

# Appendix B.18. Shropshire Council - Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation

Whitchurch

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 18 pages including the cover.

## Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
Rev 1.0	Draft Whitchurch	JL	BN	VD	VD	10 <sup>th</sup> May 2019
Rev 2.0	Final Whitchurch	JL	TH	VD	VD	3 <sup>rd</sup> June 2019

## Client signoff

Client	Shropshire Council
Project	Shropshire Council - Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation
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	6
<b>3. Windfall Development</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1. Question 5	7
3.2. Question 6	8
<b>4. Whitchurch Place Plan Area</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1. Question 61 (a)	8
4.2. Question 61 (b)	8
4.3. Question 61 (c)	9
4.4. Question 61 (d)	9
4.5. Question 61 (e)	10
4.6. Question 62 (a)	10
4.7. Question 62 (b)	10
4.8. Question 62 (c)	11
4.9. Question 62 (d)	11
<b>5. Further Information</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1. Question 63	11
5.2. Question 64	12
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.</b>	<b>15</b>
A.1. Question 3	15
A.2. Question 4	15
A.3. Question 5	15
A.4. Question 6	15
A.5. Question 61 (a)	15
A.6. Question 61 (b)	16
A.7. Question 61 (c)	16
A.8. Question 61 (d)	16
A.9. Question 61 (e)	16
A.10. Question 62 (a)	16
A.11. Question 62 (b)	16
A.12. Question 62 (c)	17
A.13. Question 62 (d)	17
A.14. Question 63	17

## 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 Whitchurch Place Plan area.

# 1. Overview

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

There were nine questions specifically relating to the Whitchurch 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 Whitchurch-specific questions.

A total of 78 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 Whitchurch Place Plan Area, supported the proposed policy. The reasons for supporting a cross-subsidy exception site policy included:

- It would increase the supply of affordable homes delivered in Shropshire.
- Demand has outpaced the delivery of affordable homes. It will encourage affordable housing in rural areas. This issue is exacerbated by the CIL structure in Shropshire which affords preference to development in Key Centres.
- It would encourage a mix of housing types.
- It would assist in ensuring viability of development proposals.
- Economic benefits for local construction industry from the steady supply of housing delivered as a result of the policy.

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

- Open market housing should be allowed in moderation and the quantity should be based on the requirements of each Community Hub or Community Cluster. This will enable development to be cost efficient and will ensure the perpetuity of the housing needs of the development.
- A similar exception site policy should be adopted for self-build homes.
- Site developments must be viable.

A small number of respondents opposed the policy. One consultee stated that the policy would contradict policies in the SAMDev Plan.

There was confusion surrounding the concept of the cross-subsidy exception site policy which resulted in a number of consultees misunderstanding the question. Several respondents highlighted this and one highlighted their inability to find a definition or any further information.

### 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. Of the respondents, who were interested in the Whitchurch Place Plan Area, consultees were fairly evenly split between the two options, the majority preferred a site by site option, with many of the respondents declining to comment on a preference to either option.

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

- This option would allow developers to use a simple formula in establishing viability across the District which would simplify the process and create transparency and certainty.
- A preference for a mix of low-cost ownership and open market housing.
- It is crucial for long-term community prosperity that low cost/rented and high cost private housing be fully integrated geographically.
- Developers should be made accountable for building affordable housing and should not depart from this once planning permission is granted.
- Sites should be considered in the centre of villages rather than on the periphery, to ensure a cohesive community.

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 included the location of village centres and the accountability of developers relating to affordable housing.

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

- It will ensure the correct tenure mix is delivered to suit the needs of the local community.
- Site location and shape can dictate the layout and mix of a development. This may be restricted due to local demand.
- The assessment should take into account one off costs which may be incurred on one site and not on another. Furthermore, the objective of delivering affordable housing will not be delivered if the landowner is not able to get a market value for the open market dwelling plots as well as the developer making a profit.

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 declined to select a preference and therefore 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 Whitchurch Place Plan area, supported the use of a windfall allowance for housing.

Consultees that supported the inclusion of a windfall allowance commented:

- It would enable the redevelopment of brownfield sites which are not preferred allocations; and
- It would allow smaller settlements with no preferred allocations to grow.

Among the supporters of including a windfall allowance for housing, concerns were raised regarding the proportion of the housing guideline reliant on windfall sites. Several consultees 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. In the same vein, a consultee disagreed with the inclusion of a windfall allowance on the basis that it should be additional to the housing guideline rather than contributing to achieving the housing guideline.

Another concern raised by a consultee is that windfall sites are often located in the Green Belt, although it should be noted that there is no Green Belt within this Whitchurch Place Plan Area.

In terms of those who did not know / had no opinion on the windfall allowance, a comment was made concerning the need for clarity regarding the definition of how close windfall must be to a settlement in order to 'count' against its guideline figure. The geographical extent of 'windfall' around settlements was encouraged to include land within 1 kilometre of the settlement development boundary. Another comment was also made

expressing concern over a lack of clarity regarding the balance between housing allocations and the windfall allowance proposed in Whitchurch.

### 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 questions, who were interested in the Whitchurch Place Plan Area, supported a windfall allowance for employment. The reasons for support were focused on the flexibility that windfall development would provide in delivering employment opportunities.

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.

Comments which opposed the windfall allowance included:

- The allocation of employment land provides certainty to businesses and job creators.
- Windfall development should be counted in addition to the employment guideline numbers.
- The question is inappropriate as employment land has already been allocated.

## 4. Whitchurch Place Plan Area

### 4.1. Question 61 (a)

Question 61 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Whitchurch. The majority of respondents did not know or had no opinion, although responses, which supported or disagreed with the proposals were fairly evenly split amongst responding consultees.

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

- Reference to the full range of facilities, services and public transport links available in Whitchurch to support the planned employment growth.
- Support for Whitchurch's role as a Principal Centre and the focus on housing and employment growth.
- A cautious approach should be taken to the contribution windfall development will make to the overall settlement requirement.

Concerns over the housing and employment guidelines were varied. With suggestions that the guideline is both too low and too high. Concerns included:

- Existing infrastructure is insufficient to support the guideline figure of 1,600 homes.
- The guideline has not considered sustainability, wildlife, infrastructure or the Green Belt (it should be noted that there is no Green Belt within the Whitchurch Place Plan Area).
- Conjoining more appropriate and better located sites would offer a holistic approach to delivery of housing and would allow proper masterplanning.
- The transport infrastructure and facilities currently in place are at capacity and will be stretched further with additional development.
- There has been an overreliance on the delivery of homes in Principal and Key Centres, more growth should be directed towards Community Hubs and Clusters such as Ash Magna & Ash Parva.
- As a 'Principal Centre' Whitchurch should receive higher guideline figures; and
- The guideline may be applied in a manner that is contrary to the NPPF and should be considered a minimum figure to achieve a sound plan.
- Lack of up-to-date evidence base on the need for sports facilities to support growth.

### 4.2. Question 61 (b)

Question 61 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Whitchurch. Most respondents did not know or had no opinion about the proposed development boundary. The majority of respondents who did have an opinion disagreed with the proposed development boundary and promoted alternative sites which they think the development boundary should include. Other comments made include:



- Concern over the ability to deliver the housing guideline on windfall sites with the development boundary drawn so tightly.
- Groundwater is shallow in places; underlying sand and gravel supports small scale commercial supplies locally.
- One consultee requested that the Council be more flexible and consider sites put forward abutting the development boundary, of all sizes, to be reviewed and potentially included within the settlement.

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

- It correctly excludes the undeveloped fields around the town while providing land for housing and employment need.
- Extension of the boundary to the north-east of the settlement and in particular to the north of Waymills is a logical rounding off and affords opportunities for more efficient usage of the town's railway station.

Consultees who stated 'don't know / no opinion' or declined to answer did not provide any further comment.

### 4.3. Question 61 (c)

Question 61 (c) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocations WHT037/044. 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 supported this proposal.

Those who agreed with the preferred housing allocations WHT037/044 provided comments including:

- Many respondents referenced the good existing vehicular access from the main road / town centre to the sites.
- The two sites are located in sustainable locations adjacent to the settlement boundary and have good access to Chester Road and the town centre. As such, the sites form a logical and sustainable extension to the settlement.
- The sites will provide a cohesive rounding off of development, as well as being located within reasonable walking distance of the town centre and rail station and accessible by foot to services.

Those who disagreed with the allocations WHT037/044 provided comments including:

- Loss of green space - open land in existing densely populated areas must be retained.
- Development on the north side of the town away from both the railway station and the schools would exacerbate existing parking problems.
- The allocation will not benefit Whitchurch directly and will become a gateway to Manchester, Chester and Liverpool, putting pressure on existing infrastructure.
- WHT037 and WHT044 are co-depending on one another to overcome significant individual failings.
- Existing infrastructure is insufficient to accommodate additional growth.

The majority of those who stated 'don't know / no opinion' or declined to answer did not provide further comment. However, Welsh Water, the authority on sewage infrastructure, stated that public sewers can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed allocation, but that there would be a requirement for off-site sewers to be provided to the boundary of the development site. Respondents also expressed doubts as to whether existing infrastructure can cope with the development.

### 4.4. Question 61 (d)

Question 61 (d) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHT014 in Whitchurch. 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.

One respondent commented that the site is well situated for the town centre and is far more sustainable than WHIT026.

One respondent questioned whether investment at Tilstock Road into sports facilities would be sufficient and suggested investment also at Whitchurch Sport Centre.

Those who disagreed with the allocation WHT014 provided comments including:

- Existing poor access / infrastructure and traffic congestion.
- An adjacent field has 2 springs beneath it as well as biodiversity value.
- The suggested capacity would constitute overdevelopment of the site.

- The effects of piledriving are identified as being problematic to the Edwardian houses nearby.

Welsh Water have stated that a hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) of the sewerage network will be required to assess its capacity to accommodate additional foul flows. Potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages. The findings of the HMA would inform the extent of any necessary sewerage upgrades which can be requisitioned through the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended).

#### 4.5. Question 61 (e)

Question 61 (e) sought views on whether the respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHT042. 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 supported this proposal.

Those who agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHT042 provided the following comments:

- The site is close to the railway station and other employment / services.
- The delivery of HS2 and the improved transport links between London and Crewe will benefit employment opportunities and improve the sustainability of Whitchurch.

Those who disagreed with the preferred housing allocation WHT042 provided the following comments:

- Conflicting use for residential development in proximity to employment uses across the railway line.
- Concern is raised over the immediate deliverability of the site due to reliance on adjacent site being developed to provide highways access.
- Stagg Brook LWS falls inside the site and is not considered in the Site Guidelines. A significant buffer zone is required to protect and enhance the LWS and priority species.

Additional comments raised for this site include:

- Welsh Water's stance that a hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) of the sewerage network will be required to assess its capacity to accommodate additional foul flows. Potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages. The findings of the HMA would inform the extent of any necessary sewerage upgrades which can be requisitioned through the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended).
- Access to the bypass would be easier if the current road systems are upgraded.
- The site has the scope to improve the linkage to the railway station and in particular the eastern platform, as well as provide further cross-subsidy support for the delivery of the employment allocation to the east.

#### 4.6. Question 62 (a)

Question 62 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Prees as a Community Hub. Most of the respondents stated they either agreed or that they did not know / had no opinion. No respondents disagreed with the identification of Prees as a Community Hub.

Those who agreed with the identification of Prees as a Community Hub referred to:

- The range of facilities, services and employment opportunities making Prees a sustainable location.
- It is strategically positioned on a major road and rail network and can accommodate growth.
- A bypass may be necessary as the village grows, owing to the narrow roads.

#### 4.7. Question 62 (b)

Question 62 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Prees. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. Of the remaining respondents, the majority supported this proposal.

Those who agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Prees provided the following responses:

- The level of development reflects the size, status and sustainability of the settlement.
- The guideline could be increased further considering Prees' strong transport connections and range of public facilities and services.

Numerous consultees disagreed with the guideline on a similar basis, suggesting that more housing could be accommodated in Prees due to its size, transport connections and facilities and services.

A consultee suggested that recent significant development at Higher Heath and potential for further growth on an adjoining brownfield site are ignored.

## 4.8. Question 62 (c)

Question 62 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Prees. Generally, respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion. The remaining respondents expressed both agreement and disagreement with the proposal. One respondent referred to the boundary as a logical extension of the settlement.

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

- The development boundary is not in keeping with the definition of a Community Hub.
- The development boundary is drawn too tightly around the settlement.
- The development boundary is illogical as it fails to include part of PPW009.
- The development boundary should be extended around PPW019 which would provide the remaining housing guideline for the Community Hub.

## 4.9. Question 62 (d)

Question 62 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation PPW025. Most of the respondents stated that they did not know / had no opinion on whether they agreed with the housing allocation PPW025. The remaining respondents expressed both agreement and disagreement with the proposal.

Of the respondents who supported the allocation, comments were provided by the consultant representing the site:

- The site lies within one ownership which simplifies delivery.
- A flood risk assessment for the site identifies that it is wholly outside of the flood plain.

One representation was received in support for the site, but stating that this site would only cover half of the village's guideline and advocated for further sites to be allocated.

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

- The site is located in a flood plain and is not suitable to be allocated for housing.
- The site has poor highways access.
- PPW022, which is located adjacent to PPW025, is more appropriate for housing and affords opportunities for additional parking for the primary school and expansion of the cemetery.
- PPW009 is more appropriate for housing and affords the opportunity for highway improvements.

# 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. Of the remaining respondents the many suggested additional Community Clusters should be added, although a proportion also felt that no Community Clusters needed adding or removing.

Respondents suggested settlements to be added, which included:

- Prees Higher Heath;
- Prees;
- Lower Heath; and
- Willaston.

A consultee commented that Community Clusters should be determined by Shropshire Council rather than by Parish Councils. However, another consultee stated that the Community Clusters are fair if they are based on aspirations of the communities and Parish Councils.

Another consultee suggested that Community Clusters/ Community Hubs should be included in the smaller settlements to allow them to grow.

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

- The number of Community Clusters identified is sufficient with the size of settlements in the Whitchurch Place Plan Area. Ash Magna is a sustainable settlement and should be the focus of development. Additional development in the Ash Villages could promote the addition of new areas of public open space in the village as well as additional community services as appropriate.
- The allocation of Tilstock as a Community Cluster is supported, as well as the Council's Document 'Preferred Scale and Distribution of Development - Achieving appropriate development in Community Clusters'.
- A consultee expresses disappointment with the proposed removal of Prees Higher Heath from the Community Cluster. It also doesn't recognise the important role that Prees Higher Heath plays in providing a stock of good quality family homes.

The majority of those who stated 'don't know / no opinion' or declined to answer did not provide further comment.

## 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 Whitchurch-specific questions.

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

- The map in the Consultation document does not show all the development sites which were granted Planning Permission before the SAMDev Plan was adopted and therefore does not give a true picture of where development is taking place or has been completed, because of this the development boundary as shown is incorrect.
- Preferred Allocation PPW025 does not meet the criteria set out in the NPPF, NPPG, FOAHN, TD42/95 Highways Agency items 3.6 and 3.7 and SLAA 2018 Appendix B.
- Other allocated sites have so far not seen development take place. Concerns have been raised over whether these sites are to be delivered within a reasonable time period. The failure to deliver housing renders a plan out of date.
- A concern expressed by a respondent related to the potential for the quantum of housing proposed for Whitchurch to overburden existing education and healthcare services.
- The assessment scoring of Prees Higher Heath fails to give sufficient weight to the existing size of the settlement and therefore its ability to both sustain and enhance its level of services and facilities. Further detailed consideration should be given to the categorisation of Prees Higher Heath as a Community Hub settlement within the settlement hierarchy.
- Prees is welcomed as a Community Hub due to it being able to provide a wide range of facilities and amenities resulting in it being viewed as an important hub of local services for the surrounding rural community.
- Another concern raised is the lack of existing employment opportunities for locals. One respondent suggested that new employment opportunities for locals should be created before developing housing.
- Some respondents made comments on the high number of houses being proposed for Whitchurch, and the adverse effect this will have on the amount of available green space if implemented.
- Various alternative sites were promoted by consultants and developers:
  - A number of Consultees promoted PPW021(a) for a mix of housing and recreation, due to the site being located in Flood Zone 1 and having good access to the railway station.
  - Ash Road, Ash Magna – relatively unconstrained site for housing allocation. The nearest transport node is within 500m of the site. Overhead wires would be diverted.

- Cherry Tree Hotel Site (SLAA Site PRH004) is promoted for housing, existing work demonstrates no ground condition or highways constraints and a utilities strategy has been developed. Site would support local services in the rural communities including the primary school at Tilstock.
  - WHT050 – this site was identified as being a suitable alternative site on the grounds of having good accessibility, diminished agricultural land value, biodiversity factors, design and low flood risk.
  - PHH011 ‘The Croft, Towers Drive’ should be given further consideration.
  - PPW022 is promoted for open market and affordable housing, the site is in proximity of the village’s primary school and there is scope to expand the cemetery and provide parking for the school.
  - WHT051 is promoted due to it being identified as a key centre which is supported by a range of facilities in a sustainable settlement accessible to pedestrians and vehicles via Alkington Road. There is also an opportunity for future linkage from the proposed new Tilstock Road Allocation.
  - PPW018 is promoted for housing adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and the Prees Cricket & Recreation Club. The site could provide a suitable landscaping buffer from the neighbouring employment land.
  - PPW009 – The exclusion of this section from the development boundary appears illogical due to the pending planning application (17/05815/FUL), which would have several benefits in that it will see modest scale new housing developed.
  - WHT032 is promoted for the viewpoint that the inclusion of this site in the settlement boundary would be a rounding-off of the settlement. The development of this land could be sympathetically undertaken and afford good connectivity to the surrounding footpath network, as well as being comfortably accommodated without undue impact on existing infrastructure or neighbouring properties.
  - WHT040 is promoted for small scale housing development adjacent to the development boundary.
  - WHT035 is promoted for housing which would be accessible to existing facilities and services as well as in keeping with the character of its surroundings. The consultee suggests it performs well in the Sustainability Appraisal.
  - Land off Terrick Road is promoted due to the view that it represents a realistic, sustainable and appropriate development option for Whitchurch, with safe and convenient access onto the highway network, good access to existing facilities and services, clearly defined boundaries on all sides and is developable in a manner consistent with the surroundings.
- It was noted that Prees has existing residential and business uses. Safe pedestrian access between PPW022 and Prees would increase footfall to those businesses.
  - Using HS2 as justification for the quantum of housing proposed in Whitchurch was rejected as invalid by one respondent on the basis that the station will be located in Crewe.
  - One Consultee pledged support for allocations which avoid impact on the proposed Northern Sea Route project.
  - More publicity is required on the consultation procedure as a whole.

# Appendices





# Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis.

This appendix details the responses provided to the multiple-choice questions posed for the Whitchurch 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 Whitchurch Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 66% agreed with the introduction of a cross-subsidy exception site policy;
- 13% 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 Whitchurch Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 56% preferred a development mix to be assessed on a site by site option;
- 44% 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 Whitchurch Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 70% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline;
- 11% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline; and
- 19% 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 Whitchurch Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 48% agreed that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline;
- 14% did not agree that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline; and
- 38% 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 61 (a)

Question 61 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Whitchurch. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 28% agreed with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Whitchurch;
- 22% did not agree with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Whitchurch; and

- 50% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Whitchurch.

## A.6. Question 61 (b)

Question 61 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Whitchurch. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 15% agreed with the proposed development boundary for Whitchurch;
- 38% did not agree with the proposed development boundary for Whitchurch; and
- 47% don't know/ no opinion on the proposed development boundary for Whitchurch.

## A.7. Question 61 (c)

Question 61 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHT037/044 in Whitchurch. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 24% agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHT037/044 in Whitchurch;
- 13% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation WHT037/044 in Whitchurch; and
- 63% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation WHT037/044 in Whitchurch.

## A.8. Question 61 (d)

Question 61 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHT014 in Whitchurch. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 14% agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHT014 in Whitchurch;
- 19% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation WHT014 in Whitchurch; and
- 67% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation WHT014 in Whitchurch.

## A.9. Question 61 (e)

Question 61 (e) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHT042 in Whitchurch. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 26% agreed with the preferred housing allocation WHT042 in Whitchurch;
- 10% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation WHT042 in Whitchurch; and
- 64% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation WHT042 in Whitchurch.

## A.10. Question 62 (a)

Question 62 (a) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the identification of Prees as a Community Hub. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 37% agreed with the identification of Prees as a Community Hub;
- 0% did not agree with the identification of Prees as a Community Hub; and
- 63% don't know/ no opinion on the identification of Prees as a Community Hub.

## A.11. Question 62 (b)

Question 62 (b) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Prees. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 20% agreed with the preferred housing guideline for Prees;
- 12% did not agree with the preferred housing guideline for Prees; and
- 68% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing guideline for Prees.



## A.12. Question 62 (c)

Question 62 (c) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary for Prees. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

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

## A.13. Question 62 (d)

Question 62 (d) sought views on whether respondents agreed with the preferred housing allocation PPW025. Of the unique respondents that completed this question:

- 17% agreed with the preferred housing allocation PPW025;
- 15% did not agree with the preferred housing allocation PPW025; and
- 68% don't know/ no opinion on the preferred housing allocation PPW025.

## A.14. 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 Whitchurch Place Plan Area, and completed this question:

- 24% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be added;
- 0% agreed that additional Community Clusters should be removed;
- 19% disagreed that additional Community Clusters should be added or removed; and
- 57% 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