

# Appendix B.17. Shropshire Council - Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation

Wem

Shropshire Council

03 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 28 pages including the cover.

## Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Wem	KD	MG	VD	VD	28/05/2018
Rev 2.0	Final Wem	KD	TH	VD	VD	03/06/2018

## Client signoff

Client	Shropshire Council	
Project	Appendix B.17. Consultation	Shropshire Council - Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites
Job number	5188227	
Client signature / date		

# Contents

Chapter	Page
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. Overview</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. Delivering Local Housing Needs</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1. Question 3	6
2.2. Question 4	7
<b>3. Windfall Development</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1. Question 5	7
3.2. Question 6	8
<b>4. Wem Place Plan Area</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1. Question 57 (a)	8
4.2. Question 57 (b)	9
4.3. Question 57 (c)	10
4.4. Question 57 (d)	11
4.5. Question 57 (e)	11
4.6. Question 58 (a)	12
4.7. Question 58 (b)	13
4.8. Question 58 (c)	13
4.9. Question 58 (d)	14
4.10. Question 59 (a)	15
4.11. Question 59 (b)	16
4.12. Question 59 (c)	16
4.13. Question 59 (d)	17
4.14. Question 60 (a)	18
4.15. Question 60 (b)	18
4.16. Question 60 (c)	18
4.17. Question 60 (d)	19
<b>5. Further Information</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1. Question 63	19
5.2. Question 64	20
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.</b>	<b>24</b>
A.1. Question 3	24
A.2. Question 4	24
A.3. Question 5	24
A.4. Question 6	24
A.5. Question 57 (a)	24
A.6. Question 57 (b)	25
A.7. Question 57 (c)	25
A.8. Question 57 (d)	25
A.9. Question 57 (e)	25
A.10. Question 58 (a)	25
A.11. Question 58 (b)	25
A.12. Question 58 (c)	26

A.13. Question 58 (d)	26
A.14. Question 59 (a)	26
A.15. Question 59 (b)	26
A.16. Question 59 (c)	26
A.17. Question 59 (d)	26
A.18. Question 60 (a)	26
A.19. Question 60 (b)	27
A.20. Question 60 (c)	27
A.21. Question 60 (d)	27
A.22. Question 63	27

## 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 9<sup>th</sup> 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 Wem Place Plan area.

# 1. Overview

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

There were 17 questions specifically relating to the Wem Place Plan Area, the responses to these questions are summarised in Section 4. Section 5 summarises other comments raised by consultees that responded to the Wem-specific questions.

A total of 171 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 consultees 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 consultees, who were interested in the Wem Place Plan area, supported the proposed policy.

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

- The policy would provide a balanced approach to housing provision, particularly in rural areas and will improve housing choice in locations such as Edstaston.
- The policy will boost the supply of housing.
- The policy will assist local building companies by providing site opportunities.
- The policy is supported by paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

Further key issues raised by consultees who support the policy included:

- The policy is acceptable within a strict framework. Too many large homes are being built which is pushing out young families.
- This policy should not be used to overdevelop villages.
- It will benefit remote towns and villages, however, the main argument for the policy is to increase land supply and there is not a shortage of sites in Hadnall.
- It shouldn't be necessary to prove local need.
- The policy should explicitly enable a mix of owner-occupied housing (including entry-level starter homes), discounted housing at 20% below market value and self-build housing.
- Sites should be available within identified settlements, like the single plot exception policy.
- Financial viability should be carefully considered.
- Only pre-agreed levels of market housing should be incorporated, and a maximum size or scale of development should be considered.
- Given the nature of these developments they cannot contribute to the strategic housing requirement.
- Respondent would like to see a similar rural exception sites policy for self/custom build housing.

A small number of respondents opposed the policy. These respondents raised the following concerns:

- People need to live close to their work.
- Wem Town Council believe that housing need should be met on allocated sites within the development boundary.
- Affordable homes should be safeguarded, and development tailored to local need.

- If land is offered to private developers, the function of the authority may be undermined.
- Development will not resemble the original plans.

There was confusion surrounding the concept of the cross-subsidy exception site policy which resulted in two consultees stating that they did not have a strong enough understanding to make an informed decision.

## 2.2. Question 4

Question 4 sought views on whether respondents preferred (subject to viability assessment) if development mix should be assessed on a site by site basis or a set development mix, which would be geographically defined and subject to the findings of a viability assessment undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review. The majority of respondents, who were interested in the Wem Place Plan area, were in favour of development mix being assessed on a site by site basis. A significant proportion of respondents also declined to comment on a preference to either option.

Those respondents who indicated a preference for development to be assessed on a site by site basis made comments which included:

- Open market housing should be limited to 25%.
- It is better to integrate different types of housing in small villages.
- The policy would ensure the correct tenure mix for local need.
- The policy would take into account one off costs.
- Flexibility is needed to ensure viability.

Those respondents who indicated a preference for a set development mix made the following comments:

- A 60:40 or 50:50 open market housing to affordable housing mix should be set to ensure viability.
- Support for a set development mix that could be adjusted to take account of local site considerations and abnormal costs.
- A clear policy setting out the required housing mix would be transparent and fair.
- This policy would be easier to administer if suitable criteria could be established.
- Concerns expressed as to whether affordable housing will be realistically affordable.

Some respondents appear to have misunderstood the question and provided answers that relate to the 'pepper-potting' of properties as an alternative interpretation of the term 'development mix'. One respondent declined to select a preference but expressed that the development mix should reflect local need as opposed to developers interests. Some respondents declined to select a preference and provided no further comments on this question.

# 3. Windfall Development

## 3.1. Question 5

Question 5 sought views on whether respondents thought that it was appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guidelines. Overall, the majority of consultees, who were interested in the Wem Place Plan area, supported a windfall allowance for housing.

Consultees that supported the inclusion of a windfall allowance commented:

- This is acceptable if it is for small developments by local people and not for large developments.
- Landowner disposition could change, and a windfall allowance will allow for development of this land.
- A windfall allowance should only be available when building in the countryside.
- It is vital to support local families through provision of appropriate housing.
- There is scope to widen housing choice and delivery by introducing a cross-subsidy exception site policy which will increase housing supply from windfall provision in rural settlements.
- Windfall development within the development boundary is and will become limited and will continue to take up land that should be used to deliver on the Wem Place Plan and Community Led Plan priorities. This includes the car park which has value for the development of village amenities and a village centre.

- The geographical extent of the windfall allowance isn't clear. To aid deliverability of windfall development, it should be allowed within 1km of the settlement boundary.
- Respondents questioned whether the guidelines were to be regarded as maximum or minimum figures. Further stating that they should be regarded as minimum figure.
- The Local Plan would benefit from windfall allowances being provided on a Place Plan basis.
- The proportion of houses to be delivered through windfall is too high, although a windfall allowance is not objected to in principle. Expansion of the proposed settlement boundaries is needed.

Consultees that objected to the inclusion of a windfall allowance made the following comments:

- There is no need for a windfall target as Clive's need can be met on exception sites.
- Windfall allowance should not be based on a figure for each settlement as in some settlements, sites will come forward and in others they will not.
- Windfall development should be counted in addition to the housing guideline numbers and should not be used to artificially raise the 5-year supply.
- If there is no compelling need for housing this should not be considered.

It was expressed by a respondent that selected "don't know/no opinion" that it is unclear how the Council has arrived at the identified windfall allowance and that is assumed that the approach relies on an untried and untested exception site policy to allow windfall development outside settlement boundaries. A number of respondents also commented that a clearer explanation of the implications of a windfall allowance could be provided, to make it more accessible and less technical to help respondents make an informed decision.

## 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 consultees responding to this question, who were interested in the Wem Place Plan Area, did not know or have an opinion, but a similar amount supported the windfall allowance for employment. The reasons for support were focused on the benefits for the development and growth of small businesses and the support it would offer to the local economy.

Among the supporters of including a windfall allowance for employment, concern was raised regarding the impact of employment development on settlement character and many stated it must be well controlled and in line with residents' desires. It was also raised by supporters that windfall employment development should be proportionate and not detract from plan-led development.

Comments which opposed the windfall allowance included:

- This is not appropriate if the plan continues to be restrictive with development outside of the settlement boundary. The windfall allowance should include an area up to ½ a kilometre beyond the development boundary.

A number of respondents stated that more information and better explanation of the implications was needed for them to make an informed decision. One respondent appeared to have misunderstood the question and stated that there is no compelling need for housing.

# 4. Wem Place Plan Area

## 4.1. Question 57 (a)

Question 57 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Wem. The majority of respondents did not know or have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Support for the preferred housing and employment guideline commented upon the sustainability, public transport links and appropriate location for growth.

Those who did not agree with the housing and employment guidelines provided comments which included:

- Wem Town Council, amongst other respondents, believes that the existing infrastructure including sewage system, roads, schools and GP surgery should be improved before there is more development



in the town. Evidence that paragraph 20.9 of the Shropshire Local Plan Review: Consultation on Preferred Sites November 2018 document will be addressed is required.

- Allocations should be identified to meet the shortfall in housing rather than relying on windfall development as this is not plan-led development.
- There has been no industrial growth in the town to support the housing proposed at Lowe Hill Road.
- Wem should have a higher employment land guideline figure due to its transport connections and proximity to Shrewsbury.
- The method for calculating employment land demand is flawed and the planned reduction in employment growth is contrary to the Council's economic strategy.
- Reliance on windfall development with restrictive control of development outside of settlement boundaries will make the guideline difficult to deliver.
- Objection to the number of houses as they will put strain on local infrastructure and services. There is a lack of local employment and the houses will destroy local character.
- The residential allocations are too low and the windfall allowance too high.
- Concerned about the delivery of the 600 dwelling requirement, given the failure to deliver sufficient dwellings on the existing allocation, proposed allocations and windfall sites.
- Unconstrained land should be identified for housing and included within the development boundary.
- If more employment land is allocated, then a programme to attract employers is essential.
- Employment areas must be developed first to encourage people to settle in Wem.
- Employment guidelines are too low and would be a reduction in employment development over the plan period, contrary to Economic Strategy
- Questions the need to increase Wem's employment allocation when the current allocation has not been taken up.

## 4.2. Question 57 (b)

Question 57 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Wem. Most respondents did not know or have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents the majority disagreed with the proposal. Many respondents have promoted alternative sites which they think should be within the development boundary. These sites are:

- Extension of WEM003 due to the gas main constraint.
- WEM013
- WEM027
- WEM029
- WEM037
- WEM038
- Land north of the B5065 (Soulton Road) between the existing residential development and Wem Industrial Estate.

One respondent stated that the settlement is underlain by a shallow groundwater system, appropriate drainage and pollution prevention measures would be required.

Other comments made by objectors included:

- Preference for the boundary to be extended to key features on the Shawbury Road.
- Wem Town Council accepts the existing boundary within the adopted Local Plan not the proposed boundary.
- Preference for the removal of WEM033 as there should be no further development to the north.
- Request for evidence as to why these sites have been chosen for inclusion.
- The west side of Wem is underused due to infrastructure failings.
- Wem is large enough and services will not cope with expansion.
- Infrastructure must be improved first.

Comments made by supporters included:

- The boundary must be maintained and controlled and developments must not take place adjacent to the boundary.
- The gas main constraint at site WEM003, will limit the dwelling contribution that the site can make. One respondent proposed that the development boundary is amended to allow the site to be extended.
- Agreement with the boundary except allocation WEM033 as they wish to see no future housing to north.

### 4.3. Question 57 (c)

Question 57 (c) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEM010. 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 WEM010 provided comments including:

- Agree with the location but object to the number of dwellings.
- It would be better to build further housing and amenities on WEM010.
- A reference to a separate vehicle access off Pym's Road, in the event that the connectivity of the sites (003 and 010) cannot be achieved, is welcomed.

Those who disagreed with the allocation WEM010 provided comments including:

- Concerns about traffic and highway issues especially in close proximity to the school.
- Would like to see more housing allocated to support the future population but realise the numbers are sustainable and more services would be needed to support further housing.
- Improvements needed to existing infrastructure including sewage system roads, schools and GP surgery before development.
- Evidence needed that paragraph 20.9 of the Shropshire Local Plan Review: Consultation on Preferred Sites November 2018 document will be addressed. This paragraph relates to the identified infrastructure priorities in Wem.
- Objection to development on Lowe Hill Road due to extra traffic, presence of great crested newts, the fact it is a rural area and impact on local character. Development would be better next to the existing housing allocation.
- The uncertainty surrounding the deliverability of WEM003 is equally applicable to WEM010 which is an extension of WEM003.
- Development would have a negative impact on the character and setting of the town.
- WEM010 has poor access and transport links and will result in unsustainable travel patterns.
- Housing density considered too great for this location given highway and sustainability appraisal issues.
- Concerns that the residents are being ignored by the Council.
- Questioning the site's allocation due to ownership being the same as that of another allocated site. Promotes WEM040 as alternative.

The majority of those who stated 'don't know / no opinion' or declined to answer made the following relevant comments:

- One respondent stated that the allocation seems sensible, but they are concerned about implications for access, parking and drop off at Thomas Adams School.
- SP Energy Networks stated that WEM010/025/033 affect the existing 33kv network and future developers need to ensure any development allows for the retention of this network.
- There are wild birds that feed and breed on the land at Lowe Hill Road.
- One respondent purchased their home on Lowe Hill Road for the views which they will lose, there will be detrimental noise and landscaping issues amongst issues mentioned by other respondents.
- A pit in the field on the Lowe Hill Road site could contain newts.

One comment mentions that the site affects existing 33kV network and future developers need to ensure any development allows for retaining this network.

#### 4.4. Question 57 (d)

Question 57 (d) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEM025 in Wem. 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 disagreed with the allocation made the following comments:

- Concerned about visual intrusion, vehicular access, traffic and highway safety.
- Mixed housing will discord with the current, mostly retired, population and the housing mix is unclear.
- There are great crested newts and rescued horses on the site.
- This development will affect the balance of housing and green space.
- The development will impact privacy, peace and property values.
- Improvements are needed to existing infrastructure before development.
- Evidence needed that paragraph 20.9 (**identified infrastructure priorities for Wem**) of the Shropshire Local Plan Review: Consultation on Preferred Sites November 2018 document will be addressed.
- The Town Council wishes the site to remain as a greenfield site and for part of the land to be used as additional allotments.
- Development would be better next to the existing housing allocation.
- WEM025 and WEM033 will have cumulative impacts on the drainage and highway infrastructure.
- The site already has adjacent land allocated for housing.
- The site was originally allocated for schools.

Those who agreed with the allocation made the following comments:

- WEM025 should be built on due to close proximity to WEM010 but Great Crested Newts should be protected or relocated.
- Ecological evaluations and supportive measures must be taken during the development.
- Shropshire Council as landowner supports residential development of the site as it integrates well with existing residential areas and has good vehicular access to the site from Trentham Road.
- Site must retain the rural character of the PRoW.

The majority of those who stated 'don't know / no opinion' or declined to answer, made the following relevant comments:

- The allocation seems sensible but there are concerns about implications for access, parking and drop off at Thomas Adams School.
- SP Energy Networks stated that WEM010/025/033 affect the existing 33kv network and future developers need to ensure any development allows for the retention of this network.
- There is a colony of Great Crested Newts.
- The area is dominated by bungalows, so any other type of development will be out of character.
- One comment mentions that the site affects existing 33kV network and future developers need to ensure any development allows for retaining this network.

#### 4.5. Question 57 (e)

Question 57 (e) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEM033. The majority of the respondents who gave a response indicated they did not have an opinion or did not know. The remaining respondents expressed a mix of agreement and disagreement for the proposal.

Those who agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEM033 provided the following comments:

- The site has easy access north to Whitchurch.
- The site must be reviewed as part of a wider allocation to the north of Wem to include the southern part of WEM013 and all of WEM027 so that developer contributions can be maximised.

- The low density of the development must be maintained given that this is an edge of town development.
- Site is in proximity of services and facilities and is in a sustainable location. Suggestion to increase allocation to 84 dwellings.

Those who disagreed with the preferred housing allocation WEM033 provided the following comments:

- One respondent noted they would like to see additional housing allocated to support future generations, although they agreed that the proposed numbers are sustainable and any more may require a new school or extension
- Wem Town Council believes that existing infrastructure and services should be improved before there is more development in the town.
- Evidence is needed that paragraph 20.9 (**identified infrastructure priorities for Wem**) of the Shropshire Local Plan Review: Consultation on Preferred Sites November 2018 will be addressed.
- The Town Council do not support development outside of the Parish Boundary.
- Suggestion of a one-way traffic system.
- This allocation extends into open countryside, whereas WEM038 is considered to be 'rounding off'.
- The access is on a blind bend.
- The site has a poor sustainability assessment.
- Development to the south should be considered (promotion of WEM037).
- WEM033 is the opposite side of the railway line and is considered likely to exacerbate congestion issues and result in unsustainable travel patterns.

Those who answered "don't know/no opinion" did not offer any further comments. SP Energy Networks stated that WEM010/025/033 affects the existing 33kv network and future developers need to ensure any development allows for the retention of this network.

One comment mentions that the site affects existing 33kV network and future developers need to ensure any development allows for retaining this network.

## 4.6. Question 58 (a)

Question 58 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Clive as a Community Hub. The majority of respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents the majority were in favour of the designation.

Those who agreed with the identification of Clive as a Community Hub made the following comments:

- There appears to be an error in the scoring of Clive, allocating a higher number of points than is strictly warranted.
- General support for the designation.
- The Parish Council accepts the designation but states that there are no outdoor sports facilities in Clive following the closure of the bowling club and the score needs adjusting from 54 to 51.
- Acceptance of the designation but infrastructure improvements are needed in the village.

Those who disagreed with the identification of Clive as a Community Hub made the following comments:

- The local pub closed over a year ago and the post office and shop have limited capacity. Further development will put strain on infrastructure and services.
- Clive is too inaccessible by public transport to be a Community Hub.
- Windfall aspirations for Clive are too high.
- Clive has already had a lot of recent development.
- Clive should be a Community Cluster for limited development due to the volume of recent development and the inadequacy of the highway network for further traffic.
- Clive is a small rural village and should stay as such.
- Clive lacks employment opportunities and public services and therefore does not meet the definition of hub.

The following additional comments were made:

- The scoring system is simplistic in assessing the long-term sustainability of any services.
- The distinction that has now been made between Community Hubs and Community Clusters in the Local Plan Review has resulted in a move for Community Hubs to be driven by a top down approach.
- A respondent wishes to see Clive opt in for some small-scale development through the 'opt in' process for Community Clusters joining as a networked group of settlements with Grinshill.
- Agreement with the Community Hub status if it precludes the rural exception scheme.

#### 4.7. Question 58 (b)

Question 58 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Clive. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion. The remaining respondents expressed a mix of agreement and disagreement for the proposal.

The comment in support of the guideline was limited to general support for the guideline as a minimum number of housing.

Respondents who disagreed with the guideline made the following comments:

- The local pub closed over a year ago and the post office and shop have limited capacity.
- Further housing will put strain on local services and infrastructure.
- Development would change the character of the village.
- Objection based on too many houses and queries around local need.
- Clive has poor access. Doctors' Surgery and Primary School will be compromised.
- 25 homes would be more appropriate than 40. Family homes would benefit the school and village vibrancy.
- 40 dwellings are not in keeping with historical expansion of the village.
- The Parish Council seek a housing figure of 25 in total, fulfilled by an allocation of 10-15 dwellings. They suggest a mix of 50% of which need to be mixed affordable housing of 2&3 bedrooms and family houses, the remaining 50% to be open market. The remaining dwellings will be fulfilled by infill development of no more than 3 properties per development.

Those respondents who selected "don't know/ no opinion" chose not to make further comments on this question. However, the following relevant comments were made by those who did not indicate a preference:

- The housing guideline should be a maximum.
- There is no need for a windfall target.
- Seeks a maximum of 30 houses with some infill at the eastern end of the village.

#### 4.8. Question 58 (c)

Question 58 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Clive. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Respondents that supported the development boundary made the following comments:

- One respondent stated that they support the boundary as it limits development and will therefore preserve the village.
- One respondent stated that they support the proposed development boundary but would suggest that a boundary is also drawn around Yorton as an outlier but treated as being part of the Community Hub of Clive.

Respondents who opposed the development boundary for Clive provided the following comments:

- Infill development is the only sensible development going forward so strain is not put on local services and infrastructure.
- Development should be on small sites rather than an estate due to traffic, noise and total obstruction of countryside vistas.
- No pavements or street lighting and speeding cars make further development unsafe.

- Development boundary should extend along High Street to the east of the village.
- Development boundary to be revised to include CVL012, CVL013 and CVL017 and to remove CLV010. These sites have safer access and construction traffic would not have to travel through the village to access the sites.
- CLV012, 013 and 017 make the village long and narrow. This would result in a lot of traffic. Infrastructure would not be sufficient.

Those respondents who selected “don’t know/ no opinion” did not make any further comments. However, a respondent that did not indicate a preference commented that proposals will lead to incremental extension of the development boundary in an uncontrolled manner.

## 4.9. Question 58 (d)

Question 58 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation CLV010. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Amongst the respondents who supported the allocation, the following comments were made:

- Supported the allocation for 20 dwellings with open space as it is in a sustainable location with good access and relates well to the existing development boundary.
- CLV010 is served with better access to the main road and is nearer to the centre of the village than other sites.
- Strongly supports the Community Hub and the scale of development proposed as well as CLV010. Objects to CLV012/013/017 as the infrastructure is not in place and they would impact the character of the village.
- CLV010 will deliver the required number of houses on one plot, minimising the visual impact.

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

- The local pub closed over a year ago and the post office and shop have limited capacity – further housing will put strain on local services and infrastructure.
- Objects to CLV010 and promotes CLV012/013/17 as more suitable sites on the basis of the impact of CLV010 on the character of the village, drainage, sustainability, visual impact, distance to amenities, road safety and traffic.
- Distance to the school and medical centre raises concerns about pedestrian safety.
- Concerns about traffic and drainage.
- Concerns that development on this site will lead to development of adjacent sites.
- Alternative sites on the east side of the village would have less impact on residents.
- Moderate family homes are needed not executive homes that cater for multiple car ownership.
- Too many homes are proposed.
- This site is not the most strategic as it is a large site which protrudes out into the village and cannot be described as an infill site.
- The proposed increase of 40 homes represents a greater increase than ever in the history of the village. 25 homes would be more reasonable.

Those respondents who selected “don’t know/ no opinion” did not make any further comments. However, those respondents that did not indicate a preference made the following relevant comments:

- There is reference in the consultation document to the key infrastructure capacity constraints and requirement to build housing (design, setting, and local housing needs). There is no such reference in the proposal for Clive which needs addressing based on relevant supporting studies and their recommendations.
- This site is 5.5 metres from their property which has bedroom accommodation on the ground floor and living accommodation on the upper floor which causes privacy issues for new development. Respondent suggests the Council refer to ECHR (assumed this refers to European Court of Human Rights) Section 8.
- The plot size indicates that the development would expand further.



- The existing access having gas mains and crossing a private drive. There are also highways safety issues, the impact on nearby listed buildings, a lack of social and economic infrastructure and concerns about traffic.
- Plot accessibility could be improved by linking it to the footpath from Yorton Station to Back Lane which would link the plot with local services and facilities. The plot affects the impression of the village minimally. This part of the village has had little development in the past 20 years.
- A respondent states that, the Parish Council response implies there has been a total opposition to the site. The three alternative plots preferred by the Parish Council (CLV12/13/17) will further concentrate the effect of development in recent years. The issues raised by the Parish Council also concern the plots to the eastern end of the village - drainage issues in particular. Respondent lists issues associated with the alternative sites CLV12/13/17.
- CLV010 would have less impact on the character of the village than alternative sites as it is next to a current estate, public transport, local services and facilities, local safe play area and unrestricted access.
- Respondent, who misunderstood the question stated, they would be happy to see the allocation shared amongst smaller sites throughout the village.

#### 4.10. Question 59 (a)

Question 59 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Hadnall as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion, although a number of respondents agreed or disagreed with the designation.

Those respondents who agreed with the designation made the following comments:

- Hadnall is well placed and has good transport links.
- Hadnall has not had the expansion of amenities to match recent development.
- Support for the designation but states that the lack of employment allocations is a missed opportunity as the Sansaw Estate is willing to make sites HDL011 and HDL007 available for employment development.
- The Parish Council are preparing a Community Led Plan and support new development balanced with new facilities.
- The Community Hub status allows Parish Council involvement.
- General support for the designation.

Those respondents who disagreed with the designation made the following comments:

- The methodology for identifying Hadnall as a Community Hub is flawed due to oversubscribed services and poor facilities.
- One respondent stated that they moved to live in the countryside, not in an urban area.
- The village must be given time to properly absorb the recent increase in houses before further development is considered.
- Following surveys and meetings, Hadnall residents consider that it should remain as countryside.
- One respondent suggested this conflicts with the classification declared in 2017.
- Some residents and the Parish Council recognise the pressure to provide sufficient housing land supply, but the Parish Council states that development must be restricted to the south of the village to avoid amalgamation with Upper Battlefield and the suburbs of Shrewsbury.
- Development sites should be assessed against what they offer in meeting the priorities in the Community Led Plan and the Wem Place Plan priorities for Hadnall.
- The Parish Council provided a list of services they seek the development of.
- The services used to classify Hadnall are not fit for purpose.-The school is oversubscribed, the playground that classes as an amenity area is poorly used due to its condition and the shop has a dangerous access.
- Settlement lacks employment opportunities and public services and therefore does not meet the definition of hub.

Two respondents commented that they do not live in the area and as such felt it inappropriate to comment. All other respondents who answered “don’t know/no opinion” declined to offer further comment.

#### 4.11. Question 59 (b)

Question 59 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hadnall. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal

Only one of the respondents who agreed with the preferred housing guideline made further comment. This outlined that more than half of the homes had already been built and there is pressure for housing. However, the village is not yet benefitting from current development sites. The respondent wishes to see further actions to improve the village facilities and services.

Of those respondents who disagreed with the preferred housing guideline, the following comments were made:

- Current proposals are lacking amenities and Hadnall needs an expansion of amenities.
- Every area should have an equal allocation of the burden. Not all hamlets and villages are taking a fair portion of the housing requirement.
- Traffic will increase in an already congested area.
- Development to the south of the village is undesirable as houses all face inwards towards the village. The respondent was concerned about loss of open field views.
- Any future development should be concentrated around the centre of the village.
- No growth or limited infill should be allowed, to conserve the rural nature of the village.
- There are too many houses proposed, Hadnall has completely changed.
- A respondent does not agree with the housing guidelines of 125 houses as a minima as this is too low for a sustainable settlement.
- The housing guideline should be increased to 135 dwellings overall.
- There are flooding issues in Hadnall.
- There should be a broader portfolio of sites and further allocations should be identified and included.

Those respondents who selected “don’t know/ no opinion” did not make any further comments.

#### 4.12. Question 59 (c)

Question 59 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Hadnall. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Those respondents that approved of the proposed development boundary for Hadnall made the following comments:

- There is a need to protect the village environment. There is a risk of losing the village’s character and becoming a dormitory settlement. The proposed boundary should prevent this from happening.
- The policy should not set a precedent for development in the future.

Those respondents that objected to the proposed development boundary for Hadnall made the following comments:

- Future facilities will be in the wrong place relative to housing if east to west expansion is not established now.
- Respondents fears they will lose their views and suggest the village boundary remain the same with windfall allowance only to provide the increased number of houses.
- Retain the current north-south boundaries and focus on east-west expansion if needed, particularly western.
- The proposed development boundary ignores the potential for a more vibrant village core around the community facilities. The countryside should not be viewed as a no-go area for development.
- It must be altered to include site HDL003.
- The development boundary for site HDL006 should be enlarged to 1.98 ha to reflect the natural boundary of the site.



- Extending the boundary removes countryside.
- The concept of development boundaries and their use to control development is outdated. The Council is allocating insufficient sites to meet the identified guideline. The Council should provide headroom and the supply should not be planned to a minimum with no flexibility.
- It must be altered to include HDL009.
- Development should be infill only.
- Agrees to infill around the village but any more building will affect the makeup of the land and cause flooding.
- Building on the site south of Wedgefields will cause flooding and highway issues.

Those respondents who selected “don’t know/ no opinion” did not make any further comments.

One respondent noted that the settlement is located in a Groundwater Management Unit with no water available for licensing, existing sources would need to be used.

#### 4.13. Question 59 (d)

Question 59 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation HDL006. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Those respondents who agreed with the allocation made the following comments:

- Recognise the need for housing and the benefits of a new school car park that the site would bring.
- Flood prevention should be resolved fully and improvements are needed to infrastructure.
- Agrees with the allocation of housing but only in infill as there is plenty of scope in Hadnall for that.

Those respondents who disagreed with the allocation made the following comments:

- Concerns about flooding in nearby gardens.
- Design needs to encompass future amenity development which the village needs.
- There should be no building in any countryside location – Brownfield and windfall development should be used to meet the housing need.
- Site HDL015 is more suitable due to the size of the required number of properties and location with regards to the school. The site can provide additional parking and a walkway to the school which provides a safer access than HDL006.
- Hadnall has had recent development and the village needs time to absorb this.
- Objects on the basis that there has been refused planning permission on the site (14/04559/OUT) and there has been no change with regard to site suitability since then.
- The proposal is Green Belt and will alter the boundary of the village (it should be noted that the site is not within the Green Belt).
- Too many houses are being proposed.
- This site was dismissed at appeal and the inspectors report noted issues of character and the appearance of the countryside and sense of place.
- Concerns over safety of the access onto the A49.
- The site was not assessed under the Sustainability Appraisal conclusion on page 188 (it was not clear from the response which document was being referenced, but it is assumed it is the Sustainability Appraisal produced to inform the Preferred Sites Consultation Document).
- Concerns over impact on ecology.
- Respondent chose to live here to be in the countryside.
- This will impact views from the respondent’s house.
- The proposed density is out of keeping with the rest of the village.

One respondent commented that there is insufficient detail about the proposal.

## 4.14. Question 60 (a)

Question 60 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Shawbury as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority supported the proposal.

Those respondents that agreed with the designation made the following comments:

- Respondent recognises that housing is being allocated and that as part of this process Shawbury is being identified as a Community Hub.
- Shawbury is sustainable.
- Due to the range of facilities and amenities, this is a sensible designation.
- Respondent fully endorses the identification of Shawbury as a Community Hub.

Just one of the two respondents that disagreed with the designation offered further comment. They stated that Shawbury does not have the capacity for further housing and that the approved extension will already place significant strain on services and infrastructure.

Two respondents commented that they do not live in the area and as such felt it inappropriate to comment. All other respondents who answered “don’t know/no opinion” declined to offer further comment.

## 4.15. Question 60 (b)

Question 60 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Shawbury. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority supported the proposal.

Those respondents who agreed with the preferred housing guideline made the following comments:

- Understand and support the requirement for a maximum of 80 properties but the Parish Council asks that Shropshire Council phases development so any further large-scale housing development in the next five years, to reflect recent development in the village.
- Respondent suggests this should be a minimum figure.

Those respondents who objected to the housing guideline made the following comments:

- Respondent objects to the housing guideline as it appears that it is down to the proposed Community Hub status and the process behind the hierarchy of settlements does not analyse quality and capacity of services.
- Amenities and employment opportunities in Shawbury cannot support further demand.
- The impacts of recent development remain to be seen.
- Housing guideline is higher than housing need, should be reduced by 10% in Shawbury.
- There is a need for respite before any new development commences due to the volume of recent developments and number of helicopter operations.

No further issues were raised in the comments of those who “don’t know/no opinion”.

## 4.16. Question 60 (c)

Question 60 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Shawbury. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority disagreed with the proposal.

Of those respondents who agreed with the proposed development boundary only one made an additional comment to say that the boundary is logical.

Those respondents who objected to the proposed development boundary made the following comments:

- The development boundary ignores the scope to include the adjoining village of Edgebolton. The boundary should be expanded to help deliver windfall housing or a policy should be adopted that allows development of suitable sites adjacent or close to settlements.
- The development boundary should be extended to include the large area of residential development around The Groves.
- Without the allocation of further land within the development boundary the housing guideline will not be achieved.

- SHA016 should be added.

No further issues were raised in the comments of those who “don’t know/no opinion”.

One respondent noted that the settlement is located in a Groundwater Management Unit with no water available for licensing, existing sources would need to be used.

## 4.17. Question 60 (d)

Question 60 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHA019. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know or have an opinion. The remaining respondents expressed a mix of agreement and disagreement of proposals.

Those respondents who agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHA019 made the following comments:

- The preferred site is appropriate as are other locations in the village, which should be re-considered.
- It is a logical and sustainable extension to the existing settlement.

Those respondents who objected to the preferred housing allocation SHA019 made the following comments:

- The site only has development on one side.
- The site is included as part of the designated environmental network.
- The site is adjacent to a Grade II heritage asset.
- The site is in a flood risk zone and is not a logical extension.
- SHAW015 is a more appropriate site.
- SHA016 should be added as it has much fewer constraints.

Other comments made by respondents include:

- Two streams flow across this site and the boundary ditch on the northern side takes water from the RAF Shawbury airfield and from the new Oaklands development.
- The site assessments only look at the immediate vicinity and not at the impact on the village as a whole.

# 5. Further Information

## 5.1. Question 63

Question 63 sought views on whether respondents thought any additional ‘Community Clusters’ to those identified within the Preferred Sites Consultation should be formed or whether any of the existing ‘Community Clusters’ identified in the consultation document should be removed. Most of the respondents, who were interested in the Wem Place Plan Area, stated that they did not know or have an opinion on whether there were additional settlements suitable to be designated as Community Clusters. The other respondents provided a mixed view.

Respondents suggested settlements to be added and many offered justifications for these. These suggested additions included:

- Edstaston
- Quina Brook
- Northwood
- Newtown
- Tilley
- Aston
- Grinshill
- Yorton
- Myddle
- Edgebolton
- Weston Under Redcastle

- Whixhall

One respondent requested that Hadnall is removed (although Hadnall has been identified as a Community Hub and not a Community Cluster) and another two respondents suggested the removal of allocations (WEM010 and WEM025) as their response to this question but did not mention any Community Clusters they wished to see removed.

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

- Whixhall should remain as open countryside.
- One respondent supports the designation of Grinshill as a Community Cluster and will work with the community, through the Parish Council and neighbouring landowners, including the Sansaw Estate to deliver improved community facilities and meet housing needs.
- Harmer Hill should be maintained as a Community Cluster settlement as there are many designated Community Clusters that are less sustainable than Harmer Hill.
- The more sustainable 'other rural settlements' should automatically become Community Clusters.
- In some Community Clusters, developments larger than 3 dwellings or 0.1 ha will be appropriate and the policy should be reworded to accommodate this.
- Paragraph 1.21 of the consultation document refers to a threshold but as this is an opt-in process there are no thresholds. It should be noted that this threshold relates to Community Hubs and not Community Clusters.
- The inclusion of Aston is supported.

Other additional comments included:

- There is not enough information to make an informed decision.
- Developments should be small and in keeping with small communities, not large housing estate developments.
- The designation of Harmer Hill as a Community Cluster is supported.
- The designation of Edstaston as a Community Cluster is supported.
- Community Clusters should be identified on a professional planning assessment and not by Parish Councils who could potentially have a vested interest in preventing development.
- Disagree with the requirement that development in Community Clusters is limited to infill development. It is more appropriate for landowners and the Council to promote and identify individual sites to determine whether a village should be allowed to opt in to be a Community Cluster. The proviso that an individual development should be restricted to no more than 3 houses is felt to be appropriate.
- Respondent raises procedural concerns about a 2014 questionnaire that is being relied on to determine whether the village becomes a 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 Wem-specific questions.

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

- Objection to development around the Lowe Hill area due to congestion and suggests development is directed to the Aston side of Wem.
- Whixhall should remain as open countryside as building is ruining the county.
- A Network Plan was submitted alongside SP Energy Network's representation.
- Concerns regarding the lack of a railway bridge in Wem.
- The Parish Council should work with some urgency to agree with Shropshire Council the Neighbourhood Plan area for Clive and set out the ambition to form a Community Cluster with Grinshill setting out the commitment to take this forward immediately with the aim of having it in place as soon as is practically possible to support the Local Plan Review.

- There is no evidence in the Local Plan Review to local housing needs in Clive and development strategies are inconsistent across proposed Community Hubs.
- Concerns about the inadequacy of access routes to Clive, and lack of capacity and lack of parking at the medical centre. Concerns about highway safety and added traffic at the school and medical centre from new housing. Suggests that smaller houses built on CLV013/017/018 will cost less and would be available for elderly local residents and release their larger homes that they sell to incoming families.
- Respondent supports Clive Parish Council proposals in response to this consultation. Important to retain sense of community and friendliness, this could be damaged by insensitive growth and development.
- Respondent has included an accompanying Strategic Vision Document for the rural area around Hadnall, Clive and Grinshill.
- Respondent does not approve of the spatial distribution of development which fails to recognise the relationship that the proposed Community Hub settlements of Clive and Hadnall have to Shrewsbury and the potential they offer to host larger growth levels.
- Respondent objects to CLV012 (which has not been identified as a preferred allocation) on the basis of highway safety, flooding, local character, poor road infrastructure, loss of open areas, knotweed.
- The neighbourhood plan for Clive should make clear that the 40 dwelling housing target is a maximum.
- Developments in the last 33 years have not provided Hadnall with notably improved amenities. Design for village facilities should be considered. Objects to the use of £325,000 CIL money on one classroom - the community should be allowed to tender for this and the remaining money remain in the CIL fund.
- Reference to HDL006- issues with flooding, starting in Wedgefields Close and situation will be made worse by converting the field use to housing. A study into environmental impact of housing development in relation to the water course should take place.
- Respondent concerned about potential criminal misuse of car park on the site south of Wedgefields.
- Comments that the scale of recent planning approvals for housing in Hadnall along the A49 is disproportionate given the existing services.
- Respondent notes in relation to site SHA019 that the Sustainability Appraisal is incorrect and offers corrections, stating that the sustainability score should be +1 rather than -3. Respondent indicated that there was developer interest in the site and disagreed with Parish Council proposals (documented within their minutes) to phasing development beyond the five years following adoption of the Local Plan. Respondent also confirmed that the site is in one ownership which simplifies availability and deliverability.
- 33% target for affordable housing is overly dependent on the development of allocated sites. This can be addressed by increasing development opportunities in areas such as Edstaston where there are local housing needs. Respondent also submitted plan and details of a site that they promoted in 2017.
- Soulton Road Industrial Estate needs revitalising before more land is allocated. Question about local need and high demand for housing are raised.
- There has been a lack of consultation or communication from the Council about what plans they have for a number of Place Plan areas.
- Forms should be simplified so questions can be better understood.
- Respondent expresses concern over the blunt approach taken by allocating growth guidelines by settlement. The current policy approach on preferred scale and distribution of development will not enable sustainable growth as it focuses too much on the existing character and size of a settlement and doesn't provide for sustainable growth. Respondent expresses concerns that the draft policy criteria for Community Cluster settlements is unnecessarily restrictive and will undermine the intentions of the approach - in particular the limitation of development to small scale infill sites or conversions which will prevent sustainable development from coming forward.
- Respondent objects to the approach taken to make no provision in Community Hub settlements for employment land. Respondent is promoting land on the Sansaw Estate for the delivery of housing, employment and leisure.
- Respondent does not consider that sites CLV012/013/017 are more suitable for development than the proposed allocation due to poor highway infrastructure, congestion, poor pedestrian access and distance to local amenities.

- Respondent states that sustainability hasn't been given a high priority in the plan review.
- Preferred Scale and Distribution of Development Consultation states the need to maintain gaps between settlements. The integrity of development boundary must be maintained.
- Disappointed that the voices of residents have been ignored.
- CLV017 and CLV013 are better sites to provide affordable housing.
- Respondents promoted a range of sites:
  - Respondent is promoting site WEM037, HDL003, HDL009, HDL015, CLV015, CLV016, CLV017, HMM007, EDS005, WEM035, WEM, 013, WEM027, SHAW015, WEM029, WAW001.
  - Respondent submitted a location plan for WEM038 from the 2014 planning application for 50 homes off Aston Road and Church Lane, Wem.
  - Respondent reports on incorrect assessment of WEM048 - There is plenty of suitable employment land off Shawbury Road. The existing allocation ELR031 could be extended. Respondent proposed this extension in 12/2017 and the Council's site assessments have accepted the existing allocation (WEM047) but rejected the proposed extension (WEM048) due to mistaken assumptions about access and flood risk. The respondent has submitted comments on the Councils SLAA assessment of WEM048 and offers reasons why WEM048 should be considered
  - Respondent promotes CLV012 and CLV013 for inclusion within the development boundary for Clive. The Council's comments on CLV012 and CLV013 highlight highways, amenity and ecology concerns that the respondent notes can be overcome. Respondent notes CLV012 has the highest sustainability rating for Clive. Respondent disagrees with the Council's assessment that the site has no potential for development as it represents a natural extension to the village and comprises some previously developed land. The site will have less visual and traffic impact than the preferred allocation. Respondent notes that CLV013 constitutes infilling with the adjoining site CLV017. Respondent lists issues with the other option sites. Respondent also notes that the Parish Council meeting proved a strong community preference for development on sites CLV012/13/17 and opposition to CLV010.
  - Respondent is promoting site SHA016. Respondent claims that some stage 3 comments are incorrect as the site is 100% brownfield. Business rates are being charged and therefore the land is commercial not agricultural. There will not be a displacement of an active waste facility and there will be no loss of farmable land. The sustainability appraisal has been incorrectly calculated.
  - Housing guidelines Shropshire wide do not meet the Council's preferred requirement. Respondent suggests the inclusion of more allocations will afford more certainty as windfall housing allowance is too high. Respondent suggests the Council is more flexible with regard to the development boundary. Respondent is promoting site EBM001 Ladybird Garden Centre for the development of 40 dwellings.
  - Promotion of an alternative site at Harmer Hill (referred to in the response as HMM002).
  - Various sites are being promoted that do not have codes or names but are shown on plans submitted alongside representations.



# Appendices



# Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

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

## A.1. Question 3

Question 3 sought views on whether consultees 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 Wem Place Plan area, and completed this question:

- 58% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 21% did not agree with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy; and
- 21% 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 Wem Place Plan area, and completed this question:

- 80% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option;
- 20% preferred a set development mix option; and

## 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 Wem Place Plan area, and completed this question:

- 55% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 15% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 30% 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 Wem Place Plan area, and completed this question:

- 37% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 22% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 41% 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 57 (a)

Question 57 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Wem. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:



- 17% agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Wem;
- 23% did not agree with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Wem; and
- 60% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Wem.

## A.6. Question 57 (b)

Question 57 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Wem. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 14% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Wem;
- 22% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Wem; and
- 64% don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Wem.

## A.7. Question 57 (c)

Question 57 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEM010 in Wem. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 14% agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEM010 in Wem;
- 19% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation WEM010 in Wem; and
- 67% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation WEM010 in Wem.

## A.8. Question 57 (d)

Question 57 (d) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEM025 in Wem.

- 14% agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEM025 in Wem;
- 19% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation WEM025 in Wem;
- 67% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation WEM025 in Wem.

## A.9. Question 57 (e)

Question 57 (d) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEM033 in Wem.

- 15% agreed with the preferred housing allocation WEM033 in Wem;
- 13% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation WEM033 in Wem;
- 72% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation WEM033 in Wem.

## A.10. Question 58 (a)

Question 58 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Clive as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 29% agreed with the identification of Clive as a Community Hub;
- 11% did not agree with the identification of Clive as a Community Hub; and
- 60% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Clive as a Community Hub.

## A.11. Question 58 (b)

Question 58 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Clive. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 14% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Clive;
- 19% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Clive; and
- 67% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Clive.

## A.12. Question 58 (c)

Question 58 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Clive. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Clive;
- 21% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Clive; and
- 68% don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Clive.

## A.13. Question 58 (d)

Question 58 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation CLV010. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the preferred housing allocation CLV010;
- 21% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation CLV010; and
- 68% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation CLV010.

## A.14. Question 59 (a)

Question 59 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Hadnall as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 18% agreed with the identification of Hadnall as a Community Hub;
- 21% did not agree with the identification of Hadnall as a Community Hub; and
- 61% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Hadnall as a Community Hub.

## A.15. Question 59 (b)

Question 59 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hadnall. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Hadnall;
- 26% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Hadnall; and
- 63% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Hadnall.

## A.16. Question 59 (c)

Question 59 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Hadnall. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 9% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Hadnall;
- 24% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Hadnall; and
- 67% don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Hadnall.

## A.17. Question 59 (d)

Question 59 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation HDL006 in Hadnal. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 10% agreed with the preferred housing allocation HDL006;
- 24% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation HDL006; and
- 66% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation HDL006.

## A.18. Question 60 (a)

Question 60 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Shawbury as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 27% agreed with the identification of Shawbury as a Community Hub;
- 3% did not agree with the identification of Shawbury as a Community Hub; and
- 70% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Shawbury as a Community Hub.

### A.19. Question 60 (b)

Question 60 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Shawbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 19% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Shawbury;
- 6% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Shawbury; and
- 75% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Shawbury.

### A.20. Question 60 (c)

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

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

### A.21. Question 60 (d)

Question 60 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHA019 in Shawbury. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 11% agreed with the preferred housing allocation SHA019;
- 6% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation SHA019; and
- 83% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation SHA019.

### A.22. 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 Wem Place Plan area, and completed this question:

- 17% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be added;
- 17% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be removed;
- 23% disagreed that additional Community Clusters should be added or removed; and
- 43% did not know / had no opinion.

**Atkins Limited**

The Axis  
10 Holliday Street  
Birmingham  
B1 1TF

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

© Atkins Limited except where stated otherwise