vehicular access from the main road / town centre is good.
- White Island should also be included in the allocation.
- The allocation needs to be supported by infrastructure and services which need to be provided before completion of the development.

Those who disagreed with the allocations SHR158/SHR060/SHR161 provided comments including:

- The Council's Sustainability Appraisal score for the three sites came to -15. This leads to questions over whether the sites should be allocated for potential future development.
- It would result in the loss of habitat and community greenspace.
- There was concern over deliverability due to multiple ownership.
- Existing public services facilities are at capacity;
- It would exacerbate existing pollution.
- It would result in the urbanisation of the A5 gateway to the town and the loss of rural amenity for locals living in the west of Shrewsbury.
- Little co-ordination of employment and housing sites or any strategy to reduce travel-to-work journey distances.
- Over-development of the site in order to achieve maximum developer profit.
- Due to its size it requires masterplanning and integration with the Big Town Plan.
- Alternative sites, such as SHR187, SHR027 and SHR063 should be preferred allocations instead.

The majority of those who stated 'don't know / no opinion' generally provided no further comments. However, one respondent suggested this site demonstrated a significant over-reliance on a small number of large sites to achieve the housing guideline. Another stated that there is no reference to playing field provision and no clear proposals to meet the needs of this development for sports facilities.

4.4. Question 46 (d)

Question 46 (d) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR057(part)/SHR177 in Shrewsbury. The majority of the respondents indicated they did not have an opinion or did not know. The remaining respondents indicated a mixture of agreement and disagreement with the proposal.

Those who agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR057(part)/SHR177 in Shrewsbury provided comments such as:

- The site is deliverable as early as 2020.
- The proposals should include a green corridor along the length of the existing PRow
- A buffer zone adjacent to the A5 Bypass should be employed.

However, others who agreed expressed concern and reluctance over the development, including:

- There are existing congestion issues which further development would exacerbate.
- Existing infrastructure is not adequate and the preferred allocations should make provision for infrastructure improvements.
- Due to its size the site requires masterplanning and integration with the Big Town Plan.

Those who disagreed with the allocation SHR057(part)/SHR177 provided comments including:

- There will be increased traffic and pollution from increased vehicles using local roads.
- There was concern over deliverability due to multiple ownership.
- Existing public facilities and services are at capacity.
- Rural amenity land should be retained.
- The housing density is too high.
- The housing density is too low.
- The sites are too small to create a community.
- Various species will be adversely affected as a result of the development.

The majority of those who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment. However, one comment referenced the approach within the Preferred Sites consultation represents a significant over-reliance on a small number of large sites to achieve the required level of housing delivery.

4.5. Question 46 (e)

Question 46 (e) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR216. The majority of the respondents who gave a response indicated they did not have an opinion or did not know. Of the remaining respondents the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Those who agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR216 provided the following comments:

- This site will help deliver a crucial section of the North West Relief Road, between the Oxon Link Road and the River Severn.
- It is a strategic location for new development and particularly housing.
- A development which includes new infrastructure and public open space is encouraged.

Those who disagreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR216 provided the following comments:

- The number of houses proposed is too high.
- It is contrary to national and local planning policy and the national environmental strategy.
- Proposed housing density is too low.
- There is insufficient capacity in existing secondary schools.
- Increased congestion is a concern.
- The site is too small to create a community.
- Housing development on the site represents a significant risk to the strategic water supply.
- The site has significant access constraints being dependent on a roundabout and link road which is still subject to planning.
- It is not a sustainable site, it has high landscape and visual sensitivity and contains important existing strategic infrastructure. It is the least sustainable site in Shrewsbury according to the Sustainability Appraisal.
- It has important habitat value and is next to the Shelton Rough SSSI.
- The site is located within a source protection zone, this has implications for water quality and supply.

- Sites should be chosen on housing grounds and not as an indirect way to achieve a different purpose.

The majority of those who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment. However, one comment referenced the approach within the Preferred Sites consultation represents a significant over-reliance on a small number of large sites to achieve the required level of housing delivery. Another stated that there is potential for on-site provision of sport and recreation facilities to meet the needs of the development. This should be included in the allocation to ensure developers are clear on expectations.

4.6. Question 46 (f)

Question 46 (f) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR145 in Shrewsbury. The majority of the respondents who provided a response indicated they did not have an opinion or did not know. The remaining respondents indicated a mixture of agreement and disagreement with the proposal.

Those who agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR145 in Shrewsbury and provided comment, indicated that the site is situated in an already developed area which is well suited to further development and the location provides one of the better opportunities for development. In addition, the would-be developer stated that the site is highly deliverable and could quickly come forward for development. Another respondent stated that the congestion of Hereford Way should be addressed through development.

Those who disagreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR145 stated:

- Otley Road is not suited to high levels of vehicle movements likely to arise from the allocation of this site for housing.
- Noise and air pollution from surrounding dual carriageways and the railway line would affect any future development at this site.
- Not a suitable site for care/assisted living as it is isolated from key community infrastructure.
- The site would be better suited to employment land.
- Infrastructure should be improved before major development occurs, such as the road network, education provision and health services.

The majority of those who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment. However, one comment referenced the approach within the Preferred Sites consultation represents a significant over-reliance on a small number of large sites to achieve the required level of housing delivery. Another stated that there is potential for on-site provision of sport and recreation facilities to meet the needs of the development. This should be included in the allocation to ensure developers are clear on expectations.

4.7. Question 46 (g)

Question 46 (g) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred employment allocation SHR166 in Shrewsbury. The questionnaire referred to site as a housing allocation. A number of respondents noted this in their response; however, it may have affected how some responded. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Those who agreed with the preferred employment allocation SHR166 in Shrewsbury provided the following responses:

- The site benefits from good access to the A5 and M54 and is a sensible location for employment development.
- There is scope for a phased development if either SHR199 or SHR026 was considered as an additional allocation.
- The strategy for employment land delivery must be integrated with and supported by housing development which will both retain existing and attract new workers.

Those who disagreed with the preferred employment allocation SHR166 in Shrewsbury stated:

- The site is Grade 2 Best and Most Versatile agricultural land.
- The site is isolated and has limited vehicular access from the town. Development would generate unnecessarily long car journeys for employees.
- The site is located in the Flood Plain.
- The river will be a barrier to accessibility to the town.

- Existing public transport links are insufficient.
- This development would sterilise an opportunity to link rural communities more closely to the rail network.
- The site encroaches beyond the development boundary.
- All other land within existing development boundaries should be developed prior to development in open countryside.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment.

4.8. Question 47 (a)

Question 47 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Baschurch as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with the proposal.

Those who agreed with the identification of Baschurch as a Community Hub provided the following responses:

- The identification of Baschurch as a Community Hub and therefore the provision of planned housing up to 2036 will help secure the future of the settlement going forward.
- Baschurch has ample facilities to accommodate the sites identified as preferred options.

One respondent who opposed the identification of Baschurch as a Community Hub stated that there are no clear advantages for the village and it overburdens existing infrastructure. Another stated that the settlement lacks certain public services and employment opportunities, therefore it does not meet the definition of a 'Community Hub'.

Most respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment. However, one responded stated that adequate drainage, water supply, fuel provision and assessment of and mitigation for flood risk are considerations for the deliverability of developments in Baschurch. Another respondent stated that future housing growth in Baschurch should be carefully controlled and development should be closer to the centre of the village.

4.9. Question 47 (b)

Question 47 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Baschurch. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion on whether they agreed with the preferred housing guideline. Of the remaining respondents the majority did not agree with the guideline.

Those who agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Baschurch stated:

- Future developments should use the 'Right Home, Right Place' housing needs analysis to deliver an appropriate mix of dwellings.
- Guideline figures should be treated as minimum figures.
- There is strong demand in the local area for market housing.

On the contrary, respondents who opposed the housing guideline generally did so on the basis that the guideline is too low. Respondents stated that:

- A marginally higher number would be reasonable.
- The existing development boundary is too restrictive.
- Baschurch is capable of supporting further housing outside the existing / proposed development boundary.

However, some respondents did oppose the guideline because of its potential impact on roads and public services.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.10. Question 47 (c)

Question 47 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Baschurch. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion on whether they agreed with the proposed development boundary. Of the remaining respondents the majority disagreed with the proposed development boundary.

Of the respondents who supported the development boundary, comments consisted of:

- Growth should be focused around the centre of the village as development outside the boundary will deliver isolated pockets of housing situated away from the main residential hub of the village.
- The proposed boundary provides opportunities for the growth of the village to meet the needs of younger and older residents, to retain a balanced community in the village.

On the contrary, respondents who opposed the development boundary raised concerns that:

- It should be revised to incorporate alternative, unconstrained and deliverable sites from those which currently form preferred allocations.
- The village should not expand further to the west due to impacts on the natural springs, the landscape and the River Perry.
- Employment sites usually require infrastructure to enable its delivery. Allocation of employment sites will provide certainty to landowners to invest in infrastructure.
- The boundary is too restrictive.
- It has failed to include a permissioned site on Station Road.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment. However, one respondent stated that the boundary is located in a Groundwater Management Unit where no water is available for licensing or licensing is restricted. Existing sources would need to be used.

4.11. Question 47 (d)

Question 47 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BNP024 in Baschurch. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. The remaining respondents indicated a mixture of agreement and disagreement with the preferred allocation.

Respondents who supported the allocation, did so on the basis that:

- Additional land is required for a new medical practice and additional facilities.
- It forms a natural extension of the recent development by Galliers' Homes on the adjoining site to the west. The site is within a short walking distance of all village facilities.
- The development would contribute to the vitality of the village, extending the range and choice of housing available and supporting local services, as well as provide generous amounts of public open space.

Some respondents agreed with the allocation but expressed concerns over the suitability of the narrow lane to access the site.

Respondents who opposed the allocation raised concerns that:

- The village should not expand further to the west due to impacts on the natural springs, the landscape and the River Perry.
- The site offers no additional community benefit.
- The site is too remote from the core facilities in Baschurch.
- The proposal will increase traffic pressure on Shrewsbury Road.
- It would result in the loss of greenfield land.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.12. Question 47 (e)

Question 47 (e) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BNP035 in Baschurch. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion on the preferred housing allocation BNP035. The remaining respondents indicated a mixture of agreement and disagreement with the preferred allocation.

Respondents who supported the allocation and provided comments, stated that the site:

- Is a logical site within the development boundary.
- Adjacent to existing housing.
- Is available in the immediate term.

Some respondents agreed with the allocation but highlighted the need for highway improvements and queried transport impacts associated with the number of additional vehicles. A concern was also raised about the allocation being greenfield land.

Respondents who opposed the allocation raised concerns that the site:

- Encroaches on open countryside.
- Development should be kept to the west of the unclassified county road running to the east of the village.
- Is too remote from the core facilities of the settlement.
- Would increase traffic pressure on the Shrewsbury Road.
- Is greenfield land.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment. However, one respondent stated that justification is required for the loss of the playing field as per NPPF paragraph 97 and if provided, mitigation for loss is required as per the NPPF.

4.13. Question 48 (a)

Question 48 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Bayston Hill as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the identification of Bayston Hill as a Community Hub, comments included:

- Existing facilities and services in Bayston Hill can facilitate the development.
- It is in a strategically important location to the south of Shrewsbury with excellent public transport links.

In contrast, respondents who opposed the identification of Bayston Hill as a Community Hub did so on the basis of the following concerns:

- There are inadequate facilities and infrastructure.
- Bayston Hill is a rural village and does not have good roads linking it to other local settlements.
- Existing issues with on-street parking would be exacerbated.
- Fear of crime and anti-social behaviour.

The majority of respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment, although one respondent stated that existing facilities are at capacity and cannot accommodate further development.

4.14. Question 48 (b)

Question 48 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bayston Hill. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the preferred housing guideline.

Respondents who agreed with the housing guideline, did so with caveats including the guideline should not be considered as a maximum total.

Respondents who opposed the housing guideline raised concerns that:

- The existing services/facilities/amenities are already over-stretched.
- The need for the village's character to be enhanced by and protected from the housing guideline.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.15. Question 48 (c)

Question 48 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred development boundary for Bayston Hill. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the development boundary, one respondent stated that it maintains a green gap between Meole Brace and the South East slope of the Rea Brook Valley, preserving the valley.

Respondents who opposed the development boundary raised concerns that:

- The boundary should be extended as Bayston Hill is the most sustainable location for growth of all the settlements identified as Community Hubs.

- Housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Bayston Hill.
- Alternative, unconstrained and deliverable sites should be identified for housing development and included within the proposed development boundary of Bayston Hill.
- The proposed development boundary will encourage development at a level which is likely to exacerbate capacity issues in existing services, facilities and infrastructure.
- Extending the boundary, especially on attractive countryside/farmland, and so close to a Country Park, should be avoided.
- The concept of development boundaries tend to depress the supply of housing and prevent sustainable sites from coming forward.
- The existing boundary to the south of the village should be retained to protect the rural country park around Lyth Hill and to maintain a sustainable area of agricultural land.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.16. Question 48 (d)

Question 48 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BAY039 in Bayston Hill. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, a comment of support for the provision of green space within the preferred allocation was provided. Another promoted site BAY029 for housing development in conjunction with the preferred allocation.

On the contrary, respondents who opposed the allocation raised concerns that:

- The site is located beyond the current development boundary.
- The level of traffic arising from development on surrounding unsuitable roads including Lyth Road.
- Additional traffic will deter non-motorised users accessing the Country Park.
- The site doesn't accord with the aspiration of the Bayston Hill Community Led Plan (2028) which desires small housing sites spread around the village and retention of the gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury.
- The site is remote from and has poor road access to most of the existing facilities in Bayston Hill.
- Better alternative sites exist at the area to the northwest of BAY039.
- Planning permission has already been refused for good reasons.
- Would result in the loss of greenfield land.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.17. Question 48 (e)

Question 48 (e) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BAY050 in Bayston Hill. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, comments included:

- Support for the sustainable use of a brownfield site.
- The numbers of houses proposed, together with the delivery of a Community Hub is in line with the Bayston Hill Parish Council's aspirations.
- There is good access to the site and it is walking distance from facilities.
- Redevelopment of the old school site will enhance the area and create homes for families.

Of the respondents who agreed with the housing guideline, some comments included caveats such as the importance of provision of green space onsite and the need for adequate opportunities for community participation in developing the plans. Respondents advised that the site should provide a mix of houses including affordable homes and homes for older people. Support for the demolition of Oakland School was provided.

On the contrary, respondents who opposed the allocation raised concerns that:

- The development of the site would result in the loss of a playing field in the centre of the village.

- Constitutes over-intensification of the village and loss of character contrary to the Bayston Hill community priorities identified in the Shrewsbury Place Plan.
- Loss of green space and impacts on resident's mental wellbeing.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment. However, one comment stated that the allocation involves the loss of playing fields but no proposals for mitigation are provided.

4.18. Question 49 (a)

Question 49 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Bicton as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with this proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the identification of Bicton as a Community Hub, comments included:

- Bicton is a sustainable place for future housing development. It's proximity and links to Shrewsbury further enhances the sustainability of the location.
- It should form a joint Community Hub with Four Crosses with a joint development boundary.
- Bicton should be classed as a 'Community Cluster'.
- It is important that the Council's preferred spatial strategy and housing distribution recognises the needs of both urban and rural communities.

In contrast, respondents who opposed the Community Hub raised concerns that:

- Bicton is unsuitable as a Community Hub.
- The growth associated with the Community Hub status would erode the green space between Shrewsbury and Bicton.
- The local population have not been adequately consulted on the matter.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment. However, one comment stated that adequate drainage, water supply, fuel provision and assessment of and mitigation for flood risk are considerations for the deliverability of developments in Bicton.

4.19. Question 49 (b)

Question 49 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bicton. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the housing guideline, one respondent stated that small-scale cross subsidy exception sites should not form part of the guideline. Housing commitments through extant planning permissions in Bicton mean that future development should be limited in size and to infill development only. Another stated that the windfall allocation is very high for Bicton and will amount to overdevelopment unless a joint status with Four Crosses is allowed.

Respondents who opposed the housing guideline raised concerns that:

- The population of Four Crosses is wrongly included in the total population for Bicton and the number of new dwellings should be decreased as it would negatively impact the small village.
- Existing schools are near to capacity and couldn't accommodate the housing guideline.
- Housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Bicton.
- For the Council to maximize housing delivery the widest possible range of sites is required in order to offer the widest possible range of products.
- It is important for Bicton to retain its rural character. If Bicton is made a Community Hub, then in effect it will be 'urban sprawl' from Shrewsbury.
- Bicton could accommodate additional dwellings beyond those currently proposed.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.20. Question 49 (c)

Question 49 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bicton. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the proposed development boundary for Bicton, one Respondent stated that, the development boundary should be extended to enable an increased housing guideline and suggested the boundary around preferred allocation 'BIT022' could be extended.

On the contrary, respondents who oppose the development boundary raised concerns that:

- The boundary is drawn too tightly, considering the over reliance on windfall development to meet the guideline.
- The additional village entry as part of BIT022 has not been delivered.
- It is too restrictive and prevents development proposals of appropriate size and good site layout.
- BIT023 should be considered for inclusion within the development boundary.
- It is important for Bicton to retain its rural character. If Bicton is made a Community Hub, then in effect it will be 'urban sprawl' from Shrewsbury.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment. However, one respondent stated that the boundary is located in a Groundwater Management Unit where no water is available for licensing or licensing is restricted.

4.21. Question 49 (d)

Question 49 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BIT022 in Bicton. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, comments included:

- Traffic implications have not been considered, particularly consideration of increased traffic following implementation of North West Relief Road and Oxon Link Road. Access to The Oval via Woodside should be considered instead.
- Opportunity to create new highways access to Bicton must be delivered as part of this development. A respondent suggests a T-junction off the B4380 and open space next to the Qube (a dwelling) extending to the B4380.
- The suggested highways improvements would leave room for infill between the Qube and BIT022 which may be necessary to meet the requirement.
- The site extends to 1.8 hectares and could accommodate up to 50 dwellings. There is direct access to the B4380. Should Bicton be earmarked for greater growth, this allocated site could be extended further north.
- Allocation preferred if site provides bungalows and smaller houses for locals. Housing should respond to character and rural setting.

On the contrary, respondents who opposed the allocation raised concerns that:

- BIT023 should be considered to be included within the development boundary as the preferred site. This site benefits from full title and is immediately available for development.
- The Council should provide some headroom within its overall Housing Land Supply. Housing Land Supply should not be planned to minimum with no flexibility to respond to changing circumstances.
- Expanding Shrewsbury towards Bicton village and expanding Bicton village towards Shrewsbury will seriously erode the green/rural nature of the space to the detriment of Shrewsbury and Bicton.
- The site is in proximity to the river and greenfield sites.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.22. Question 50 (a)

Question 50 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Bomere Heath as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the identification of Bomere Heath as a Community Hub, comments included:

- Community Hub status could improve the village by providing opportunities for new areas of public open space.
- There is a lack of employment opportunities locally so further housing development will turn the village into a dormitory settlement to Shrewsbury.

Respondents who opposed the Community Hub mostly declined to provide further comment. However, one comment stated that the settlement lacks certain public services and employment opportunities, therefore it does not meet the definition of a 'Community Hub'

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.23. Question 50 (b)

Question 50 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bomere Heath. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the housing guideline, one respondent stated that there is strong demand in the local area for new homes that will support at least 110 dwellings, or more.

Of the respondents who opposed the housing guideline, one respondent stated that there is no secondary school provision in Bomere Heath, which would increase the need to travel and therefore result in increased traffic and pollution from journeys to Shrewsbury schools. Another stated that it is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a housing guideline.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.24. Question 50 (c)

Question 50 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bomere Heath. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the development boundary, comments consisted of:

- The direction of growth is naturally to the south, in the direction of the Leaton Industrial Estate which provides local employment opportunities on 22 let units. There is a very wide range of businesses on the Industrial Estate.
- Although it seems to constitute a natural expansion, it encroaches on to greenfield sites.

On the contrary, of the respondents who opposed the proposed development boundary, one comment suggested that development boundaries artificially depress the supply of housing and prevent sustainable sites from coming forward. Another stated that it is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development, it should not have a revised development boundary.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment. However, one comment stated that it is located in a Groundwater Management Unit where no water is available for licensing or licensing is restricted.

4.25. Question 50 (d)

Question 50 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BOM019 in Bomere Heath. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion but declined to provide further comments. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, one respondent stated that the allocation forms a natural extension of Galliers Homes recent development of 34 dwellings on the adjoining site and will be accessed through the existing development site to its north. There are no technical difficulties and it provides an opportunity for Bomere Heath to benefit from a well-designed site that will deliver a suitable mix of housing with attractive areas of public open space, better linking the village with its leisure and employment opportunities.

On the contrary, respondents who opposed the allocation proposed alternative sites for consideration in Question 64 of the questionnaire. Another respondent stated that there is no secondary school provision in Bomere Heath which would increase the need to travel and therefore result in increased traffic and pollution from journeys to Shrewsbury schools. Another comment stated that it is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a housing allocation.

4.26. Question 50 (e)

Question 50 (e) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BOM020 in Bomere Heath. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, one respondent stated that it forms a natural extension to BOM019 and provides certainty for the direction of growth for the village over the longer term. The landowner advised that an option agreement is in place with the would-be developer and that a planning application will be forthcoming shortly after allocation.

Respondents who opposed the allocation raised alternative sites to be considered in Question 64 of the questionnaire. Another comment stated that it is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a housing allocation.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.27. Question 51 (a)

Question 51 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Cross Houses as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents either disagreed or stated that they did not know / had no opinion.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, one stated that it is a sustainable settlement with a good range of services and local employment. Another respondent caveated their support with the condition that transport infrastructure improvements, namely walking / cycling routes, are provided to Shrewsbury.

Respondents who opposed the identification of Cross Houses as a Community Hub raised concerns that:

- The hierarchy of settlements scoring system is not fit for purpose. Cross Houses is not sustainable as there are no services or facilities.
- The village is too small and the points system for the garage/ post office gives an inflated view of what the village has to offer.
- Objection to the hierarchy of settlements scoring and how a Mobile Library scores the same as a permanent library building. The scoring is deemed unfair.
- It would increase the process of development along the A458.
- Public transport provision is inadequate and unreliable.
- Local residents were not adequately consulted on Community Hub status.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.28. Question 51 (b)

Question 51 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cross Houses. Most of the respondents either disagreed or stated that they did not know / had no opinion.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, one respondent suggested an opportunity for the development to deliver a cycle route along the old railway. Another stated that the 78 dwellings already built/ given consent since 2016 demonstrates Cross Houses has delivered its housing guideline.

On the contrary, respondents who opposed the housing guideline raised concerns that:

- There is no secondary school provision in Cross Houses which will increase traffic and pollution from journeys to Shrewsbury schools.
- It is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a housing guideline.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.29. Question 51 (c)

Question 51 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Cross Houses. Most of the respondents either disagreed or stated that they did not know / had no opinion.

Respondents who supplemented their support for the allocation with a specific comment were limited. One respondent supported the compact development boundary. Another stated that CSH004 is a good location for growth without the need for the boundary to be extended and allows for safer joining of the development to the roads.

In contrast, several concerns were raised by respondents who opposed the development boundary:

- Development boundaries artificially depress the supply of housing and prevent sustainable sites from coming forward.
- It is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development, it should not have a revised development boundary.
- Development should be restricted and only allowed to the south of village, in order to avoid coalescence with Shrewsbury's southern fringe.
- The proposed boundary and allocation of CSH004 will result in a confined development on a very small site on village edge, abrutting the village edge.
- There is not enough information on the duration the proposed development boundary would remain unchanged.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.30. Question 51 (d)

Question 51 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation CSH004 in Cross Houses. Most of the respondents either disagreed or stated that they did not know / had no opinion.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, one respondent stated that it delivers the lowest number of houses and it gives a compact boundary around the village. Another respondent identified the site as a good location for growth without the need for the boundary to be extended.

A respondent suggested the site should only be developed if the old railway is incorporated into the proposals and provided as a cycle path.

Reasons for objection to the allocation were mostly limited to the potential increase in traffic on the A49. Another comment stated that it is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment. However, one stated that although the housing allocation can produce an attractive, village edge development and protect historic former railway station, it cannot support 40 dwellings.

4.31. Question 52 (a)

Question 52 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Dorrington as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the identification of Dorrington as a Community Hub, one comment stated that it is an important settlement with other Community Clusters in the locality.

Comments of opposition to the designation of Dorrington as a Community Hub were limited; one comment outlined major concerns over the suitability of the road network around the village to safely cope with expansion on the scale of development proposed.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.32. Question 52 (b)

Question 52 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Dorrington. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

With the exception of several respondents who promoted alternative sites for development, no respondents provided comments to accompany their support for the housing guideline.

Respondents opposed to the housing guideline raised concerns that:

- The lack of secondary school provision in Dorrington would result in increased traffic and pollution from journeys to Shrewsbury schools.
- A further 100 houses would place an unreasonable burden on existing infrastructure, would significantly increase the volume of traffic joining / leaving the A49 within the village and would completely change the character of Dorrington.
- Inadequate guideline given the demand for housing in Dorrington.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.33. Question 53 (a)

Question 53 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Ford as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the Community Hub, one respondent commented that Ford is a sustainable village with the potential of growth.

Opposition to Community Hub status was made on the basis that:

- Ford is not a sustainable community and should be identified as a Community Cluster.
- Ford is already overdeveloped, there is insufficient and poorly/dangerously located public services and there are inadequate public transport links.
- Ford should be designated as Open Countryside with restrictions on housing development.

Those who stated 'don't know / no opinion' gave the following relevant responses:

- Poor public transport links;
- A lack of services, facilities and a community centre in the village.
- Existing village services are poor, yet the settlement still score highly in the Hierarchy of Settlements scoring.

4.34. Question 53 (b)

Question 53 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Ford. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Support for the housing guideline came on the basis that:

- Provided the guideline is delivered as well-planned developments, of good design in order to enhance the village's image as the gateway into Shrewsbury from the west.
- Traffic considerations at Butt Lane and the primary school are dealt with through the planning process.

On the contrary, respondents who opposed the housing guideline raised concerns that:

- It is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a housing guideline.
- There is no secondary school provision in Ford which will result in increased traffic and pollution from journeys to Shrewsbury schools.
- The guideline is too large and development of this scale will have congestion and road safety implications.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.35. Question 53 (c)

Question 53 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ford. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the proposed development boundary, one respondent stated that it is the same/similar to that established by the Ford Conservation Area Boundary.

Respondents made the following comments of objection:

- It is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a revised development boundary.
- Chavel should be included within the boundary.
- Housing should avoid the A458 due to highway safety concerns associated with accessing the site from the A458.
- The development boundary should be redrawn to exclude the allocation FRD011, which would then allow development in Ford to comprise of infilling only.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.36. Question 53 (d)

Question 53 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation FRD011 in Ford. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, comments consisted of:

- Community benefits could be delivered.
- Road safety concerns for school children must be addressed.
- Existing road and drainage issues in Ford should be addressed as part of the development of FRD011.

One respondent who opposed the preferred allocation raised concerns that the proposed site FRD011 lies adjacent to the A458. Another stated that it is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a revised development boundary.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment. Respondent

4.37. Question 54 (a)

Question 54 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Hanwood as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, one respondent suggested that Hanwood is a sustainable place for housing development and its proximity to Shrewsbury further enhances this.

Respondents who opposed the Community Hub mostly declined to provide further comment. However, one respondent stated that the settlement lacks certain employment opportunities and public services, therefore it does not meet the definition of a 'Community Hub'.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.38. Question 54 (b)

Question 54 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hanwood. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. The remaining respondents provided a mixture of agreement and disagreement on this proposal.

There were no key issues raised by respondents who supported the housing guideline.

Opposition to the preferred housing guideline was based on concerns that:

- The Council is allocating insufficient sites to meet the Preferred Development Strategy housing requirement. Housing Land Supply should not be planned to be a minimum with no flexibility to respond to changing circumstances.
- It is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a housing guideline.
- Headroom within the overall housing land supply should be provided as contingency.
- The guideline fails to capitalise on the strategic location of Hanwood and should be increased.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment. Respondent

4.39. Question 54 (c)

Question 54 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Hanwood. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. The remaining respondents provided a mixture of agreement and disagreement on this proposal.

Of the respondents who agreed with the proposed development boundary, one respondent expressed support that the boundary would prevent coalescence with surrounding communities.

Respondents who disagreed with the proposed development boundary raised concerns that:

- It is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a housing guideline.
- The development boundaries artificially depress the supply of housing and prevent sustainable sites from coming forward.

- The boundary should be extended west to include the school, recreation ground and the current SAMDev Plan housing allocation.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment. Respondent

4.40. Question 55 (a)

Question 55 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Longden as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with this proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the Community Hub, comments included:

- It is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a housing guideline.
- Longden has a range of facilities and amenities that make it a sustainable settlement.
- There is no secondary school provision in Longden which will result in increased traffic and pollution from journeys to Shrewsbury schools.
- The existing development boundary would need to be extended to enable the scale of development arising from Community Hub designation.

In contrast, respondents who opposed the Community Hub expressed concerns that:

- Longden has insufficient infrastructure capacity, an inadequate road network and a lack of employment opportunities and should remain a Community Cluster settlement.
- The Hierarchy of Settlements scoring is incorrect. An infrequent mobile library service, a closed pub and an oversubscribed school should not be awarded points
- The rural character of Longden will be impacted by growth associated with Community Hub status.
- Congestion will occur resulting from a lack of road capacity.
- Existing public transport could not cope with the growth associated with Community Hub status.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.41. Question 55 (b)

Question 55 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Longden. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with this proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the housing guideline, comments consisted of caveated responses such as:

- Support providing there is no further development approved during the plan period to 2036.

Respondents who opposed the preferred housing guideline raised a variety of concerns:

- It is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a housing guideline.
- The evidence base identifying the need for 50 additional houses is not clear.
- The existing highway network is at capacity.
- There are insufficient employment opportunities in the settlement.
- Recent development in Longden has resulted in school and healthcare services being at capacity.
- Development should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, with new development growing organically.
- The guideline has increased significantly since compared to that within the SAMDev Plan. Concern that the guideline will increase this much at each review of the Local Plan.
- The housing guideline is low and a higher figure is recommended to ensure suitable growth to support the facilities in the village.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment. One respondent stated that they had a concern for impacts of this level of growth on the character of the settlement and quality of the local environment, as well as the capacity of the road network and amenities.

4.42. Question 55 (c)

Question 55 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Longden. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with this proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, comments included:

- A boundary is important to prevent development sprawling onto greenfield sites.
- Development proposals on sites outside of this boundary should not be considered.

Respondents who provided opposition to the proposed development boundary did so on the basis of concerns that:

- It is not a suitable or sustainable location for significant rural development and it should not have a housing guideline.
- It should be drawn more tightly to prevent ribbon development.
- The proposed development boundary would encourage a scale of development which the existing facilities in the village could not support.
- The existing development boundary should not be amended (it should be noted that Longden does not currently have a development boundary).
- Development boundaries artificially depress the supply of housing and prevent sustainable sites from coming forwards.
- The local community should be offered the opportunity to input into the decision over which greenfield sites are included in the boundary.
- Preferred allocations should be included within the development boundary.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' declined to provide further comment.

4.43. Question 56 (a)

Question 56 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Nesscliffe as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority agreed with this proposal.

Respondents in support of Community Hub status commented:

- Nesscliffe is a key local settlement with good access to the highway network and hosts a range of supporting services and facilities.
- Nesscliffe is a sustainable place to support future housing development given its situation between Shrewsbury and Oswestry.

The respondents who stated disagreed with the proposal declined to provide further comment to support their opinions.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment. However, one respondent stated that Nesscliffe is already overdeveloped and there is insufficient levels of public services to accommodate further development. Another stated that adequate drainage, water supply, fuel provision and assessment of and mitigation for flood risk are considerations for the deliverability of developments in Nesscliffe.

4.44. Question 56 (b)

Question 56 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Nesscliffe. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion.

The respondents who supported the allocation declined to provide further comment.

Respondents who opposed the guideline raised concerns including:

- Housing targets are above housing need and should be reduced by 10% in Nesscliffe.
- Recent demand for housing in the area due to proximity to Shrewsbury suggests the guideline should be higher.
- There is no secondary school provision in Nesscliffe which will lead to an increase in traffic and pollution from journeys to Shrewsbury school.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment. One respondent stated that the number of dwellings is low when comparing the number of dwellings in other proposed Community Hubs with a similar function score.

4.45. Question 56 (c)

Question 56 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Nesscliffe. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with this proposal.

The respondents who supported the proposed development boundary declined to provide further comment.

Respondents who opposed to the proposed development boundary raised concerns that:

- The boundary excludes areas of existing development which should be within the boundary, including the village school, the Nesscliffe Hotel site and properties along the A5 south-east of the village.
- The position of the development boundary is restrictive and wouldn't allow the level of windfall necessary to achieve the preferred housing guideline.
- If further development in Nesscliffe is required then the preferred site is the favourable option.
- The development boundaries artificially depress the supply of housing and prevent sustainable sites from coming forwards.

The respondents who stated 'don't know / no opinion' mostly declined to provide further comment. However, one respondent stated that it is located in a Groundwater Management Unit where no water is available for licensing or licensing is restricted.

5. Further Information

5.1. Question 63

Question 63 sought views on whether respondents thought any additional 'Community Clusters' to those identified within the Preferred Sites Consultation should be formed or whether any of the existing 'Community Clusters' identified in the consultation document should be removed. The majority of those who responded indicated that they did not know / had no opinion on whether there were additional settlements suitable to be designated as Community Clusters.

Respondents suggested settlements to be added, which included:

- Longden;
- Condoover; and
- Westbury.

A respondent commented that Community Clusters should be identified based on a planning assessment undertaken by Shropshire Council Officers, rather than allowing Parish Councils to choose. However, another respondent stated that Community Clusters should be agreed by the Local Parish Council.

Respondents suggested settlements to be removed, which included:

- West Lullingfields;
- Hookagate;
- Annscroft; and
- Longden Common.

Numerous respondents expressed their support for maintaining all settlements surrounding Longden as open countryside due to capacity issues in the sewage treatment facility. These respondents suggested that Longden village should be designated a Community Cluster, as the proposal to make Longden a Community Hub does not take into consideration the wide area that Longden's facilities serve.

Respondents who stated that no Community Clusters should be added or removed provided comments which included:

- If Longden remains a Community Cluster with the other villages, the housing load would be shared throughout the Parish. This would be fair to the population of the Parish and avoid significant impact on any one settlement.

- Uffington should be retained as a Community Cluster. It is geographically well located to Shrewsbury, has public transport links to Shrewsbury, and has a service / facility provision of its own greater than a number of other Community Cluster settlements.

The majority of those who stated ‘don’t know / no opinion’ or declined to answer generally did not provide further comment. Although, one respondent expressed a lack of understanding of the term ‘Community Cluster’.

5.2. Question 64

Question 64 sought any other views. A number of respondents took this opportunity to provide further justification for their previous responses in the questionnaire. Where suitable, responses on this question have been consolidated into the relevant Shrewsbury-specific questions.

The key issues raised by respondents which are not covered in the preceding questions were:

- A large number of respondents opposed development on site SHR183 (which is not a preferred allocation). The majority of objections were based on non-compliance with local planning policies, referring to the site’s planning history, the potential impact on ecology and its location in a Conservation Area.
- Various alternative and additional sites were promoted by consultants and developers, including:
 - SHR054a (Shrewsbury) – the site is capable of delivering around 68 dwellings.
 - SHR054b and SHR054c (Shrewsbury) – as alternatives to SHR166 (the preferred employment allocation) with better access and underlain by lower value agricultural land. The development of sites SHR054b and SHR054c offer an opportunity to improve the operation of the existing roundabout, which would alleviate existing traffic congestion in the area.
 - SHR063 (Shrewsbury) - could be delivered as a lone site or in conjunction with neighbouring land also under the same ownership. It has limited ecological value due to agricultural activities.
 - SHR093 (Shrewsbury) – located in a sustainable location, has a good range of services, and has opportunities for families and employment.
 - SHR185 (Shrewsbury) – suitable for housing development.
 - SHR187 (Shrewsbury) - potential to be delivered in conjunction with SHR027 or to form the highways frontage to a large development including SHR192, SHR190 and SHR189. There is potential to provide a link road from Longden Road to Hanwood Road. The ecological value is minimal due to agricultural activities.
 - WEY002 (Westbury) - would constitute infill development and could provide an opportunity for an access through to future development land. Access is fit for residential purposes and the site would likely score positively in the Sustainability Appraisal.
 - The current residential allocation at Hanwood (HAN011) - potential to extend the allocation further. Respondent states that the viability and deliverability of the site can be demonstrated and could deliver 50 homes.
 - HDW005 (Hanwood) - could be included within a development boundary if a preferred allocation is brought forward.
 - MFB006 and MFB004 (Montford Bridge)– housing development which would aid the delivery of MHS181, MHC182 and MHC191 (it is not clear whether the latter site numbers are incorrect or mislabelled).
 - BIT023 (Bicton) - The land is well placed for the expansion of Bicton in terms of its proximity to the school and other facilities. It is considered that an appropriate access can be established and its development would not result in any highway safety concerns.
 - BOM022, BOM002 and BOM023 (Bomere Heath) – the sites are deliverable and can provide development to support the delivery of the housing guideline. The sites are sustainable and have good access to the Shrewsbury Road.
 - BNP021 (Baschurch) - would form a natural and logical addition to the settlement.
 - BNP033 and BNP040 (Baschurch) – the site is considered viable. Safe access can be provided and a footpath to and through the site is possible.
 - BNP036 and BNP037 (Baschurch) - the proposals will not adversely affect listed buildings or the Conservation Area. The sites also have a good range of services and transport

infrastructure. The benefits of the proposed housing would outweigh loss of agricultural land, and the percentage of affordable units proposed would be in excess of that required by Council policy.

- Sites DGN017, DGN018 and DGN021 (Dorrington) - each is individually capable of providing approximately 50% of Dorrington's housing guideline.
 - LGN015 and LGN016 (Longden) - the site is available, achievable, viable and deliverable. Phasing of the development may also be possible. The percentage of affordable units will be in excess of that currently required by Council policy. The village has a range of services which could support further residents. Furthermore development of this site could support these facilities in the future.
 - CSH005 (Cross Houses) – this site could be used to promote a walking and cycling route using a disused railway line.
 - Land at Hopton Lane, Nesscliffe provides an ideal location for an additional housing allocation that could comprise 10 affordable bungalows to meet local needs. This site has previously been promoted for development.
- A respondent opposed any proposals for future development on agricultural land between Back Lane and Manor Crest in Ford and referred to an appeal decision which refused development here as inappropriate.
 - One respondent stated that previous consultation responses have been ignored. Analysis of the responses to the Issues and Strategic Options Consultation shows 88% of respondents and 74% of town and Parish Councils favoured a lower rate of growth.
 - A number of respondents stated that light pollution should be taken into account for all preferred allocations and that any new developments must be designed to be non-polluting in this respect. The respondent added that no further encroachment should be allowed into dark areas.
 - One respondent stated that there is little reference made to transport modes alternative to the car.
 - A respondent accepted the need to provide housing but considered that this should be dealt with in Strategic, Principal and Key Centres rather than small rural settlements.
 - Many respondents stated that additional infrastructure is required before any additional housing development takes place.
 - Shrewsbury Civic Society disagreed with a high level of housing growth proposed for Shropshire. They also consider that the county must reduce car journeys. One way that this could be achieved is by planning smaller local communities, which can be more self-sufficient, through fringe estates, and mixed-use sites.
 - Clarification is requested over the reason for rejecting sites with Sustainability Appraisal scores of 'Good' in favour of sites assessed as 'Fair'.
 - Numerous objections to the Hierarchy of Settlement methodology. Respondents objected to the allocation of points for particular facilities or the lack thereof for many of the proposed Community Hubs. Another respondent expressed the view that the method of attributing points appeared too factual and doesn't allow for material considerations.

Comments were also provided on the quality of the consultation process. A greater level of publicity and a glossary of terms was requested for future consultations.

Appendices



Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

This appendix details the responses provided to the multiple-choice questions posed for the Shrewsbury PPA.

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

- 33% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 54% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 13% 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 a viability assessment undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review. Of the unique respondents, who were interested in the Shrewsbury Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 21% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option; and
- 79% preferred a set development mix option.

A.3. Question 5

Question 5 sought views on whether respondents thought that it was appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guidelines. Of the unique respondents, who were interested in the Shrewsbury Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 40% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 45% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 15% 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, who were interested in the Shrewsbury Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 30% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 44% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 26% 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 46 (a)

Question 46 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Shrewsbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 22% agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Shrewsbury;
- 36% did not agree with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Shrewsbury; and

- 42% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Shrewsbury.

A.6. Question 46 (b)

Question 46 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Shrewsbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 16% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Shrewsbury;
- 44% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Shrewsbury; and
- 40% don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Shrewsbury.

A.7. Question 46 (c)

Question 46 (c) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred mixed-use allocation SHR158/SHR060/SHR161. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 16% agreed with the preferred mixed-use allocation SHR158/SHR060/SHR161 in Shrewsbury;
- 28% did not agree with the preferred mixed-use allocation SHR158/SHR060/SHR161 in Shrewsbury; and
- 56% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred mixed-use allocation SHR158/SHR060/SHR161 in Shrewsbury.

A.8. Question 46 (d)

Question 46 (d) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR057(part)/SHR177 in Shrewsbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 19% agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR057(part)/SHR177 in Shrewsbury;
- 19% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation SHR057(part)/SHR177 in Shrewsbury; and
- 62 don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation SHR057(part)/SHR177 in Shrewsbury.

A.9. Question 46 (e)

Question 46 (e) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR216. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 15% agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR216 in Shrewsbury;
- 26% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation SHR216 in Shrewsbury; and
- 59% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation SHR216 in Shrewsbury.

A.10. Question 46 (f)

Question 46 (f) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR145 in Shrewsbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 18% agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR145;
- 15% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation SHR145; and
- 67% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation SHR145.

A.11. Question 46 (g)

Question 46 (g) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred employment allocation SHR166 in Shrewsbury. The question set out in the questionnaire incorrectly referred to SHR166 as a housing allocation which may have affected how respondents answered this question. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 10% agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHR166;
- 24% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation SHR166; and

- 66% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation SHR166.

A.12. Question 47 (a)

Question 47 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Baschurch as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 17% agreed with the identification of Baschurch as a Community Hub;
- 3% did not agree with the identification of Baschurch as a Community Hub; and
- 80% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Baschurch as a Community Hub.

A.13. Question 47 (b)

Question 47 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Baschurch. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Baschurch;
- 12% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Baschurch; and
- 83% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Baschurch.

A.14. Question 47 (c)

Question 47 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Baschurch. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 4% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Baschurch;
- 16.% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Baschurch; and
- 80% did not know / had no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Baschurch.

A.15. Question 47 (d)

Question 47 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BNP024 in Baschurch. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing allocation BNP024 in Baschurch;
- 10% disagreed with the preferred housing allocation BNP024 in Baschurch; and
- 82% did not know / had no opinion on the preferred housing allocation BNP024 in Baschurch.

A.16. Question 47 (e)

Question 47 (e) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BNP035 in Baschurch. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing allocation BNP035 in Baschurch;
- 9% disagreed with the preferred housing allocation BNP035 in Baschurch; and
- 83% did not know / had no opinion on the preferred housing allocation BNP035 in Baschurch.

A.17. Question 48 (a)

Question 48 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Bayston Hill as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 25% agreed with the identification of Bayston Hill as a Community Hub;
- 7% disagreed with the identification of Bayston Hill as a Community Hub; and
- 68% did not know / had no opinion.

A.18. Question 48 (b)

Question 48 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bayston Hill. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bayston Hill;
- 17% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bayston Hill; and
- 72% did not know / had no opinion.

A.19. Question 48 (c)

Question 48 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred development boundary for Bayston Hill. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 7% agreed with the preferred development boundary for Bayston Hill;
- 26% disagreed with the preferred development boundary for Bayston Hill; and
- 67% did not know / had no opinion.

A.20. Question 48 (d)

Question 48 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BAY039 in Bayston Hill. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 9% agreed with the preferred housing allocation BAY039 in Bayston Hill;
- 23% disagreed with the preferred housing allocation BAY039 in Bayston Hill; and
- 68% did not know / had no opinion.

A.21. Question 48 (e)

Question 48 (e) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BAY050 in Bayston Hill. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 20% agreed with the preferred housing allocation BAY050 in Bayston Hill;
- 9% disagreed with the preferred housing allocation BAY050 in Bayston Hill; and
- 71% did not know / had no opinion.

A.22. Question 49 (a)

Question 49 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Bicton as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 18% agreed with the identification of Bicton as a Community Hub;
- 5% disagreed with the identification of Bicton as a Community Hub; and
- 77% did not know / had no opinion.

A.23. Question 49 (b)

Question 49 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bicton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bicton;
- 13% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bicton; and
- 82% did not know / had no opinion.

A.24. Question 49 (c)

Question 49 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bicton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bicton;
- 15% disagreed with the proposed development boundary for Bicton; and
- 82% did not know / had no opinion.

A.25. Question 49 (d)

Question 49 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BIT022 in Bicton. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 7% agreed with the preferred housing allocation BIT022 in Bicton;
- 10% disagreed with the preferred housing allocation BIT022 in Bicton; and
- 83% did not know / had no opinion.

A.26. Question 50 (a)

Question 50 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Bomere Heath as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 12% agreed with the identification of Bomere Heath as a Community Hub;
- 3% disagreed with the identification of Bomere Heath as a Community Hub; and
- 85% did not know / had no opinion.

A.27. Question 50 (b)

Question 50 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bomere Heath. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bomere Heath;
- 7% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Bomere Heath; and
- 90% did not know / had no opinion.

A.28. Question 50 (c)

Question 50 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bomere Heath. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Bomere Heath;
- 7% disagreed with the proposed development boundary for Bomere Heath; and
- 90% did not know / had no opinion.

A.29. Question 50 (d)

Question 50 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BOM019 in Bomere Heath. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 2% agreed with the preferred housing allocation BOM019 in Bomere Heath;
- 8% disagreed with the preferred housing allocation BOM019 in Bomere Heath; and
- 90% did not know / had no opinion.

A.30. Question 50 (e)

Question 50 (e) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation BOM020 in Bomere Heath. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the preferred housing allocation BOM020 in Bomere Heath;
- 8% disagreed with the preferred housing allocation BOM020 in Bomere Heath; and
- 89% did not know / had no opinion.

A.31. Question 51 (a)

Question 51 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Cross Houses as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the identification of Cross Houses as a Community Hub;
- 41% disagreed with the identification of Cross Houses as a Community Hub; and
- 54% did not know / had no opinion.

A.32. Question 51 (b)

Question 51 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cross Houses. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 1% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cross Houses;
- 45% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Cross Houses; and
- 54% did not know / had no opinion.

A.33. Question 51 (c)

Question 51 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Cross Houses. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 2% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Cross Houses;
- 46% disagreed with the proposed development boundary for Cross Houses; and
- 52% did not know / had no opinion.

A.34. Question 51 (d)

Question 51 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation CSH004 in Cross Houses. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 3% agreed with the preferred housing allocation CSH004 in Cross Houses;
- 44% disagreed with the preferred housing allocation CSH004 in Cross Houses; and
- 53% did not know / had no opinion.

A.35. Question 52 (a)

Question 52 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Dorrington as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 14% agreed with the identification of Dorrington as a Community Hub;
- 2% disagreed with the identification of Dorrington as a Community Hub; and
- 84% did not know / had no opinion.

A.36. Question 52 (b)

Question 52 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Dorrington. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 4% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Dorrington;
- 9% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Dorrington; and
- 87% did not know / had no opinion.

A.37. Question 53 (a)

Question 53 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Ford as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 9% agreed with the identification of Ford as a Community Hub;
- 29% disagreed with the identification of Ford as a Community Hub; and
- 62% did not know / had no opinion.

A.38. Question 53 (b)

Question 53 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Ford. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Ford;
- 31% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Ford; and
- 64% did not know / had no opinion.

A.39. Question 53 (c)

Question 53 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ford. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 6% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ford;
- 32% disagreed with the proposed development boundary for Ford; and
- 62% did not know / had no opinion.

A.40. Question 53 (d)

Question 53 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation FRD011 in Ford. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 8% agreed with the preferred housing allocation FRD011 in Ford;
- 29% disagreed with the preferred housing allocation FRD011 in Ford; and
- 63% did not know / had no opinion.

A.41. Question 54 (a)

Question 54 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Hanwood as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 16% agreed with the identification of Hanwood as a Community Hub;
- 4% disagreed with the identification of Hanwood as a Community Hub; and
- 80% did not know / had no opinion.

A.42. Question 54 (b)

Question 54 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hanwood. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hanwood;
- 9% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hanwood; and
- 86% did not know / had no opinion.

A.43. Question 54 (c)

Question 54 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Hanwood. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 5% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Hanwood;
- 10% disagreed with the proposed development boundary for Hanwood; and
- 85% did not know / had no opinion.

A.44. Question 55 (a)

Question 55 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Longden as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the identification of Longden as a Community Hub;
- 31% disagreed with the identification of Longden as a Community Hub; and
- 58% did not know / had no opinion.

A.45. Question 55 (b)

Question 55 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Longden. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 1% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Longden;
- 35% disagreed with the preferred housing guideline for Longden; and
- 64% did not know / had no opinion.

A.46. Question 55 (c)

Question 55 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Longden. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 24% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Longden;
- 15% disagreed with the proposed development boundary for Longden; and
- 61% did not know / had no opinion.

A.47. Question 56 (a)

Question 56 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Nesscliffe as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 16% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be added;
- 1% disagreed that additional Community Clusters should be added or removed; and
- 83% did not know / had no opinion.

A.48. Question 56 (b)

Question 56 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Nesscliffe. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 4% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be added;
- 8% disagreed that additional Community Clusters should be added or removed; and
- 88% did not know / had no opinion.

A.49. Question 56 (c)

Question 56 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Nesscliffe. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 2% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be added;
- 10% disagreed that additional Community Clusters should be added or removed; and
- 88% did not know / had no opinion.

A.50. Question 63

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

- 13% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be added;
- 11% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be removed;
- 23% disagreed that additional Community Clusters should be added or removed; and
- 53% responded don't know/ no opinion.

Atkins Limited

The Axis
10 Holliday Street
Birmingham
B1 1TF

Tel: +44 (0)121 483 5000
Fax: +44 (0)121 483 5252

© Atkins Limited except where stated otherwise