

**Shropshire Site Allocations and
Management of Development (SAMDev)
Plan**

**Pre-Submission Draft (Final Plan)
March 2014**

Consultation Statement

This page is intentionally blank

Table of Contents

| | <i>Section</i> | <i>Page</i> |
|-------------------|--|--------------------|
| 1 | Purpose of the Consultation Statement | 4 |
| 2 | Statement of Community Involvement | 4 |
| 3 | The SAMDev Plan | 4 |
| 4 | Issues and Options Consultation (April 2010) | 5 |
| 5 | Preferred Options Consultation (March 2012) | 10 |
| 6 | Draft Development Management Policies Consultation (January 2013) | 14 |
| 7 | Revised Preferred Options Consultation (July 2013) | 16 |
| Appendix A | Issues and Options Consultation Strategy (April 2010) | 18 |
| Appendix B | Issues and Options: Key Issues Raised | 22 |
| Appendix C | Preferred Options Consultation Strategy (March 2012) | 54 |
| Appendix D | Preferred Options 2012 Consultation: Key Issues Raised | 58 |
| Appendix E | Development Management Policy Directions 2012 – Key Issues Raised | 184 |
| Appendix F | Draft Policies 2013 Consultation: Key Issues Raised | 200 |
| Appendix G | Revised Preferred Options Consultation 2013: Key Issues Raised | 208 |

1) Purpose of this Statement

- 1.1 Shropshire Council has engaged widely and extensively on the preparation of the Site Allocation and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan. This document brings together and summarises the consultation on the SAMDev Plan from 2010 up to the publication of the Final Plan publication document in March 2014.
- 1.2 This Consultation Statement is one of the Submission Documents required as part of Regulation 17 (d) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 1.3 The document shows the Council has met the requirements of Regulation 25 of the Town and Country (Local Development) and Regulation 18 of the 2012 Regulations, as well as the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

2) Shropshire Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

- 2.1 The Shropshire Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was adopted by the Council in February 2011. The document sets out the broad framework for how Shropshire Council will engage communities and organisations on planning issues across the county, including in the preparation of Planning Policy documents.
- 2.2 The preparation of the SAMDev Plan has followed the consultation principles established in the SCI, and in many cases exceeded them, in particular in the Pre-submission phase of production.
- 2.3 The SCI can be viewed on the Shropshire Council website at [http://shropshire.gov.uk/planningpolicy.nsf/viewAttachments/EWET-8URCNQ/\\$file/statement-of-community-involvement-adopted-version-february-2011.pdf](http://shropshire.gov.uk/planningpolicy.nsf/viewAttachments/EWET-8URCNQ/$file/statement-of-community-involvement-adopted-version-february-2011.pdf)

3) The SAMDev Plan

- 3.1 The Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan is the second part of the Council's statutory development plan. When adopted it will sit alongside the Core Strategy (adopted in 2011) and together these will form the Local Plan for the area.
- 3.2 The adopted Core Strategy has established a number of development principles and policies, which have already been subject to extensive consultation as part of its preparation between 2008 and 2010. The preparation of the SAMDev Plan has focussed solely on those aspect not covered by the Core Strategy, principally:
 - The identification of sustainable growth targets for Shropshire's 18 market towns and key centres;

- The identification of Community Hubs and Community Clusters in the rural area where some further market housing development will be planned for;
- The identification of appropriate sites for future housing and employment development in market towns, community hubs and community clusters;
- The provision of additional development management policies which can be used in the consideration of planning applications

3.3 Community consultation and the idea of ‘localism’ has been a key part of the SAMDev Plan’s preparation. The Council’s approach to community engagement has far exceeded the level required by national regulations and has allowed the Council to better reflect local community visions and priorities.

3.4 Table 3.1 illustrates the separate stages involved in the preparation of the SAMDev Plan alongside our periods of consultation.

| Production stage | SAMDev Consultation Document | Dates |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Production | Issues and options | 2 April – 25 June 2010 |
| | Preferred Options | 9 March – 20 July 2012 |
| | Preferred Options Draft Policies | 31 Jan - 28 th March 2013 |
| | Revised Preferred Options | 1 July - 23 August 2013 |
| | Pre-Submission Draft | March 2014 |
| | Submission | Estimated Summer 2014 |
| Examination | Examination in Public | Estimated Autumn 2014 |
| Adoption | Adopted Plan | Estimated Spring 2015 |

3.5 As well as the specific periods of consultation and representation shown in table 3.1 the Council has been keen to maintain meaningful and continuous engagement with local communities and developers throughout the plan preparation period.

4) Issues and Options Consultation (May 2010)

Overview

4.1 The SAMDev Issues and Options consultation was carried out between April and June 2010. This stage of consultation was not statutory but contributed to the Council meeting regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 which requires pre-production engagement on development plan documents.

4.2 The Issues and Options document was extensive, covering the whole Shropshire unitary Council area. However, given the size of the area, it was important to break down the document into smaller ‘parcels’ based upon geographical areas. Outside Shrewsbury, the County’s Local Joint Committee (LJCs)¹ areas were therefore used as the geographic basis for the

¹ There are 28 Local Joint Committees in Shropshire covering different geographical areas, based around clusters of parishes. They are formal committees and have a diverse role including raising awareness and facilitating debate on local issues.

consultation. A single document was prepared for Shrewsbury which encompassed all the town's LJC areas.

- 4.3 In total 22 separate documents were prepared for consultation.
- 4.4 Each Issues and Options document was structured in the following way:
Part A: asked questions about the relevant Spatial Zone
Part B: asked question specifically relevant to the LJC area
Part C: asked questions about Development Management themes covering the whole Shropshire LPA area.
- 4.5 Each document asked a set of questions concerning the following issues:
- The broad distribution of housing development within the Spatial Zone;
 - The scale of development in specific Market Towns and Key Centres;
 - Which villages should be defined as Community Hubs and Community Clusters and how many houses should they accommodate;
 - What types of sites would be appropriate to allocate for development;
 - Which areas should be considered for policy protection;
 - Infrastructure priorities for settlements;
 - The scope of policy issues for additional Development Management policies
- 4.6 To help consultees various options were presented for potential scales of housing and employment development. In addition, for those settlements identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) a range of site options were presented based upon information from the SHLAA database.
- 4.7 Aside from the 'givens' already identified in the adopted Core Strategy, the key purpose of the Issues and Options document was to raise important questions rather than to provide answers. As such, at this stage no sites were screened out which allowed consultees to view all the options available.

Consultation Process

- 4.8 Appendix A shows the Consultation Strategy used at the Issues and Options Stage.

Summary

- The public consultation was carried out between April and June 2010 for a period of 12 weeks.
- Letters were mailed to everyone on the LDF Consultee Database, which at this stage represented around 4000 organisations and individuals.
- Copies of relevant documents were sent to all Parish and Town Councils
- Copies of all documents held at each main Council Office and Libraries in the County;

- The Council website hosted a specific webpage including downloads of all the documents;
- Local Community ‘drop in’ meetings were held in each of Shropshire’s 18 Market Towns and Key Centres;
- Additional local meetings were held on request of Parish and Town Council, where resources allowed;
- Press releases were issued to advertise the consultation and the ‘drop in’ events;
- Questionnaires and Consultation material were made available to the public on request

Consultation Bodies

- 4.9 Shropshire Council holds an extensive consultee database which includes the full list of Specific, General and Other Consultation bodies totalling around 4,000 individuals and organisations. A significant number of the non-statutory consultees held on this database have been included as a result of commenting on previous planning policy consultations. Given the scale and importance of this initial SAMDev consultation it was decided to directly consult all consultees on this database by letter.

Parish and Town Councils

- 4.10 In line with the Council’s SCI and Localism agenda, the involvement of Parish and Town Council’s from this early stage was particularly important.
- 4.11 To support this, the Council gave advanced notice of the consultation to all Parish and Town Councils and provided them with several copies of the relevant consultation documents for their area. In addition, where a request was made and resources allowed, a planning officer would attend a parish meeting to discuss the document and to answer questions.

Community Consultation Events

- 4.12 The consultation was supported by a series of ‘drop in’ style meetings in each of the County’s main towns. In total 18 meetings were held which allowed communities to look at the development options for their area and to raise questions with planning officers. The times of these meetings were held between later afternoon and early evening in order to allow a wider range of people to attend.
- 4.13 The Planning Policy team worked closely with the Council’s Communications Team in order to promote these consultation events. This included press releases and radio interviews on local stations with the Head of Strategic Planning and Portfolio Holder for Planning.
- 4.14 Table 4.1 below shows the dates and venues of these ‘drop in’ meetings

| |
|--|
| Table 4.1 SAMDev Issues and Options: List of Community ‘Drop In’ Meetings |
|--|

SAMDev Plan Pre-Submission Draft March 2014: Consultation Statement

| Date (2010) | Town | Venue | Drop in times |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| Tuesday 13 th April | Shifnal | Village Hall | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Wednesday 14 th April | Highley | Severn Centre | 3.30pm– 7.30pm |
| Monday 19 th April | Market Drayton | Festival Drayton | 3.30pm – 7.00pm |
| Wednesday 21 st April | Ludlow | Harley Centre | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Thursday 22 nd April | Wem | Council Chamber | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Tuesday 27 th April | Ellesmere | Town Hall | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Wednesday 28 th April | Craven Arms | Community Centre | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Thursday 29 th April | Shrewsbury | Gateway Centre | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Wednesday 5 th May | Oswestry | Memorial Hall | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Monday 10 th May | Cleobury Mortimer | Sports and Social Club | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Wednesday 12 th May | Albrighton | Red House Village Hall | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Thursday 13 th May | Bishop's Castle | Community College | 4.30pm – 8.00pm |
| Tuesday 18 th May | Church Stretton | Silvester Horne Institute | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Wednesday 19 th May | Shrewsbury | Guildhall, Frankwell Quay | 4.30pm – 8.00pm |
| Monday 24 th May | Bridgnorth | Castle Hall | 4.30pm – 8.00pm |
| Tuesday 25 th May | Much Wenlock | Priory Hall | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Wednesday 26 th May | Whitchurch | Civic Building, High Street | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |
| Thursday 27 th May | Minsterley | Community Hall | 4.00pm – 7.30pm |

- 4.15 In addition to these 'drop in' events and the extra parish council arranged meetings, planning officers also attended a series of Local Joint Committee (LJC) meetings where there was a request to do so and resources allowed.

Consultation DVD

- 4.16 To support the consultation the Council produced a DVD, which took the form of a 20 minute presentation by the Head of Strategy and Policy explaining the purpose of the document, the options being presented, and how people could

have their say. A copy of the DVD was sent to each parish and town council to show at their meetings where it was not possible for an officer to attend. The presentation was also available to download via the Shropshire Council website.

Summary of Responses

- 4.17 Almost 4,000 responses were received to the SAMDev Issues and Options consultation from local residents, parish and town councils, businesses and other organisations. 102 out of 165 Parish and Town Councils responded.
- 4.18 An analysis of responses indicated the growth aspirations of towns in terms of housing, employment and infrastructure; the aspiration for local areas to be designated as Community Hubs and Clusters; and preferences for site allocations.
- 4.19 As expected, responses across the County were varied, indicating different growth aspirations between settlements. The localism agenda meant that this 'bottom up' approach to plan making was given significant weight in emerging plan making, alongside the need to ensure the plan delivered the strategic growth target and broad distribution of development identified in the Core Strategy (adopted February 2011).

5) Preferred Options Consultation (March 2012)

Overview

- 5.1 The SAMDev Preferred Options consultation was carried out between March and July 2012. This stage of consultation was not statutory but contributed to the Council meeting regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 which requires pre-production engagement on development plan documents.
- 5.2 The Preferred Options document was extensive, covering the whole Shropshire unitary Council area. This stage introduced 'Place Plan' areas as a means of consultation. The 'Place Plan' areas derived from work carried out with parish and town councils in identifying related geographic areas, each one based around a main settlement and their hinterland. In total 18 separate SAMDev documents were prepared, each based round a single 'Place Plan' area. The use of the 'Place Plan' specific documents allowed the Council to focus consultation more effectively, and to use resources more efficiently.
- 5.3 In addition to the 18 'Place Plan' documents, a separate consultation document was prepared covering the range of policy directions the Council intended to form into full Development Management policies. This document covered the whole of Shropshire. A full list of Preferred Options documents is included in Appendix C.
- 5.4 A key purpose of this stage was to consult on preferred site allocations for future residential and employment development. These 'preferred' options had been selected through a technical site assessment process and as a result of consultation responses at the Issues and Option stage.
- 5.5 In all the consultation focussed on the following key areas:
- Growth targets for Shropshire's 18 Market Towns and Key Centres;
 - The identification of Community Hubs and Clusters in the rural area, and their proposed scale of growth;
 - Preferred site allocations for housing and employment development;
 - Proposed Development Management policy directions
- 5.6 The main consultation documents were supported by a range of technical background reports setting out the site assessment process, and the reasons why sites were selected as preferred options for development.

Consultation Process

- 5.7 Appendix C shows the Consultation Strategy used at the Preferred Options Stage.

In summary:

- The public consultation was carried out between March and July 2012 for a period of 19 weeks (this represented a 7 week extension to the original 12 week programme set out in the Consultation Strategy shown in Appendix C);

- Letters were mailed to everyone on the LDF Consultee Database, which at this stage represented around 5,500 organisations and individuals;
- Copies of relevant documents were sent to all Parish and Town Councils
- Copies of consultation documents were held at main Council offices and Libraries in the County;
- The Council website hosted a specific webpage including downloads of all the documents;
- An on-line 'Survey Monkey' questionnaire was used, alongside more traditional Word versions of the response forms;
- Local community meetings were held in each of Shropshire's 18 Market Towns and Key Centres;
- Additional meetings and drop in sessions were held on request of Parish and Town Council;
- A specific 'Plan my Shropshire' Facebook page was created and updated throughout the consultation to promote consultation events, respond directly to queries and to provide general information on the consultation;
- Press releases were issued to advertise the consultation and the consultation meetings;
- Questionnaires and consultation material made available to the public on request.

Consultation Bodies

- 5.8 As at the Issues and Options stage, the consultee database was used as the primary basis for directly contacting individuals and organisations. This list includes the full list of Specific, General and Other Consultation bodies. In May 2012 the consultee database had increased to around 5,500 individuals and organisations largely due to the inclusion of new individuals who commented on the Issues and Options consultation. Given the scale and importance of this consultation it was decided to directly consult all consultees on this database by letter. It was decided that following this stage the Council would focus more on e-communication and significantly decrease the amount of direct mailing to enable more efficient modes of communication.

Parish and Town Councils

- 5.9 Parish and Town Councils were used as a key consultee, and as an important focal point for their communities. This allowed the Council to use resources more effectively and allowed additional community buy-in into the SAMDev process, which in turn meant wider interest and involvement.

On-line 'Survey Monkey' Questionnaire

- 5.10 An important addition to this consultation was the ability for the public to respond via an electronic communication form. The 'Survey Monkey' software was used, and this allowed the Council to use separate bespoke questionnaires for each of the 18 consultation documents. This proved particularly valuable in targeting questions effectively, and to encourage a more efficient and convenient way for people to communicate with the Council. To ensure those without access to a computer could also respond,

the Council continued to use Word versions of the questionnaire. The questionnaire asked respondents to say if they supported a proposal or not, and to raise other comments. In doing this, it became easier to get a snapshot of people's overall feelings on a proposal.

Community Consultation Events

- 5.11 A series of local consultation meetings were arranged by the Council in each of Shropshire's main 18 settlements. These meetings favoured the use of formal presentations rather than running them as 'drop-in' sessions. This allowed a more structured format to the meetings which suited the stage of consultation and the more focussed questions that were being asked. Table 5.1 shows the dates and venues for all these events. As with the Issues and Options, planning officers continued to attend additional parish and town council meetings on request, and where resources allowed.

| Table 5.1 SAMDev Preferred Options: List of Community Meetings | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Date (2012) | Town | Venue | Time |
| 2 April | Whitchurch | Civic Centre | 7-9pm (drop in session from 5.30pm) |
| 4 April | Shrewsbury (South East Area) | Shirehall Council Chamber | 7-9pm (drop in session from 5.30pm) |
| 11 April | Market Drayton | Festival Drayton | 7-9pm |
| 12 April | Shrewsbury (Full Place Plan Area) | Guildhall, Frankwell | 7.30-9.30pm (drop in session from 5.30pm) |
| 24 April | Highley | Severn Centre | 7-9pm |
| 24 April | Church Stretton | Sylvester Horne Building (following Annual Parish Meeting) | 7.30 – 9.30pm |
| 24 April | Wem | Edinburgh House | 7-9pm (drop in from 6pm) |
| 26 April | Ludlow | Assembly Rooms | 7.30-9.30pm |
| 1 May | Shrewsbury (South West Area) | Guildhall, Frankwell | 7.30-9.30pm (drop in session from 5.30pm) |
| 3 May | Minsterley/Pontesbury | Minsterley Village Hall | 7-9pm |
| 3 May | Ellesmere | Town Hall | 7-9pm (drop in from 5.30pm) |
| 9 May | Broseley | Birchmeadow Centre | 7-9pm |
| 22 May | Shifnal | Village Hall | 7-9pm (drop in session from 5pm) |
| 24 May | Oswestry | Memorial Hall | 7-9pm (drop in session from 5.30pm) |

SAMDev Plan Pre-Submission Draft March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | | |
|---------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| 31 May | Albrighton | Red House | 7-9pm |
| 31 May | Cleobury Mortimer | Parish Hall | 7-9pm |
| 11 June | Bishops Castle | Town hall | 7-9pm |
| 14 June | Craven Arms | Community Centre | 7-9pm (drop in from 5.30pm) |
| 20 June | Bridgnorth | Westgate | 7-9pm (drop in from 5.30pm) |

Summary of Responses

- 5.12 Almost 4,000 responses were received to the SAMDev Preferred Options consultation from a mixture of statutory consultees, local residents, parish and town councils, businesses and other organisations.
- 5.13 Appendices D and E provide a thorough assessment of the responses into the Preferred Options consultation. Appendix D focusses on the issues raised on each of the Place Plan areas on the specific questions asked, whilst Appendix E focusses on the key issues raised on the proposed Development Management Policy Directions.
- 5.14 As expected when conducting a consultation of this size and nature, a wide range of responses were received. An analysis of responses indicated the local opinion on the proposed growth levels for the towns, the identification of 'preferred' sites and the choice of community hubs and clusters.

6) Draft Development Management Policies Consultation (January 2013)

Overview

- 6.1 The SAMDev Development Management Policies Preferred Options Consultation took place between January and March 2013 for 8 weeks. This stage of consultation was not statutory but contributed to the Council meeting regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 which requires pre-production engagement on the preparation of development plan documents.
- 6.2 This stage was used to consult on 16 draft Development Management policies only, and did not contain any information on the scale of growth or the identification of site allocations.

Consultation Process

- 6.3 Given the nature of the consultation, only one document was prepared which contained all 16 draft development management policies and relevant background information. Whilst a consultation plan was not formally prepared, the Council's SCI was used as the basis for consulting. The consultation document was able to be viewed at each library and main council office in Shropshire, as well as being able to be downloaded from the Council's website. A copy was sent to each parish and town council.
- 6.4 Direct mail was not used as a means for contacting consultees, with the Council focussing instead on electronic means of communication such as e-mail and Facebook. This was consistent with the principles set out in the SCI and responded to the need for Councils to utilise more efficient ways of communicating. To support this, a new e-mail consultee list was created. The Survey Monkey software was again utilised to offer the opportunity for people to respond to the questionnaire electronically, although paper copies and Word versions on the website were also made available on request. E-mails were sent to each Specific Consultation Body, and to those of the General Consultation and Other Consultation Bodies where e-mail addresses were known.
- 6.5 Whilst the Council did not use local consultation meetings at this stage, parish and town councils were once again heavily involved in the consultation. The Shropshire Association of Local Councils (ALC) helped to set up two meetings specially aimed at the parish and town councils, where planning officers attended and presented on the evenings of 27 February and 5 March 2013.

Summary of Responses

- 6.6 Appendix F summarises the responses from the Draft Development Management Policies consultation.
- 6.7 In total there was around 900 comments made across on the 16 draft Development Management policies. Whilst this represents significantly fewer responses than received than either of the two stages of consultation, it is

SAMDev Plan Pre-Submission Draft March 2014: Consultation Statement

considered this reflected the more technical, non-site specific nature of the document, and continued to represent a good level of involvement.

7) Revised Preferred Options Consultation (July 2013)

Overview

- 7.1 The SAMDev Revised Preferred Options Consultation took place between July and August 2013 for 8 weeks. This stage of consultation was not statutory but contributed to the Council meeting regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 which requires pre-production engagement on the preparation of development plan documents.
- 7.2 This stage was used to consult on significant revisions made to the Site Allocations part of the plan following the Preferred Options consultation in 2012. The consultation did not include a discussion of the Development Management policies.
- 7.3 The significant changes the Council consulted on were broadly based on the following issues:
- Where a change to a growth target for a settlement was being proposed;
 - Where there was a proposed change to the preferred site allocations;
 - Where the Council were proposing a change to the schedule of Community Hubs and Community Clusters

Consultation Process

- 7.4 This stage of consultation once again used the 18 'Place Plan' to present information locally to ensure consistency with previous stages. Importantly, the Council only consulted on the changes which were being made rather than to the whole document. A Consultation Plan was not formally prepared, but the Council's SCI was used as the basis for consulting. The consultation document was able to be viewed at each library and main council office in Shropshire, as well as being able to be downloaded from the Council's website and a copy was sent to each parish and town council. E-mails were sent to each Specific Consultation Body and to those of the General Consultation and Other Consultation Bodies where e-mail addresses were known.
- 7.5 The Council again focussed on utilising electronic means of communication such as e-mail and Facebook rather than using direct mail. The consultation offered an on-line questionnaire through 'Survey Monkey', but as in previous rounds of consultation paper copies were made available on request and a Word version of the questionnaire was made available on the website.
- 7.6 Whilst the Council did not use local consultation meetings at this stage, parish and town councils were once again heavily involved in the consultation, and in line with the SCI, planning officers continued to attend locally arranged community meetings on request where resources allowed.
- 7.7 Appendix G provides a thorough summary of the issues raised by Place Plan area

This page is intentionally blank

APPENDIX A: ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION STRATEGY (APRIL 2010)

| Site Allocations and Management of Development DPD: Consultation Methods | | | |
|--|----------------|--|---|
| Type of engagement method | Group targeted | Outline of method | Co-ordination with Rural Toolkit evidence collection process |
| 'Issues and Options' discussion documents | All | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate documents prepared for each LJC outside Shrewsbury; Separate document prepared for Shrewsbury; Each paper to outline the key issues under discussion, along with separate inset maps detailing potential sites for settlements within each LJC area; Ongoing informal consultation to begin on Friday 02 April until the preparation of the draft Final Plan (April 2011); | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The initial Phase 1A community testing events will begin in mid-February; The events will be based on LJC areas to correlate with the 'Issues and Options' papers; The 'Issues and Options' papers will provide useful contextual information for discussion with communities; Planning officers will attend each event to provide information on the background to rural 'hub' and 'clusters' |
| Direct Mail | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters sent out to everyone on the LDF consultee database alongside information on the Core Strategy Final Plan; Copies of relevant 'Issues and Options' papers will be sent to individual Parish and Town Councils; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters sent to all Parish and Town Councils in mid-December asking for their involvement in the community testing events; |
| Website / On-line Consultation | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Shropshire Council Planning Policy webpages will be updated to reflect the consultation. Links will be provided from the 'Home' page directly to these pages; All 22 'Issues and Options' papers will be available to download, along with the Response Form; A link to the LJC webpage will be provided to give context; The ability to comment on-line will be available through the following means: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Comments Form will be available in 'word' format to enable people to download, complete and e-mail back to the Planning Policy mailbox (planning.policy@shropshire.gov). | |

SAMDev Plan Pre-Submission Draft March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>uk);</p> <p>ii. Public Access, the Council's interactive on-line consultation module, will be updated and available to use.</p> | |
| Local Media | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Press releases will be issued to all local papers and radio stations, tailored to their geographical reach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information and invitations to the Rural Toolkit events will be advertised in newspapers. |
| Local Joint Committees | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close coordination between the format of the 'Issues and Options' papers (which area based around individual LJC areas except Shrewsbury where a single paper has been prepared); • Each LJC lead officer to be contacted requesting the consultation to be included on meeting agendas; • The format of the consultation means a formal presentation of issues by officers is inappropriate; however, Planning Officers can attend to respond to queries, in doing so 'promoting' the document and the interactive community events. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LJC areas are being used as a basis for defining venues for community testing events; |
| Parish and Town Councils | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced letter sent to all Parish and Town councils informing them of the upcoming consultation; • On request, and where resources allow, planning policy officers will endeavour to attend Parish Council meetings to discuss the SAMDev consultation; • Where possible, parishes will be encouraged to group together to hold meetings, and to include wider neighbourhood forums at the meeting. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Parish and Town Councils contacted in December requesting their participation in the exercise |
| Local Community Events | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Events to be held in Shrewsbury and each market town / key centre identified in the Core Strategy; • Events will take the format of interactive 'drop in' exhibition sessions, using graphic material to present the key issues of the SAMDev Issues and Options papers; • Planning officers will attend to set up events and material and answer questions; • It is hoped representatives from the Parish Council and the Local Member(s) for the areas will also attend, and formal invites will be sent out in due course; • To open the events to as many as | |

SAMDev Plan Pre-Submission Draft March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>possible, it is proposed to run them between mid-afternoon and early evening (exact times will depend upon the venue);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is proposed that all the events will take place within the defined consultation period (15 Feb – 7 May), with the first event to take place in the week beginning 1 March.• Dates and venues for the events will be advertised in the coming weeks | |
|--|--|--|--|

This page is intentionally blank

APPENDIX B: ISSUES AND OPTIONS: KEY ISSUES RAISED

Albrighton LJC Area

| Albrighton Town | | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome |
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | 47 responses A: Minimum (200 homes) 16 34% B: Below Mid-range (300 homes) 12 26% C: Above Mid-range (400 homes) 6 13% D: Maximum (500 homes) 8 17% E: Other (none) 1 2% E: Other (100) 2 4% E: Other (200 max excluding RAF) 1 2% E: Other (1000-1500) 1 2% |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | 41 responses A: Minimal 15 37% B: Modest 8 20% C: Moderate Plus 11 27% D: Maximum 1 2% E: Other (none) 6 15% |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | |

Settlements in Surrounding Albrighton Area:

| Settlement | Comments | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | |
|------------|--|------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either |
| Albrighton | | 20 | | |
| Badger | Cluster together with Beckbury, Ackleton, Burnhill Green | | 1 | |
| Ryton | | 1 | | |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

Parish Council views

Donington with Boscobel Parish Council – Albrighton is already a service centre for several communities including Donington (incorporating RAF Cosford), Tong, Boningale, Badger, Beckbury, Ryton and Burnhill Green and should therefore clearly be considered a community hub.

Bishops Castle LJC Area

| Bishops Castle | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome |
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | 63 responses: A: Minimum (200 dwellings) 23 36.5% B: Below Mid-range (300 dwellings) 18 28.5% C: Above Mid-range (400 dwellings) 10 16% D: Maximum (500 dwellings) 0 00% E: Other 12 19% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 1 (8%) • 100 4 (33%) • 100-200 1 (8%) • Less than 200 3 (25%) • 200 1 (8%) • 300 1 (8%) • 316-366 1 (8%) • B-C 1 (8%) |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | 53 responses A: Minimal 8 15% B: Modest 32 60% C: Moderate Plus 9 17% D: Maximum 2 4% E: Other 2 4% |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B/C 1 00% • One hectare 1 00% |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment ² | Allotments, cycle routes, keep hospital, improved public transport, improved sewage system, improved drainage, improved broadband, parking |
| Town Council view | | <p>A1- E less than 200 (majority vote)</p> <p>A2- B (majority vote)</p> <p>A3- 5 votes - employment opportunities and encouragement of new business.</p> <p>4 votes - public transport. 3 votes - schooling. 2 votes - improved parking, roads, services, sewerage and water. 1 vote - mix of housing sizes, green open spaces, development in harmony with local development, police, doctor provision and maintain and develop existing.</p> |

Settlements in Surrounding Bishop's Castle Area:

| Settlement | Number of Responses | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---|--------|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either |
| Ratlinghope | 1 | | 1 | |
| Wentnor/Norbury | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| Myndtown | 1 | | 1 Myndtown to include Asterton and Criftns | |
| Lydbury North | 7 | 1 | | |
| Brockton | 1 | 1 | | |

² Export text as '.rtf' file and analyse using word or phrase counter at: http://www.writewords.org.uk/word_count.asp

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|----|--|
| Edgton | 1 | | 1* | |
| Clunbury | 2 | | 1* | |
| Clunton | 1 | | 1* | |
| Clun | 9 | 3 | | |
| Newcastle | 1 | 1 | | |
| Clungunford | 2 | | 1* | |
| Brompton | 1 | | 1 | |
| Chirbury | 1 | 1 | | |
| Bucknell | 5 | 5 | 3 | |

Bridgnorth LJC Area

| Bridgnorth | | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome |
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | 64 responses: A: Minimum (500homes) 19 30% B: Below Mid-range (700 homes) 14 22% C: Above Mid-range (800 homes) 16 25% D: Maximum (1,000 homes) 8 12.5% E: Other • At least 1,100 1 1.5% • No further building 2 3% • Less than Option A 1 1.5% • A/B 2 3% |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | 55 responses A: Minimal 11 20% B: Modest 15 27.3% C: Moderate Plus 20 36.4% D: Maximum 6 10.9% E: Other 2 3.6% |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|---|------|
| | | • A/B | 1 | 1.8% |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | Public transport and park and ride Green spaces Road infrastructure – junction with Ludlow Road improvement. | | |
| Town Council view | | No view expressed | | |

Settlements in Surrounding Bridgnorth Area:

| Settlement | Number of Responses | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either |
| Alveley | 57 | 9 | | 3 |
| Astley Abbots | 3 | | | |
| Colemore Green | 1 | | | |
| Nordley | 1 | | | |
| Nordley Common | 1 | | | |
| Cleobury North | 1 | | | |
| Claverley | 7 | | 3 | |
| Hampton Loade | 2 | | | |
| Ditton Priors | 9 | 3 | | |
| Ditton Priors PC view | | 1 | | |
| Eardington | 2 | | | |
| Morville | 3 | | | |
| Norton | 2 | | 1 | |
| Oldbury | 8 | | | |
| Quatford | 2 | | | |
| Quatt | 3 | | 1 | |
| Chorley | 3 | | | |
| Sidbury | 2 | | | |
| Stottesdon | 7 | 2 | | |
| Tasley | 4 | | | |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | | | |
|---------------|----|---|---|--|
| Stanmore Camp | 1 | | | |
| The Hobbins | 12 | | | |
| Worfield | 6 | 1 | 1 | |

Broseley LJC Area

| Broseley | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|-----------|--------------|
| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome | | |
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | A: Maximum (200) | 18 | 43% |
| | | B: Below Mid-range (300) | 13 | 31% |
| | | C: Above Mid-range (400) | 6 | 14.3% |
| | | D: Maximum (500) | 2 | 4.7% |
| | | E: Other (list) | 1 | 2.3% |
| | | • 100 | 2 | 4.7% |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | A: Minimal | 9 | 28.1% |
| | | B: Modest | 11 | 34.4% |
| | | C: Moderate Plus | 9 | 28.1% |
| | | D: Maximum | 1 | 3.1% |
| | | E: Other | 2 | 6.3% |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | Improved public transport Recreational facilities for young | | |
| Broseley Town Council view | | <p>The maximum of 200 homes should include the outstanding 100+ which are already allocated in the Bridgnorth District Local Plan (policy BRO 1) or have planning permission, which has not yet been implemented. This development should be subject to investment in the infrastructure and facilities that the town would need to support such an increase in population.</p> <p>The town needs employment, but employment development would be affected by the constraints of the road network. The</p> | | |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| Broseley | | |
|-------------------|------------------------|--|
| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome |
| | | Town Council considers that the land to the north of Cockshutt Lane, which is already used for commercial purposes, would be suitable for employment development. The Council objects to this land being used for residential development. |

Settlements in Surrounding Broseley Area:

| Settlement | Number of Responses | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | | Comments |
|-------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------|---------------|--|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either | |
| Jackfield | 1 | | | ✓(1) | |
| Barrow | 3 | | | ✓(1) | |
| Benthall | 12 | | | ✓(1) | |
| Barrow PC | | | * | | Benthall should not be considered within a cluster, it is totally independent and not, as the maps suggest, part of Broseley but is within the Parish of Barrow. |

Church Stretton LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome | |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | A: Minimum (quantity) | 41 38% |
| | | B: Below Mid-range (quantity) | 38 35% |
| | | C: Above Mid-range (quantity) | 9 8% |
| | | D: Maximum (quantity) | 3 3% |
| | | E: Other: | 2 2% |
| | | - None | 7 7% |
| | | - Less than minimum | 6 6% |
| | | - More than maximum | 2 2% |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------|------------|
| | | - Not appropriate to set a number | 1 | 1% |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | A: Minimal | 38 | 42% |
| | | B: Modest | 33 | 36% |
| | | C: Moderate Plus | 12 | 13% |
| | | D: Maximum | 2 | 2% |
| | | E: Other: | 3 | 3% |
| | | - None | 2 | 2% |
| | | - 1 hectare | 1 | 1% |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | Health and social care facilities Sewerage and drainage infrastructure | | |

Settlements in Surrounding Area

| Settlement | Number of Responses | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either |
| Acton Burnell | 4 | 1 | 1 | |
| Frodesley | 5 | | 1 | |
| Longnor | 4 | | | |
| Leebotwood | 2 | | | |
| Cardington/Gretton | 15 | | | |
| Enchmarsh | 1 | | | |
| Plaish | 1 | | | |
| All Stretton | 9 | 1 | | |
| Little Stretton | 7 | | 1 | |
| Minton | 2 | | | |
| Wistanstow | 2 | 1 | | |
| Marshbrook | 1 | | | |
| Hope Bowdler | 4 | | | |
| Acton Scott | 1 | | | 1 |
| Hatton | 1 | | | |
| Rushbury/Roman Bank | 4 | | 1 | |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Wall under Heywood | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| Longville in the Dale | 1 | | | |

Cleobury Mortimer LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | <p>A: Minimum (200) 18 33% B: Below Mid-range(300) 21 38% C: Above Mid-range (400) 8 14% D: Maximum (500) 2 4% E: Other 6 11%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enough with existing permissions • Less than 200 • Max 336 – min 316 • None at present • Restricted to limited areas • No more housing <p>55 responses overall</p> |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | <p>A: Minimal 7 16% B: Modest 20 45% C: Moderate Plus 13 30% D: Maximum 2 5% E: Other 2 5%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • infill/redevelopment • 1 Hectare <p>44 responses overall</p> |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | <p>Parking and traffic flow through the town Sewerage</p> |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| | | Medical centre Police presence |
| Cleobury Parish Council view | | A1: mid-range 300-350 (approximately another 200 houses over the next 15 years) A2: Expansion of business park at Old Station on Bridgnorth Road would be most appropriate |

Settlements in Surrounding Cleobury Mortimer Area:

| Settlement | Number of responses | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | | Parish Council view |
|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------|--------|--|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either | |
| Cleobury Mortimer | 59 | 8 | | | |
| Hopton Wafers | 4 | | 1 | 1 | Hopton Wafers PC see Hopton Wafers and Doddington as a natural cluster; Cleobury Mortimer PC see them as largest settlements in the area |
| Doddington | 3 | | 1 | 2 | Hopton Wafers PC see Hopton Wafers and Doddington as a natural cluster; Cleobury Mortimer PC see them as largest settlements in the area |

Craven Arms LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | A: Minimum (200 homes) 14 A-B (250) 1 B: Below Mid-range (300 homes) 12 C: Above Mid-range (400 homes) 22 D: Maximum (500 homes) 13 E: Other (Between 316-366) 1 E: Other (600) 2 E: Other (On Brownfield land not agricultural) 1 E: Other (no major development) 2 |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| | | E: Other (no shortfall from Church Stretton) 1 |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | A: Minimal 1 B: Modest 13 C: Moderate Plus 22 D: Maximum 13 E: Other (existing empty sites) 1 E: Other (create full employment) 1 E: Other (more employment opportunities for local people) 5 E: Other (2.5 hectares) 1 |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | |

Settlements in Surrounding Craven Arms Area:

| Settlement | Comments | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | |
|---------------|----------|------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either |
| Aston On Clun | | 1 | | |
| Broome | | | | 1 |
| Craven Arms | | 2 | | |
| Stokesay | | | | 1 |
| Diddlebury | | 1 | | 2 |
| Munslow | | | | 1 |
| Onibury | | 2 | 3 | |

Hopesay Parish Council

Aston on Clun as a hub for; Aston, Hopesay, Broome, Beambridge, Long Meadow End, Rowton, Round Oak and Hordingley. A community cluster including Hopesay, Clunbury, Clungunford and possibly Edgton and Clunton.

Munslow Parish Council

Diddlebury Village- not identified either hub or cluster but stated that it is the logical centre for the regeneration and revitalisation of central Corvedale.

Ellesmere LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome <i>(insert relevant information here)</i> |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | 82 responses: A (500) - 37 B(700) - 22 C (800) - 10 D (1000) - 9 E (other) - 4 including 2 x mid point between B & C (750) |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | 77 responses: A (minimal) - 10 B (modest) - 42 C (moderate plus) -11 D (maximum) -12 E (other) - 2 (existing allocation is adequate/ up to market) |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

Settlements in Surrounding Ellesmere Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome <i>(insert relevant information here)</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|-----------|----|--|--|--|-----------|---|---|----|---|-----------------|---|---|---|--|-------------|---|--|--|--|-----------------|----|---|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|-------------|---|--|---|--|
| Hubs & Clusters | B1. Identification of Hubs or Clusters | <p>Potential Hubs:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Hub</th> <th>Cluster</th> <th>Either</th> <th>Neither</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Baschurch</td> <td>22</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cockshutt</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>12</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dudleston Heath</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Queens Head</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ruyton XI Towns</td> <td>10</td> <td>7</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Welshampton</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>6</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>West Felton</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Whittington</td> <td>7</td> <td></td> <td>9</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Hub | Cluster | Either | Neither | Baschurch | 22 | | | | Cockshutt | 3 | 1 | 12 | 2 | Dudleston Heath | 2 | 3 | 4 | | Queens Head | 1 | | | | Ruyton XI Towns | 10 | 7 | 4 | 1 | Welshampton | 3 | 2 | 6 | 3 | West Felton | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | Whittington | 7 | | 9 | |
| | Hub | Cluster | Either | Neither | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baschurch | 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cockshutt | 3 | 1 | 12 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dudleston Heath | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Queens Head | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ruyton XI Towns | 10 | 7 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Welshampton | 3 | 2 | 6 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Felton | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whittington | 7 | | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Parish Council view | | <p>Baschurch: Should be a Hub Cockshutt: No to Hub or Cluster Colemere: No to Hub or Cluster Dudleston Heath/Crifting: Cluster Tetchill, Lee, Lyneal & Colemere: Cluster (Ellesmere Rural PC) Welsh Frankton, Lower Frankton & New Marton: Cluster (Ellesmere Rural PC) Park Hall, Hindford, Babbinswood, Welsh Frankton, West Felton & Queens Head: Cluster (Whittington PC) Ruyton XI Towns: Community Hub Welshampton: No to Hub or Cluster West Felton: No to Hub or Cluster Whittington: Should be a Hub</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Highley LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | A: Minimum (200 homes) 30 B: Below Mid-range (300 homes) 1 C: Above Mid-range (400 homes) 7 D: Maximum (500 homes) 1 E: Other (none) 4 E: Other (100) 2 Infill Only 1 Local Affordable Housing Only 1 Existing allocations and consents 1 |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | A: Minimal 16 B: Modest 10 C: Moderate Plus 8 D: Maximum 1 E: Other (none) 2 Infill Only 1 Unused existing allocations only 1 |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | |

Settlements in Surrounding Highley Area:

| Settlement | Comments | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | |
|------------|----------|------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either |
| Highley | | | | 5 |
| Kinlet | | | | 2 |
| Chelmarsh | | | | 1 |

Parish Council views related to question B1

Highley Parish Council

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

No specific comments- Stated that sites already identified for development (Rhea Hall Estate, Hagg Corner and more recently Netherton Lane) are sufficient.

Chelmarsh Parish Council

No specific comments – The village is unsuitable for development, it has already lost a number of its services and the amount of development needed to make the village viable would change the whole character of the area.

Ludlow LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | 62 responses: A: Minimum (quantity) 14 22.8% B: Below Mid-range (quantity) 11 18% C: Above Mid-range (quantity) 18 29% D: Maximum (quantity) 12 19% E: Other • At or below median of 750 1 1.6% • Between B and C 1 1.6% • Well below 500, say 300 1 1.6% • 900 1 1.6% • Max 736 min 636 1 1.6% • 400 1 1.6% • 750 1 1.6% |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | 43 responses A: Minimal 7 16.3% B: Modest 10 23.4% C: Moderate Plus 13 30% D: Maximum 12 28% E: Other • 3 hectares 1 2.3% |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | |
|-------------------|--|---|
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | Public transport Roads need improving Need more play areas. Care and health facilities. |
| Town Council view | | Between Option B and C for both housing and employment. More new homes are required for young people within the area to give them an opportunity to live where they have grown locally to prevent aging villages |

Settlements in Surrounding Ludlow Area:

| Settlement | Number of Responses | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|--|---------|--------|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either |
| Onibury | 4 | 1 - Hub as serves Aldon, Stokesay, Duxmore | | 2 |
| Onibury PC view | | hub for Wootton; Duxmoor; Wetmore; Whittytree; Walton; Norton; Brandhill and Vernolds Common | | |
| Hopton Cangeford | 1 | | | |
| Bromfield | 4 | | | |
| The Sheet | 2 | | | |
| Ashford Carbonell | 1 | | | |
| Richards Castle/Batchcott | 1 | | | |
| Wooferton | 2 | 1 | | |
| Caynham | 1 | | | |
| Clee Hill/The Knowle | 11 | 2 | | |
| Bitterley | 2 | | | |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

Settlements in Surrounding Market Drayton Area:

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome <i>(insert relevant information here)</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|---------------------------------|---------|--------|---------|-------------|---|---|---|--|----------------|---|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---|---|---|--|----------|----|---|---|--|--------|----|---|---|----------------|------------|---|---|---|--|-----------------|---|---|---|--|-----------|---|---|---|--|-------------------------|---|---|---|--|-------|---|---|--|---------------------------------|
| Hubs & Clusters | B1. Identification of Hubs or Clusters | <p>Potential Hubs:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="981 352 1832 954"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Hub</th> <th>Cluster</th> <th>Either</th> <th>Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Cheswardine</td> <td>2</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Childs Erccall</td> <td>-</td> <td>1</td> <td>-</td> <td>With Hinstock</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eaton-upon-Tern</td> <td>1</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hinstock</td> <td>11</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hodnet</td> <td>29</td> <td>1</td> <td>-</td> <td>With Wollerton</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marchamley</td> <td>1</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Norton-in-Hales</td> <td>5</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pipe Gate</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shakeford (nr Hinstock)</td> <td>1</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Woore</td> <td>7</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>With Irelands Cross & Pipe Gate</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Hub | Cluster | Either | Comment | Cheswardine | 2 | - | - | | Childs Erccall | - | 1 | - | With Hinstock | Eaton-upon-Tern | 1 | - | - | | Hinstock | 11 | - | - | | Hodnet | 29 | 1 | - | With Wollerton | Marchamley | 1 | - | - | | Norton-in-Hales | 5 | - | - | | Pipe Gate | 1 | 2 | - | | Shakeford (nr Hinstock) | 1 | - | - | | Woore | 7 | 1 | | With Irelands Cross & Pipe Gate |
| | Hub | Cluster | Either | Comment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cheswardine | 2 | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Childs Erccall | - | 1 | - | With Hinstock | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eaton-upon-Tern | 1 | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hinstock | 11 | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hodnet | 29 | 1 | - | With Wollerton | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marchamley | 1 | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Norton-in-Hales | 5 | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pipe Gate | 1 | 2 | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Shakeford (nr Hinstock) | 1 | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Woore | 7 | 1 | | With Irelands Cross & Pipe Gate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Parish Council view | | <p>Cheswardine – hub Hinstock - hub Hodnet – Hub Norton-in-Hales – hub with little or no development Woore – cluster with Pipe Gate & Irelands Cross</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Minsterley LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | Number of Responses A: Minimum (100 homes) ³ B: Below Mid-range (200 homes) C: Above Mid-range (300 homes) D: Maximum (400 homes) E: Other (50 max) E: Other (250) E: Other (500) | 50 100% 25 50% 12 24% 6 12% 3 6% 2 4% 1 2% 1 2% |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | Number of Responses A: Minimal B: Modest C: Moderate Plus D: Maximum E: Other (none) E: Other (no alternative preference) | 45 100% 19 42% 15 33% 6 13% 1 2% 2 4% 2 4% |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | | |
| Town Council view | No specific view expressed on hubs and clusters. | | |

³ Includes 1 stating affordable only & 1 specifying smaller scale development.

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

Settlements in Surrounding Minsterley Area:

| Settlement | Comments | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either |
| Minsterley | Support for hub/cluster status rather than key settlement | | | 15 |
| Minsterley/Pontesbury | Support for hub/cluster status rather than key settlement | | | 2 |
| Minsterley/Horsebridge/Plox Green | Cluster together | | 2 | |

Pontesbury LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome | |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | Number of Responses | 80 100% |
| | | A: Minimum (100 homes) ⁴ | 47 59% |
| | | B: Below Mid-range (200 homes) | 11 14% |
| | | C: Above Mid-range (300 homes) | 9 11% |
| | | D: Maximum (400 homes) | 2 2.5% |
| | | E: Other (none) | 2 2.5% |
| | | E: Other (20) | 1 1% |
| | | E: Other (30) | 1 1% |
| | | E: Other (50 or less) | 3 4% |
| | | E: Other (100 Minsterley/Pontesbury) | 1 1% |
| | | E: Other (less than 100) | 1 1% |
| | | E: Other (A/B) | 1 1% |
| E: Other (no alternative stated) | 1 1% | | |
| | <i>(E: Other All replies</i> | <i>11 14%)</i> | |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | Number of Responses | 72 100% |
| | | A: Minimal | 42 58% |

⁴ Includes 1 stating affordable only & 1 specifying smaller scale development.

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--------------------|------------------------|
| | | B: Modest C: Moderate Plus D: Maximum E: Other (none) | 14 10 1 5 | 19% 14% 1% 7% |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment ⁵ | | | |
| Town Council view | Supports Pontesbury as a Community Hub or Cluster. Identify growth level of 10 to 50. | | | |

Settlements in Surrounding Pontesbury Area:

| Settlement | Comments | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either |
| Pontesbury with Minsterley | Support for hub/cluster status rather than key settlement | | 2 | |
| Pontesbury with Pontesbury Hill & Habberley | | | 2 | |
| Pontesbury | Support for hub/cluster status rather than key settlement | 2 | | 18 |
| Lea Cross | | | | 1 |
| Lea Cross/Plealey/Pontesford | | | | 1 |
| Cruckton | | | | 3 |
| Plealey | | | | 1 |
| Habberley | | | | 1 |

⁵ Export text as '.rtf' file and analyse using word or phrase counter at: http://www.writewords.org.uk/word_count.asp

Much Wenlock LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------------|---|----|-----------------------|---|----|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | <p>56 responses</p> <table> <tr> <td>A: Minimum (quantity)</td> <td>27</td> <td>48%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B: Below Mid-range (quantity)</td> <td>9</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C: Above Mid-range (quantity)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D: Maximum (quantity)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E: Other (list)</td> <td>20</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Option E comprised of:</u> Between Options A and B- 3 (5%) Less than 200- 1 (2%) 100 or less- 11 (20%) None before infrastructure- 3 (5%) Only land within town limits- 1 (2%) None- 1 (2%)</p> | A: Minimum (quantity) | 27 | 48% | B: Below Mid-range (quantity) | 9 | 6% | C: Above Mid-range (quantity) | 0 | 0% | D: Maximum (quantity) | 0 | 0% | E: Other (list) | 20 | 36% |
| A: Minimum (quantity) | 27 | 48% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B: Below Mid-range (quantity) | 9 | 6% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C: Above Mid-range (quantity) | 0 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D: Maximum (quantity) | 0 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E: Other (list) | 20 | 36% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | <p>42 responses</p> <table> <tr> <td>A: Minimal</td> <td>16</td> <td>38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B: Modest</td> <td>16</td> <td>38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C: Moderate Plus</td> <td>1</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D: Maximum</td> <td>1</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E: Other</td> <td>8</td> <td>19%</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Option E comprised of:</u> Option E- 1 (2%) Historical approach to be taken- 2 (5%) Difficult to justify new allocations- 2 (5%) None until current is used up- 1 (2%)</p> | A: Minimal | 16 | 38% | B: Modest | 16 | 38% | C: Moderate Plus | 1 | 2% | D: Maximum | 1 | 2% | E: Other | 8 | 19% |
| A: Minimal | 16 | 38% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B: Modest | 16 | 38% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C: Moderate Plus | 1 | 2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D: Maximum | 1 | 2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E: Other | 8 | 19% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | | None- 2 (5%) |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic management • Resolve drainage and flooding problems • Public transport provision • More car parking |
| Much Wenlock Town Council view | | A1: Maximum - no response provided to this question A2: Maximum- no response provided to this question |

Settlements in Surrounding Much Wenlock Area:

| Settlement | Number of Responses | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either |
| Much Wenlock | 76 | | | |
| Farley | 1 | | | |
| Gleedon Hill | | | | |
| Homer | 4 | | | |
| Bourton | | | | |
| Bourton Westwood | | | | |
| Callaughton | | | | |
| Stretton Westwood | | | | |
| Much Wenlock Town Council | | | | |
| Easthope | | | | |
| Easthope Parish Council | | | | |
| Shipton | | | | |
| Brockton | | | | |
| Shipton Parish Council | | | | |
| Stanton Long | 1 | | | |
| Stanton Long Parish Council | | | | |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Church Preen | | | | |
| Church Preen Parish Council | | | | |
| Hughley | | | | |
| Hughley Parish Council | | | | |
| Kenley | | | | |
| Kenley Parish Council | | | | |
| Harley | 2 | | 1- Cluster- Cressage, Harley and Sheinton | |
| Harley Parish Council | | | | |
| Sheinton | 2 | | 1- Cluster- Cressage, Harleyand Sheinton | |
| Sheinton Parish Council | | | | |
| Monkhopton | | | | |
| Monkhopton Parish Council | | | | |
| Acton Round | | | | |
| Muckley | | | | |
| Muckley Cross | | | | |
| Acton Round Parish Council | | | | |

Oswestry LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | 95 responses: Option A (2100 homes) - 27 Option B (2,400 homes) - 11 Option C (2,600 homes) - 40 Option D (2,900 homes) - 10 Option E (other) - 7* |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| | | * Option B/C -2, mid range - 1, 2500 - 1, 2900 - 1, Up to the town - 1, |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | <p>94 responses:</p> <p>Option A (minimal) - 13 Option B (modest) - 15 Option C (moderate plus) - 46 Option D (maximum) - 18 E (other) - 2*</p> <p>* Up to the town -1, Should meet local employment needs - 1</p> |
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | |

Settlements Surrounding Oswestry Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome (insert relevant information here) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|--------|-----|---------|--------|-----------------|----|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|-------------|---|--|---|
| Hubs & Clusters | B1. Identification of Hubs or Clusters | <p>Potential Hubs:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Hub</th> <th>Cluster</th> <th>Either</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ruyton XI Towns</td> <td>10</td> <td>7</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>West Felton</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Whittington</td> <td>7</td> <td></td> <td>9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Potential Clusters: Park Hall, Hindford, Babbinswood, Welsh Frankton, West Felton & Queens Head.</p> | | Hub | Cluster | Either | Ruyton XI Towns | 10 | 7 | 4 | West Felton | 4 | 2 | 3 | Whittington | 7 | | 9 |
| | Hub | Cluster | Either | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ruyton XI Towns | 10 | 7 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Felton | 4 | 2 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whittington | 7 | | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Shifnal LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | 37 responses A: Minimum (500 homes) 11 30% B: Below Mid-range (700 homes) 12 19% C: Above Mid-range (800 homes) 14 38% D: Maximum (1000 homes) 4 11% E: Other (1200 homes) 1 3% |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | 26 responses A: Minimal 4 15% B: Modest 6 23% C: Moderate Plus 10 38% D: Maximum 6 23% E: Other 0 0% |

Settlements in Surrounding Shifnal Area:

| Settlement | Comments | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | |
|--------------|----------|------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either |
| Shifnal | | 6 | | |
| Crackly Bank | | 1 | | |
| Sherrifhales | | 1 | | |

Town Council views

Shifnal Town Council – no specific comment on hubs and clusters. General comment that Shifnal is an ancient Market Town with its own Market Charter.

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

Settlements in Surrounding Wem Area:

| Settlement | Number of Responses | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | | Comments |
|--|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------|--------|--|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either | |
| Wem Rural PC view | | | | ✘ | No settlements with the Parish have been identified as suitable as a "Community Hub" or "Community Cluster". |
| Whixall | 2 | | | ✘ | |
| Dobsons Bridge/Roving Bridge | 1 | | | | No view expressed |
| Whixall PC view | | | ✓ | | Cluster: Whixall , Hollinwood, Welsh End, Platt Lane, Stanley Green, Dobsons Bridge, Roving Bridge, Northwood, Waterloo, Quina Brook, Browns Brook (not shown on the map but includes Whixall school). Also Moss Cottages not shown as part of Whixall |
| Lee Brockhurst | 2 | | | ✘ | |
| Moreton Corbet & Lee Brockhurst PC view | No response | | | | |
| Grinshill | 10 | | ✓(2) | | |
| Sansaw Heath | 1 | | | ✘ | |
| Grinshill PC view | | | | ✘ | Grinshill: Stand alone as a village |
| Hadnall | 28 | ✓(16) | ✓(1) | | |
| Hadnall PC view | | | | ✘ | We note that Hadnall has been identified as a possible hub or cluster. We totally reject this. We are a village of modest growth and wish to remain so. |
| Clive | 97 | ✓(8) | ✓(1) | | |
| Clive PC view | | | | ✘ | The vast majority of Clive parishioners have expressed a strong preference for little or no development in Clive parish, therefore designate Clive Village as a stand-alone settlement in Open Countryside. |
| Shawbury | 33 | ✓(18) | | | |
| Shawbury PC view | | | | ✘ | The Council do not wish to see Shawbury recognised as a Hub. |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| Settlement | Number of Responses | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | | Comments |
|--|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------|--------|---|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either | |
| Stanton upon Hine Heath | 1 | | | | |
| Stanton upon Hine Heath PC view | | | | | No view expressed on this issue |
| Loppington | 16 | | | x | |
| Burlton | 8 | | | x | |
| Loppington PC view | | | | x | Existing planning consent means that community cannot sustain further development |
| Myddle | 11 | ✓(6) | ✓(2) | | |
| Harmer Hill | 12 | ✓(5) | ✓(2) | | |
| Yorton | 1 | | ✓(1) | | Stanton-upon Hine Heath Parish Council |
| Myddle & Broughton PC view | | | | x | Following detailed public consultation, there is no wish for either Myddle or Harmer Hill to be considered as a hub or a cluster. |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

Whitchurch LJC Area

| Topic Area | SAMDev Question | Outcome | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------|
| Housing numbers | A1: Distribution of housing development between key centres | <p>Total responses – 170 / 206</p> <table> <tr> <td>A Minimum (1,000)</td> <td>30 (18% / 14%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B Little Below Mid-Range (1,200)</td> <td>58 (34% / 28%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C Little Above Mid-Range (1,500)</td> <td>27 (16% / 13%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D Maximum (1,700)</td> <td>53/89*(32% / 44%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E Other</td> <td>2** (1% / 1%)</td> </tr> </table> <p>*36 additional identical comments were received in favour of Option D. The majority of these additional responses were from individual members of the Football and Cricket Clubs. The alternative outcomes when these are factored in are expressed above as alternative percentages.</p> <p>** Both saying 1700+</p> | A Minimum (1,000) | 30 (18% / 14%) | B Little Below Mid-Range (1,200) | 58 (34% / 28%) | C Little Above Mid-Range (1,500) | 27 (16% / 13%) | D Maximum (1,700) | 53/89*(32% / 44%) | E Other | 2** (1% / 1%) |
| A Minimum (1,000) | 30 (18% / 14%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B Little Below Mid-Range (1,200) | 58 (34% / 28%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C Little Above Mid-Range (1,500) | 27 (16% / 13%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Maximum (1,700) | 53/89*(32% / 44%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Other | 2** (1% / 1%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment land | A2: Appropriate scale of employment development | <p>Total responses – 164 / 200</p> <table> <tr> <td>A Minimal</td> <td>11 (7% / 5%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B Modest</td> <td>75 (46% / 38%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C Moderate Plus</td> <td>31 (18% / 15%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D Maximum</td> <td>46/82* (28% / 41%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E Other</td> <td>1 (1% / 1%)</td> </tr> </table> <p>*36 additional identical comments were received in favour of Option D. The majority of these additional responses were from individual members of the Football and Cricket Clubs. The alternative outcomes when these are factored in are expressed above.</p> | A Minimal | 11 (7% / 5%) | B Modest | 75 (46% / 38%) | C Moderate Plus | 31 (18% / 15%) | D Maximum | 46/82* (28% / 41%) | E Other | 1 (1% / 1%) |
| A Minimal | 11 (7% / 5%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B Modest | 75 (46% / 38%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C Moderate Plus | 31 (18% / 15%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D Maximum | 46/82* (28% / 41%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Other | 1 (1% / 1%) | | | | | | | | | | | |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| Infrastructure | A3: Priorities for local infrastructure investment | |
|----------------|--|--|

Settlements in Surrounding Whitchurch Area:

| Settlement | Number of Responses | Identification of Hubs or Clusters | | | Parish Council View |
|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------|--------|---|
| | | Hub | Cluster | Either | |
| Press / Prees Wood | 15 | 8 | 7 | | Cluster to include Prees Village, Higher Heath, Prees Green, Lower Heath, Fauls and Sandford |
| Prees Green | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Prees Heath | 3 | 2 | 1 | | |
| Press Higher Heath | 3 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Darliston | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Grindley Brook | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Broughall | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Ash Magna / Ash Parva | 2 | | 2 | | |

This page is intentionally blank

APPENDIX C: PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION STRATEGY (MARCH 2012)

| Proposed Method | Comments |
|--|---|
| Preferred Option Documents | <p>The following documents will be prepared:</p> <p>1 Management of Development Document (Shropshire wide) covering the draft Policy Directions</p> <p>18 separate Site Allocations Documents (based on the 18 'Place Plan' areas) covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth strategy for the relevant settlements (housing and employment numbers); • Preferred site allocations for settlements <p>Reference copies of the documents to be made available at the following locations: Libraries; Customer service points; Council offices; Parish and Town Council offices.</p> <p>The public will be directed to the Shropshire Council dedicated SAMDev webpage (see below) and to reference copies in the places outlined above.</p> <p>Paper copies will only be sent to people on request, and only as a second preference after web-based options have been fully explored.</p> |
| | <p>Benefits /Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities can view locally relevant information easily; • Allows for shorter, more concise documents focussing on the most important issues; • The preference for on-line access to the documents will significantly reduce costs to the Council of publishing the document; • Some members of the public don't have direct access to the web, or easy access to local contact points, and in these circumstances hard copies can be sent out on request. |
| Parish and Town Councils / Local Member Involvement | <p>Continue the 'localism' approach by working in partnership with Parish and Town Councils to achieve a successful local consultation.</p> <p>Parish and Town Councils to act as a focal point for communities to view preferred options documents as the alternative to sending out paper copies.</p> <p>Possibility of joint working on leaflet distribution and local promotion of consultation and public meetings.</p> |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| | <p><i>Benefits / Issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides local Parish and Member ‘buy-in’ to the consultation; • Encourages community led planning; • Helps to utilise local knowledge and resources; • Helps manage council resources more efficiently; • Parish and Town Councils to be contacted ahead of consultation to clarify expectations and roles |
| <p>On-Line Response Form</p> | <p>Electronic responses will be the council’s preferred method for communities to respond to the consultation.</p> <p>‘Survey Monkey’ will be used to create on-line response forms. This software enables the creation of fit for purpose questionnaires and is therefore helps to ensure a locally responsive approach to consultation.</p> <p>The Customer Insight Team have led on the development of the questionnaire in partnership with the Planning Policy Team.</p> <p><i>Benefits / Issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant resource benefits from the public using on-line form to respond; • Will allow people to express views easily and efficiently; • Past use of on-line forms for planning policy consultations have been low. To overcome this the Council will increase the promotion of the on-line response form through press releases and through the website; • It is recognised that some people have limited access to broadband and therefore paper response forms will continue to be accepted (see below). |
| <p>Paper Response Form</p> | <p>There will be a paper response form to supplement the on-line version as the council’s second preference for people to respond.</p> <p>Copies will be made available in libraries, customer service points, main council officers, but there will be limited distribution in order to encourage people to use on-line form wherever possible.</p> <p><i>Benefits / Issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows the opportunity for people who don’t have easy access to the internet to respond; • Ensures everyone is asked the same questions; • Easier to manage consultation responses and to analyse the results more efficiently; • The ‘open comment’ element allows people to comment more widely if necessary. |
| <p>Direct Mail</p> | <p>It is the intention to contact all 6,000 consultees currently on the LDF Consultation Database by letter to inform them about the consultation and where to find the documents.</p> <p>None of the consultation documents will be sent out with the letter in order to reduce costs and to encourage people to use the website and respond electronically.</p> |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| | <p>Benefits / Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that those who have expressed a past interest in planning policy issues are contacted about the consultation; • Responses to past consultations have indicated people like to receive formal notification of consultations; • It is acknowledged there will be a significant postage cost. |
| <p>Website</p> | <p>New dedicated SAMDev Preferred Options webpage to be the 'first point of information' for consultees.</p> <p>Page will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - all consultation documents; - paper and on-line response forms; - background and contextual information; - information on consultation meeting dates <p>Benefits / Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'One stop shop' for all consultation documents; • Easy to update quickly; • Significant resource savings; • Customer Contact Centre staff will be briefed about the webpage |
| <p>Social Media</p> | <p>Social media methods will be used to supplement the consultation process. This will include a dedicated Facebook presence and Twitter feed. This will be developed and maintained through the consultation by the Council's Communications Team in partnership with the Planning Policy Team.</p> <p>These methods will be used predominantly to promote and inform people about the consultation, rather than for a method of collecting views.</p> <p>Benefits / Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social media is a rapidly expanding area, and has been used successfully by other council service areas. Can be an effective and efficient method to promote the ongoing consultation and local public meetings. |
| <p>Local Media</p> | <p>Use press releases to promote consultation and public meetings.</p> <p>Work with the Communications Team to ensure language and content are suitable and 'jargon' free.</p> <p>Benefits / Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Press releases can be tailored to the 18 'place plan' areas; • Recognise that they will not reach everyone, but they are a useful supplement to other promotional activity |

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Local Joint Committees</p> | <p>Where resources allow, officers can attend LJC meetings on request. However, given the scope and nature of the consultation, especially the significant site allocations element, it is not considered LJC meetings are a suitable mechanism to engage communities on this issue.</p> <p>However, where timeframes are suitable, it is envisaged LJC meetings can have an important role in distributing general information about the consultation, i.e. dates and times of local community meetings.</p> |
| | <p>Benefits / Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past experience has shown LJC meetings can have limitations as there is usually a long agenda and limited opportunity to engage in two way dialogue |
| <p>Local Community Meetings</p> | <p>Shropshire Council to arrange, publicise and manage a series of fit for purpose Community Meetings, to be based in each market town / key centre.</p> <p>These will be structured evening meetings to be chaired by the local Member if available. Members of the public can access information, ask questions to officers, view maps of 'preferred options' and provide direct feedback.</p> <p>Where resources allow, officers can attend further local meetings on the request of Parish / Town Councils. In these circumstances, it will be expected that Parish/Town Councils arrange the venue and help promote the meeting locally. These could either be special meetings, or be part of a scheduled Parish/Town Council meeting. Council officers can help where possible with this process.</p> |
| | <p>Benefits /Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council organised events will be specific to their 'Place Plan' area; • The format is flexible, and can be tailored to local needs; • Parish Councils are effective at arranging local meeting and in promoting events locally; • Allows Parish Councils to manage and take ownership of events in their areas. |
| <p>Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE)</p> <p>Exhibitions</p> | <p>Public Exhibitions for all three SUEs (Shrewsbury West, Shrewsbury South, Oswestry) to be held at venues within or close to the proposed SUE</p> <p>Benefits /Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public exhibitions held locally will allow communities to view draft masterplans for these areas and to comment directly to site promoters, as well as Council officers. |
| <p>Cross Council Working</p> | <p>Work will be ongoing with the following Council teams in order to ensure an effective consultation: Communications Team; Customer Insight Team; IT Community Working Team; Development Management</p> <p>Benefits /Issues</p> <p>Particularly useful in identifying and contacting the more 'hard to reach' groups</p> |

APPENDIX D: PREFERRED OPTIONS 2012 CONSULTATION: KEY ISSUES RAISED

The following pages provide a summary of the consultation responses received on each of the questions asked at the Preferred Options consultation by Place Plan area.

Albrighton Place Plan Area

Albrighton Town

Question 1: Do you think that the target of a further 72 houses to be built in Albrighton by 2026 is appropriate?

Of the 9 respondents who answered this question 78% (7) agreed with the proposed target and 22% (2) disagreed. A number of issues relating to the amount of dwellings allocated over the plan period were raised by respondents, with two of the respondents commented that a higher allocation of dwellings over the plan period is needed in Albrighton. Other points raised individually were: that a higher allocation of dwellings over the plan period is needed maintain as a sustainable settlement; that ABL002 should be allocated and excess demand should be met through windfall housing within the development boundary; and that more sites need to be allocated e.g. ALB001, ABL 003, ALB015. Issues relating to infrastructure were highlighted by a respondent, namely: that healthcare infrastructure needs improving, that road infrastructure needs improving around the village e.g. increasing the number of car parking spaces in the village centre and at the train station; that homes and sheltered housing is needed for the elderly; and that land should be identified for recreation space and opportunities should be sought to extend the footpath network surrounding the village.

Question 2: Do you agree that site ALB002 (2 hectares), being land between St. Mary's CE Primary School and the railway station, should be allocated for 50 houses?

Of the 8 respondents who answered this question 67% (4) agreed with the proposed allocation of ALB002 and 33% (2) disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (2). A number of respondents raised the point that road infrastructure locally and in the village as whole will need to be improved as part of the development, due to increased traffic. Other points highlighted by respondents were: that another place of worship is needed in the village; that higher allocation of dwellings over the plan period is needed; that ALB002 is a sustainable location for development; and that the wider area including ALB002 and the Safeguarded land needs to be comprehensively masterplanned to avoid piecemeal development. English Heritage raised the point with regards to ALB002 that the requirement for any development to address potential impacts on the setting of the conservation area is supported. The Environment Agency stated that the issues of potential ground contamination and land stability have been recognised.

Question 3: Do you agree that a small amount of additional employment land should be created in the Albrighton area over the next 14 years?

Of the 8 respondents who answered this question 75% (6) agreed with the proposal for a small amount of employment land and 25% (2) disagreed. Cosford was highlighted by two respondents as a suitable location for a small amount of employment land, with the respondents suggesting: that Cosford needs to provide land for potential industrial development; and that additional employment development in Albrighton would damage the village's character due to additional traffic, and it would be better suited to Cosford due to its existing infrastructure. Other points highlighted by respondents were: that if employment

development takes place in Albrighton it should be focused on the safeguarded land near the train station; that employment development in the Albrighton it should be part of a masterplan for a wider area; that Telford technology corridor should include the Albrighton and Cosford area due to its highly skilled workforce; and that site ALB016 should be allocated as an employment site.

Question 4: Given the key constraints of the Green Belt and the limited current availability of land, where do you think that a small amount of additional employment land should be located?

Of the 6 respondents who answered this question (4) supported Cosford being identified as a location for additional employment land and (2) supported Albrighton, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (1). A number of respondents felt that if employment development takes place in Albrighton then it should be focused on the safeguarded land at ALB002, and that employment development in Albrighton it should be masterplanned. Another point raised by a respondent was that both Cosford and Albrighton should be identified as suitable settlements for additional employment land.

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Albrighton?

Of the 8 respondents who answered this question 62.5% (5) agreed with the proposal development boundary and 37.5% (3) disagreed. A number of respondents highlighted that the development boundary should be rounded off to include a small parcel of land adjoining ALB003 that sits within the Green Belt, so that ALB003 could be developed. Other points raised by respondents were: that a higher allocation of dwellings over the plan period is needed maintain as a sustainable settlement; that development shouldn't take place on non-allocated Green Belt land; and that the allocated safeguarded land in the village is suitable for development.

Question 6: Alternative sites

A number of respondents highlighted that they sought to promote non-preferred sites for allocation, these sites are as follows: ALB001, ALB003, ALB015 and The Birches located North of Cross Road. Another point raised by a respondent was that the number of sites should be kept to a minimum as outlined in SAMdev Preferred Option: 2012 Consultation.

Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area

Bishops Castle Town

Question 1: Do you agree that allowance should be made for a further 20-70 houses to be built by 2026?

The majority of respondents, 78% (64 out of 82) supported the target of a further 20-70 houses for Bishop's Castle. Of those making comments in favour, many wanted all new housing to be affordable, or for local people only, several felt that it was important that jobs were provided at the same time and others wanted to see a mix of housing types. All of those respondents who disagreed with the target still felt that some housing was needed and generally wished to see numbers in the range 10-50. Concerns were raised that the need for housing had not been identified, that there were empty properties already in the town and that new houses would be too expensive for local people.

Question 2: Do you agree that site BISH021 (land off Oak Meadow) should be allocated for 40 houses and 20 additional independent living units for the elderly?

The majority of respondents, 72% (65 out of 90) did not support the allocation of BISH021 for 40 houses and 20 living units for the elderly. The main issues were traffic related: either an increase in vehicle numbers which would cause congestion in the town; or concerns that the access to the site was difficult and dangerous. Other comments focused on flooding and/or inadequate drainage on the site. Concerns were also raised that the existing sewerage system could not accommodate more development, that the local environment would be spoilt and that there was no need for more units for the elderly. Several people preferred alternative sites to the north and east of the town with many specifically mentioning the Castlegreen area. Bishop's Castle Town Council objected to the allocation of any site which requires access from Kerry Lane (such as this site), feeling that the road infrastructure could not accommodate any new development on this side of the town. They suggested that new housing be located on two smaller sites to the north east of the town.

Question 3: Do you agree that Bishop's Castle Business Park should continue to be allocated for further employment development?

The majority of respondents, 94% (72 out of 77) agreed that the Bishop's Castle Business Park should continue to be allocated for further employment development. The Town Council asked that the types of businesses able to use the Park should be extended to include professional and financial services such as solicitors and accountants, but that any retail use should be secondary to the principle purpose of the business.

Question 4: Do you agree that no further employment land should be allocated?

The majority of respondents, 65% (43 out of 66) agreed that no further employment land should be allocated. However, several people felt that this should only be the case until the existing business park was full.

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Bishop's Castle?

A small majority of respondents, 51% (35 out of 68) agreed with the proposed new development boundary for the town. Reasons for disagreeing focussed on opposition to the allocation of BISH021, a desire to see other land, particularly in the Castlegreen area allocated instead and a feeling that new housing sites need to be easily accessible from the A488.

Alternative sites:

The majority of respondents wanted land between Castlegreen and Schoolhouse Lane to be considered for development.

Bucknell

Question 1: Do you agree that Bucknell should be a Community Hub?

A substantial majority, 73% (11 out of 15) support the designation of Bucknell as a Community Hub. One respondent stated that more employment opportunities were required in Bucknell, in order to ensure future sustainability of the village.

Question 2: Do you think that the growth target of 50-100 houses for Bucknell is appropriate?

The majority, 67% (12 out of 18) objected to the proposed growth target for Bucknell. Several respondents stated that the target was too high, with suggestions that from 30-60 dwellings would be more appropriate. A few respondents also stated that the existing permitted brownfield sites should be developed before allocating additional greenfield sites. Whilst others were concerned that the existing infrastructure would not be able to cope with this level of housing; there were already a large number of houses for sale in the area and that there is limited employment opportunities to support this level of growth. However 22% (4 out of 18) supported the target, with one respondent stating that the settlement has sufficient local services and facilities to accommodate growth, with suggestion that a higher figure would be appropriate.

Question 3: Do you agree that site BUCK003, being land adjacent to Redlake Meadow (2ha), should be allocated for 40 houses?

The majority of respondents, 67% (12 out of 18) objected to the allocation of BUCK003. The main reason for this is the site location within the flood plain, several respondents stated that the site is liable to severe flooding, with water from the hills draining to the site. It was therefore a concern that development of the site would result in additional flooding in the locality. A few respondents stated again that development of the existing brownfield site should be prioritised before any allocation of Greenfield sites. Concern was also raised that development would destroy the character of the village and create ribbon development, which is against the findings of the parish plan. However several respondents suggest that whilst the allocation of 40 dwellings was too high, a lower figure would be more appropriate. 6 respondents (33%) support the site allocation. One respondent suggested that due to its location it would be appropriate for sheltered accommodation or a residential home. It was also suggested that in order to maintain residential amenity for occupiers of Redlake Meadow that a screening zone should be provided.

Question 4: Do you agree that the development boundary should be removed?

A small majority of respondents, 57% (8 out of 14) object to the removal of the development boundary for Bucknell. The main reason for this is the concern that removal of the boundary will result in a lack of clarification as to where the village ends and the countryside begins. One respondent stated that this could create a precedent for further village expansion in several directions.

Alternative Sites:

1. Consider allocating Land at Hill Farm (BUCK007)
2. BUCK001 should be allocated- site should be a priority because its brownfield land.
3. Object to alternative site at Land west of The Tyndings (BUCK010sd) - would increase traffic flow on a narrow and dangerous section of the road and would detrimentally encroach into the distinctive landscape.
4. Consider allocating Land west of The Tyndings (BUCK010sd)

Chirbury

Question 1: Do you agree that Chirbury should be a Community Hub?

The majority of respondents, 73% (16 out of 22), supported the idea that Chirbury should be a Community Hub. Of those in favour, some felt that this would support local businesses. The Parish Council agreed that Chirbury should be a Community Hub with an allocated site for a maximum of 30 houses and 20 other houses to be built in the remainder of the parish.

Question 2: Do you think that the growth target of about 50 houses for Chirbury is appropriate?

Respondents were split 50:50 (11 out of 22) for and against a growth target of about 50 houses for Chirbury. Views in favour supported a mix of housing types, 30 houses for Chirbury and felt that there would be a positive effect on local businesses. Those against the target felt that it was too high and that local properties would depreciate in value as a result.

Question 3: Do you agree that site CHIR001, being land to the rear of Horseshoe Road (1.38ha), should be allocated for 30 houses?

The majority of respondents, 67% (14 out of 21) supported the allocation of CHIR001 for 30 houses. Several people commented that there should be a mix of house types whilst others felt that an access through Horseshoe Road would be dangerous. Additionally, respondents did not wish to see housing to the rear of Horseshoe Road. The Parish Council supported the allocation of this site for a mixture of house sizes and types and asked that it be phased to avoid overloading the existing infrastructure and facilities.

Question 4: Do you agree that Chirbury should have a development boundary?

The majority of respondents, 62% (13 out of 21) felt that Chirbury should have a development boundary. Some people commented that the current Conservation Area should be maintained. The Parish Council did not want Chirbury to have a development boundary.

Alternative Sites: No alternative sites were suggested

Clun

Question 1. Do you agree that Clun should be a Community Hub?

A substantial majority, 86% (12 out of 14), support the designation of Clun as a Community Hub. Only one respondent made an additional comment, stating that Clun is a popular tourism town, with a number of community facilities and links to other south Shropshire market towns and therefore should be designation as a Community Hub.

Question 2. Do you think that the growth target of about 100 houses for Clun is appropriate?

Out of the 16 respondents, 8 (50%) supported the housing target, whilst 7 (44%) objected. The reason for support related to the identified need for more housing in the area. The Environment Agency also commented that due to the sensitivity of the Clun catchment area any housing target needs to be assessed in accordance with the Habitats Directive to ensure water quality is sustained at current levels. A number of respondents, including the Parish Council, stated that the target was too high and that a lower level of housing would be more acceptable, with suggestions ranging from 20 to 70 (Parish Council preference of 70).

Question 3. Do you agree that site CLUN002, being land behind the GP surgery (1.6Ha), should be allocated for 40 houses?

The majority of respondents, 73% (11 out of 15), support the allocation of the site. A few respondents stated that the site could be extended to include additional land, which will allow the site to accommodate the full target of 100 houses. However the Parish council has

stated that the site allocation should not exceed 60 houses. English Heritage commented that any development on the site will need to take account the setting of the nearby listed buildings and the conservation area. Another respondent stated that the development needs to provide family homes for local people. However 3 respondents (20%) object to the sites inclusion. One respondent stated that the housing target was too high for Clun and that 20 homes would be more appropriate and in keeping with its present size. Another respondent stated that the historic and flooding issues restrict the windfall target to 30, and that the remaining 60 houses should be allocated between CLUN001 and CLUN002.

Question 4. Do you agree that the development boundary should be removed?

Out of the 11 respondents, a large majority do not agree that the development boundary should be removed, stating that a development boundary was required. This included Clun with Chapel Lawn Parish Council, who stated that the existing boundary should be retained and if necessary redrawn to include preferred option CLUN002.

Alternative sites:

1. Allocate CLUN001 as additional site- not enough opportunities for 60 windfall, so need to allocate additional site. Landscape issues can easily be overcome by planting.

Lydbury North

Question 1: Do you agree that Lydbury North should be Community Hub?

The majority of respondents, 64% (9 out of 14) support the designation of Lydbury North as a Community Hub.

Question 2: Do you think that the growth target of about 25 houses for Lydbury North is appropriate?

A large majority of respondents, 75% (9 out of 12) support the growth target of 25, with one respondent stating that this level of development will provide support for the school and other services, whilst meeting local housing needs. However, 25% of respondent (3 out of 12) object to this figure, with one respondent arguing that the figure is too high for the size of the settlement and a maximum of 6 would be more appropriate. On the other hand, another respondent argued that in order to maintain the vitality and sustainability of the village a larger number of housing is required.

Question 3: Do you agree that site LYD001, being land behind Habershon Close (0.6ha), should be allocated for 12 houses?

The majority of respondents, 64% (9 out of 14) support the allocation of the site, largely due to the sites potential to provide community benefit, in particular public open space. A few respondents stated that they would support the allocation providing that development was concentrated on the south east part of the site, as the land slopes up to the North West and development here would be prominent and dominant over the existing development. They also stated that a smaller allocation for the site would be more appropriate and would allow for a high level of public open space provision. One respondent comment that both LYD001 and LYD002 could be allocated with a lower number of houses as this would disperse any impact across the village.

Question 4: Do you agree that Lydbury North should have a development boundary?

A substantial majority of respondents, 83% (10 out of 12) agree that Lydbury North should have a development boundary, as it will allow for small scale infill development. However

one respondent raised a concern that infilling can result in a lack of green amenity space within the village and therefore sensitively planned and managed development over a larger area, incorporating green spaces is appropriate.

Alternative Sites:

1. Identify Land adjacent to Telephone Exchange for employment use- could provide starter workshops and/ or live work units.
2. Site LYD002 should be reconsidered in light of the proposed new village hall and its requirements for complementary facilities in the future as per the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

Worthen and Brockton

Question 1: Do you agree that Worthen and Brockton should be a Community Hub?

A slight majority of respondents, 52% (17 out of 33) supported the designation of Worthen and Brockton as a Community Hub. Several of those who did not support the designation questioned the need for the proposed level of development or felt that new housing would spoil the character of the settlements. More specifically, many wanted the green space between the two villages to remain undeveloped so that the two settlements remain separate. Others were concerned that the proposed road improvements would encourage either more traffic and/or increase the speed of the existing traffic.

In their response, the Parish Council asked that the whole of the Parish's Worthen Ward be designated a Community Cluster. Worthen and Brockton would then cease to be a Community Hub, but form a cluster which included Binweston, Leigh and Aston Rogers. They also asked that no development site be greater than 5 houses in this cluster and that no more than 10 houses be built in any 5 year period.

Question 2: Do you think that the growth target of 60 houses for Worthen and Brockton is appropriate?

The majority of respondents, 79% (26 out of 33) did not feel that the growth target of 60 houses was appropriate. Many people felt that the need for new houses had not been demonstrated or mentioned that there were existing unsold properties in the villages. Others felt that there would be a negative impact on the local community and/or the local environment or they felt that Worthen and Brockton did not contain enough amenities to support such a level of development. In their response, the Parish Council asked that the target be reduced to 30, delivered over 15 years at a rate of 10 every 5 year period.

Question 3: Do you agree that site WORTH002, being land to the west of Millstream (2.2ha of 7.57ha), should be allocated for 35 houses?

The majority of respondents, 81% (26 out of 32) did not support the allocation of WORTH002 for 35 houses. Concerns raised included the danger from traffic and problems with access, the steep nature of the site, flooding, loss of view or visual amenity and the inability of the existing sewerage system to accommodate new development. Several respondents again felt that the need for new houses had not been demonstrated. The Parish Council did not want an allocated site and asked that development be through infill and the re-development of existing sites such as Millstream Close.

Question 4: Do you agree that the development boundary should be removed?

The majority of respondents, 62% (16 out of 26) felt that the development boundary should be retained. Of these, some felt that there were not enough services and utilities outside the villages to support development, others questioned the need for development in the first place and some felt that the villages should stay as they are.

Alternative sites: No alternative sites were suggested

Binweston, Leigh and Aston Rogers

Question 1: Do you agree that the settlements of Binweston, Leigh and Aston Rogers should be a Community Cluster?

The majority of respondents, 69% (9 out of 13) supported the designation of Binweston, Leigh and Aston Rogers as a Community Cluster. Where there was disagreement, this was based on the premise that redundant agricultural buildings should be converted for residential use before new houses were built.

In their response, the Parish Council asked that the whole of the Parish's Worthen Ward be designated a Community Cluster. This would include Worthen and Brockton. They also asked that no development site be greater than 5 houses in this cluster and that no more than 10 houses be built in any 5 year period.

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed number of new houses?

The majority of respondents, 77% (10 out of 13) agreed with the target of approximately 15 houses for the settlements of Binweston, Leigh and Aston Rogers. Of those who disagreed, one respondent felt that 5 would be more appropriate and another felt that redundant agricultural buildings should be converted for residential use before new houses were built.

Question 3: Do you agree this should be met through windfall development and that there are no allocated sites?

The majority of respondents, 75% (9 out of 12) felt that new housing should be delivered through windfall development and that there should be no allocated sites. Countering this, one respondent suggested that a site should be allocated in Aston Rogers and two people made the same point as in questions 1 and 2 about the re-use of agricultural buildings.

Question 4: Should the settlements have development boundaries

A small majority of respondents, 55% (6 out of 11) would like the settlements to have development boundaries. Of those who disagreed, one person felt that Binweston was too small to have a development boundary.

Alternative sites.

Two new sites in Aston Rogers were proposed for new housing allocations: land adjoining 5, The Sticks and land at Cedar Wood bungalow.

Brompton, Marton, Middleton, Priestweston, Stockton and Rorrington

Question 1: Do you agree that the settlements of Brompton, Marton, Middleton, Priest Weston, Stockton and Rorrington should be a Community Cluster?

The majority of respondents, 67% (8 out of 12) supported the designation of Brompton, Marton, Middleton, Priest Weston, Stockton and Rorrington as a Community Cluster. Of those who disagreed, one respondent felt that the settlements were too dispersed and another queried the way in which clusters were being decided upon. The Parish Council agreed that Brompton, Marton, Middleton, Priest Weston, Stockton and Rorrington should be a Community Cluster.

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed number of new houses?

The majority of respondents, 83% (10 out of 12) agreed with the target of approximately 25 houses. Two people felt that these should be spread amongst all the settlements. The Parish Council wished to see 25 houses spread evenly over the whole of the cluster area

Question 3: Do you agree this should be met through windfall development and that there are no allocated sites?

The majority of respondents, 90% (9 out of 10) agreed that new housing should be delivered through windfall rather than an allocated site. The Parish Council supported this as they felt it gives the necessary flexibility to build houses where they are required.

Question 4: Should the settlements have development boundaries?

The majority of respondents, 67% (6 out of 9) wanted the settlements to have development boundaries. However, the Parish Council does not want the settlements to have development boundaries, feeling these would restrict the ability for houses to be built where they are required.

Alternative sites: No potential new sites for allocation were proposed for the Brompton, Marton, Middleton, Priest Weston, Stockton and Rorrington Cluster

Clunbury and Clungunford

Question 1: Do you agree that the settlements of Clunbury and Clungunford should be a Community Cluster?

A substantial majority of respondents, 82% (9 out of 11) support the designation of Clunbury and Clungunford as a Community Cluster. The main reason for this is that the settlements play a functional role within the local area and development is required to meet local housing needs. However Clunbury Parish Council have comment that they do not wish to be part of the cluster and have ask Shropshire Council to remove Clunbury and designated it as countryside.

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed number of new houses?

A substantial majority of respondents, 90% (9 out of 10) support the proposed housing target. However Clunbury Parish Council reiterated their position that Clunbury should be removed from the Cluster and identified as countryside for planning policy purposes.

Question 3: Do you agree this should be met through windfall development and that there are no allocated sites?

100% of respondents (9 out of 9) agree that the housing target should be met through windfall development. One additional comment was received, which stated that development should utilise brown field sites before greenfield and provide family homes.

Question 4: Should the settlements have development boundaries?

A small majority, 56 % (5 out of 9) stated that the settlements should have development boundaries. However, 33% of respondents (3 out of 9) stated they should not have development boundaries. The main reason for this is that avoiding development boundaries will allow for small scale development to come forward on site within and adjacent to the built up area, that are determine on their sustainability. Clunbury Parish Council reiterated that Clunbury should not be part of the Cluster and as such will not need a development boundary.

Alternative Sites:

1. Land at Clungunford Farm, could provide 3 phase development to include; 1) Top Yard (Phase 2)-New build dwelling on plot opposite Clungunford Farm House within the curtilage of the existing stone wall. Conversion of the existing Stables to provide two dwellings. 2) Bottom Yard (Phase 1 Gated Community)- New build construction of four 3 and 4 bedroom properties with reasonable garden with the emphasis on family occupancy complete with the possibility of a small unit for each property for cottage industry start up enterprises. This again within the existing stone wall curtilage. 3) Rear Yard (Phase 3) -Future development of more local family housing

Hope, Bentlawnt and Shelve

Question 1: Do you agree that the settlements of Hope, Bentlawnt and Shelve should be a Community Cluster?

The majority of respondents, 80% (8 out of 10) supported the designation of Hope, Bentlawnt and Shelve as a Community Cluster. One respondent commented that this would make the community more sustainable. The Parish Council felt that the whole parish ward should form a Community Cluster, not just the named settlements of Hope, Bentlawnt and Shelve. They also wanted each development site to be no more than 2 houses.

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed number of new houses?

The majority of respondents, 80% (8 out of 10) agreed that around 15 should be the target figure for new houses. One person felt that the target should be 30. The Parish Council supported the target of 15.

Question 3: Do you agree this should be met through windfall development and that there are no allocated sites?

The majority of respondents, 78% (7 out of 9) agreed that new housing should be delivered through windfall development rather than allocated sites. Of those who disagreed, one person felt that allocating land gave more certainty for the community and another wanted land to be allocated in Bentlawnt. The Parish Council felt that windfall was the most appropriate mechanism for bringing forward new housing.

Question 4: Should the settlements have development boundaries?

The majority of respondents, 75% (6 out of 8) wanted the settlements to have development boundaries. There were no additional comments.

Alternative sites:

One new site in Bentlawnt – land opposite the village shop – was proposed for a new housing allocation.

Snailbeach, Stiperstones and Pennerley

Question 1: Do you agree that the settlements of Snailbeach, Stiperstones and Pennerley should be a Community Cluster?

The majority of respondents, 78% (7 out of 9) supported the designation of Snailbeach, Stiperstones and Pennerley as a Community Cluster. The Parish Council felt that the whole parish ward should form a Community Cluster, not just the named settlements of Snailbeach, Stiperstones and Pennerley. They also wanted each development site to be no more than 2 houses.

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed number of new houses?

The majority of respondents, 89% (8 out of 9) agreed that approximately 15 should be the target figure for housing. The Parish Council also supported this target

Question 3: Do you agree this should be met through windfall development and that there are no allocated sites?

The majority of respondents, 88% (7 out of 8) agreed that new housing should be delivered through windfall rather than an allocated site. There were no additional comments.

Question 4: Should the settlements have development boundaries?

The majority of respondents, 71% (5 out of 7) felt that the settlements should have development boundaries. There were no additional comments.

Alternative sites:

No potential new sites for allocation were proposed for the Snailbeach, Stiperstones and Pennerley Cluster

Wentnor and Norbury

Question 1: Do you agree that the settlements of Wentnor and Norbury should be a Community Cluster?

The majority of respondents, 92% (11 out of 12) supported the designation of Wentnor and Norbury as a Community Cluster. There were no additional comments.

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed number of new houses?

The majority of respondents, 67% (8 out of 12) agreed that approximately 25 should be the target figure for housing. Of these, one person felt that these should all be affordable.

Question 3: Do you agree this should be met through windfall development and that there are no allocated sites?

The majority of respondents, 90% (9 out of 10) agreed that new housing should be delivered through windfall rather than allocated sites. Again, one person commented that all new housing should be affordable.

Question 4: Should the settlements have development boundaries?

The majority of respondents, 60% (6 out of 10) felt that the settlements should have development boundaries. One person commented that any new buildings should be in keeping with the character of the local area.

Alternative sites:

No potential new sites for allocation were proposed for the Wentnor and Norbury Cluster.

Bridgnorth Place Plan Area

Bridgnorth Town

Question 1: Do you think that the target of a further 598 houses for Bridgnorth by 2026 is appropriate?

A significant majority of respondents (74%) are opposed to the target figure for Bridgnorth. Respondents raise concerns raised regarding overstretching of current levels of infrastructure and employment, and whether there is demand for this figure within the settlement given that current housing is not selling. Further queries have been raised as to the new target number of houses, which is in excess of the figure agreed with the town council and community members previously. Bridgnorth Civic Society, Tasley Parish Council and Pattingham & Patshull Parish Council also comment on a reduction on numbers, to 1000 total maximum. Pattingham and Patshull also stated a preferred maximum of 800 with affordable housing kept to a minimum and for locals only, while Bridgnorth Civic Society would prefer 500-1000 homes, with preference for the former figure.

However, a number of respondents have expressed desire for housing for local people, affordable housing, and some larger sized dwellings, phased to ensure the housing is sold before commencement of the next phase. Respondents commented on the environmental impact of the developments, especially on the green belt area around Tasley and the preferred options. A number of respondents also expressed concerns about the potential rise in crime rates from new housing.

Question 2: Do you think that the target of a further 6 hectares of employment land to be provided in Bridgnorth by 2026 is appropriate? Please note that the allocation of 6 hectares of employment land in Bridgnorth reflects the need to stimulate additional local employment opportunities. This additional land will also compensate for the loss to retail development of some existing employment land at Chartwell Industrial Estate.

Respondents were mixed (53% in favour) regarding the target of 6 ha for employment. Comments received indicate that portions of existing employment sites include vacant lots to be expanded. A number of respondents comment that there is insufficient need for further employment, citing unsold lots for a lack of demand. Though this is not unanimous, with respondents stating they would appreciate more employment for local people, and lower commuting rates.

Other respondents comment that they would prefer Bridgnorth to expand with a tourism industry in mind, with one commenter stating that prospects could be improved for town centre businesses. Issues are raised about the development into greenfield land towards Tasley, and whether this would set a precedent for development. Tasley Parish Council comments that it would prefer Bridgnorth to focus on its tourist industry, with new employment on vacant lots in the east of Bridgnorth. Bridgnorth Civic Society also comments that it would prefer vacant lots to have preference for development.

Question 3: Do you think that the target of 1.5 hectares of land for commercial waste management to be provided in Bridgnorth by 2026 is appropriate (in accordance with the Waste Management Infrastructure Policy)?

Respondents were mixed (49% in favour) regarding the target 1.5 ha for commercial waste management. A number of respondents comment that they feel current waste management facilities are sufficient for the area, or other facilities in the surrounding area are capable of meeting the increasing need. Additionally, the proximity of the proposed site to housing has

raised concerns related to smell and the inability for further expansion if necessary. Comments were also raised about the preference for increased recycling alternatives.

A small number of respondents commented that they did not feel as though the provided information was sufficient to make an informed judgment.

Question 4: Do you agree that the land north of Wenlock Road BRID001/BRID020b/09 (8Ha of a 12Ha site) should be allocated for 200 houses? Please note that this would be part of a wider planned development with a new road access from the A458 and will include housing, employment land, sheltered accommodation and recreation space. The remaining 4 hectares would comprise local services and community facilities.

A majority of respondents (73%) were against the proposed site allocation for housing. Respondents comments that there is insufficient need for more housing, including social housing, within Bridgnorth, with comments raised that infrastructure is currently lacking to support the proposed number of developments. However, contrasting points were raised regarding the need for lower priced housing for local people, together with increased employment within the town. Bridgnorth Civic Society writes that in line with their preferred number of dwellings, their aspirations are for 165 dwellings on this site.

Regarding the preferred site, a number of respondents are opposed to the relocation of the cattle market, including Bridgnorth Town Council, and Tasley Parish Council, citing the markets poor performance. The Environment Agency also caution about potential ground contamination from the market. Additionally, respondents were opposed to the development of the town to the North West towards Tasley, with concerns raised regarding building on greenfield sites. Astley Abbots Parish Council is concerned that development is creeping towards rural open countryside, which could affect farmland. As an alternative, respondents comment that existing brownfield and infill sites are preferable, and a number of alternative sites have been suggested.

Questions 5: The remaining 4 hectares of site BRID001/BRID020b/09 will comprise local services and community facilities. Please use the space below to tell us what type of services/facilities you'd like built on the site.

A number of respondents do not feel it is necessary for additional services within Bridgnorth, citing insufficient demand and infrastructure, together with general opposition towards development towards Tasley. In particular, a number of respondents do not feel it is necessary to expand the doctor's facility, warehouses, supermarkets or factory units.

Other respondents have provided examples of desired local services however, and include a convenience store, with separate petrol filling station; doctor's surgery; retail parks; schools and college facilities; increased leisure facilities for young people (children and teenagers) and the elderly; increased policing presence. Smaller scale proposals include studios for dance groups, rentable space for a martial arts club. Additionally comments indicate a need for a park and ride to aid current infrastructure, together with outdoor playing and sports fields to retain green areas to the north west of Bridgnorth.

Notable respondents include Tasley Parish Council, who comment that they would like to see a hotel, petrol station, convenience store, or office or tourist related development. They would not like to see further warehouses, supermarkets or factory units. Bridgnorth Civic Society comment that they would prefer community facilities, for youth activity, education, shops and religious worship as need demands.

Questions 6: Do you agree that the land north of Church Lane BRID020b/09 (12.73Ha) should be allocated for 300 houses? Please note that this would be part of a wider

planned development with a new road access from the A458 and will include housing, employment land, local services, sheltered accommodation and recreation space.

A significant majority of respondents (81%) are opposed to the proposed site and development, with a number of comments being against the development towards Tasley in the North West of Bridgnorth. Commenters are opposed the further building into greenfield sites located in this area. Respondents also comment that there is insufficient need for the proposed number of houses within Bridgnorth, or that the housing is better suited diluted across other sites in the town. Respondents in favour of the proposal note that additional housing is required for local young people as starter homes.

Other arguments raised include the stretching of current levels of infrastructure in the area, primarily a shortage of traffic infrastructure and too high a rate of growth within the town. Concerns raised about the impact on traffic in the area highlights a potential adverse effect on Church Lane which is currently favoured by pedestrians.

Astley Abbots Parish Council comment that this particular site would encroach the most onto open countryside and come close to their parish boundary. Bridgnorth Civic Society in light of their reviewed figures, suggest a revised sum of 250 homes.

Question 7: Do you agree that site ELR011 (13Ha), being the land south of A458 opposite Wenlock Road, should be allocated for employment land? This site would provide 7 hectares for the relocation of the existing livestock market and 6 hectares of related employment use.

A large number of respondents (74%) are opposed to the allocation of ELR011 as employment land, with comments expressing insufficient need for further employment land. Additionally, a number of respondents are opposed to development on Greenfield sites in the area, with land being available on current sites, such as Stanmore and Chartwell. Comments also indicate a lack of desire to relocate the livestock market.

Astley Abbots Parish Council comment that they do not desire to see development on the south side of the Bypass, and comment that the livestock market is modern and sufficient for needs. Bridgnorth Civic Society do not feel that the site is appropriate, due to exceptional landscape quality for walkers and leisure activities. Alternative suggestions include vacant lots on existing employment lots and the area on Stourbridge road near the aluminium factory.

Questions 8: Do you agree that site W039 (1.5Ha), being land off the Old Worcester Road, should be allocated for commercial waste management?

A majority of respondents (65%) are in favour of the allocation of W039 for commercial waste management, with comments indicating this as a preferred option due to previous use as waste site. However, one respondent queries whether the ground is suitable for this development as Veolia have previously rejected a development on this site. The Environment Agency comments that pre-existing ground contamination would have to be assessed prior to development. A small number of respondents would prefer the site be utilised as recycling management as opposed to landfill.

A small number of dissenting respondents raise concerns about the proximity of the site to nearby housing, and whether there is sufficient need for further waste management, especially if housing proposals do not go ahead.

Question 9: Do you agree with the proposed Primary Shopping Area for Bridgnorth?

A significant majority (86%) of respondents are in favour of the proposed primary shopping area, though there is confusion over the apparent lack of changes to the proposed area, with respondents expressing a desire for no change, yet disagreeing with the unchanged proposed area. Respondents do comment that there is need for a more diverse range of shops, with comments indicating both incentives for smaller retailers, and other for more big name stores.

A small number of respondents commented with proposed changes to the area, including an extension up to Northgate, proposed by Bridgnorth Civic Society, and concerns that Whitburn Street is not utilised beyond Meredith's Yard. A respondent also proposed a more significant alteration by suggesting that the both banks of the river could be utilised as shopping area to create a focal point for the town.

Question 10: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Bridgnorth? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

A large number of respondents (75%) are opposed to the proposed new development boundary, with comments indicating satisfaction with the current boundary. Primary comments indicate opposition to extension towards Tasley in the North West, with other comments opposing extension south of the bypass to the South West. Taken together, a number of respondents would like to see the A458 as the limit to development to avoid disfigured development. Other suggestions raised include the inclusion of Oldbury Wells, inclusion of up to Hook Farm Drive and the exclusion of encroachment into Astley Abbots Parish, raised by the Parish Council there. Bridgnorth Civic Society is opposed to extension of the boundary south west along the line of the bypass.

Other Comments

Other comments raised by respondents include the ability for Bridgnorth to gain more control over local decisions and development. Respondents also feel as though there has been insufficient consultation with residents, with a number of residents feeling under informed about proposed developments. Other respondents indicate the desire for maintenance of local green space, including environmental considerations when developing sites.

Ditton Priors

Question 11: Do you agree that Ditton Priors should be a Community Hub?

A large majority of respondents (77%) are in favour of Ditton Priors being designated a community hub, provided local people and the parish council are in favour of this decision.

Additionally, a couple of respondents comment that Claverly should also be designated due to comparably better infrastructure and services.

Question 12: Do you think that the target of a further 10-50 houses to be built in Ditton Priors by 2026 is appropriate?

A majority of respondents (72%) are in favour of the target for 10-50 houses in Ditton Priors, though comments, including from Ditton Priors Parish Council, indicate a lower preference of 10-25 homes, in groups of 5-6.

Question 13: Do you agree that site DITT005, being land opposite 6, Station Rd (0.4Ha), should be allocated for 12 houses in a sensitively designed, small-scale development?

A majority of respondents (70%) are in favour of site DITT005 for 12 houses, though the Parish Council would prefer to see smaller groupings of 5-6. One respondent would prefer the housing for local residents, while one comments that the site is capable of further expansion to the South.

Question 14: Do you agree with the development boundary for Ditton Priors? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

A majority of respondents (73%) are in favour of the proposed development boundary for Ditton Priors, with the Parish Council commenting it would reserve the right to ask for amendments in the future.

Other Comments

One respondent proposes an alternative site behind the School, providing access to the school and housing for Ditton Priors.

Neenton

Question 15: Do you agree that Neenton should be a Community Cluster focussed on Neenton itself?

A significant majority of respondents (81%) are in favour of Neenton being designated a community cluster, with one respondent suggesting Burwarton as a village to be included within the cluster.

Question 16: We understand that the community do not want any other housing (except houses built on affordable exception sites) unless the development supports the aspiration of delivering a community-held public house. Do you agree that up to 5 open market and affordable houses should be built on the land around the public house to support it reopening in good order as a community-held public house?

A significant majority of respondents (83%) are in favour of the allocation of 5 houses to aid in the reopening of the public house, however a couple of respondents comment that the community would still be too small to support a public house.

Question 17: Do you agree with the development boundary for Neenton? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

A large majority of respondents (79%) are in favour of the proposed development boundary for Neenton.

Other Comments

English Heritage have commented that NEE001 located within the conservation area requires sensitive and high quality design.

Countryside Areas in Bridgnorth Place Plan Area

Question 18: Do you agree that the settlements of Acton Round, Aston Eyre, Monkhopton, Morville and Upton Cressett should be a Community Cluster?

A large majority of respondents (74%) are in favour of the listed settlements being designated a community cluster. One respondent comments that Acton Round and Upton Crescent both have insufficient access while another comments that while Morville has sufficient infrastructure, the other suggested settlements appear to be of little value and an evidence base to justify their inclusion is needed.

Question 19: Do you think that the level of development over the period to 2026 for these settlements, i.e. a limited amount of low-cost housing for local families to be built on infill sites, is appropriate?

A large majority of respondents (77%) are in favour of the suggested development level, though some respondents indicate a preference for the housing to be for local and young people.

Bridgwalton

Question 20: Do you agree that an extension to the existing quarry at Bridgwalton Farm should be a preferred option for mineral extraction?

A small majority of respondents (64% of 39 respondents) are in favour of the extension to the existing quarry at Bridgwalton Farm, with comments indicating that the extension would need to be mindful of environmental impact, including effect on water course. One respondent commented that figures suggested that the proposed Bridgwalton sites would be preferable to the Morville alternative. Other comments raised noted the impact of the existing quarry's traffic on local highway infrastructure, with further extension causing worry. A further comment suggests that the quarry should have a limited lifespan of 3 years, and should include measures to control potential noise, light and visual pollution impacts on the residents of Underton.

Morville PC are concerned that the area is taking a disproportionate amount of the extra mineral working capacity required in the Plan. They are also concerned that existing mineral sites have not delivered promised investment in highway improvements or restoration outcomes and that expectations regarding the cessation of further mineral extraction have proved to be misleading. The PC is not confident that sufficient control exists to ensure workings from the two proposed extensions do not happen concurrently. Although some local support for the extension of local quarries was expressed at a previous meeting, the overwhelming view of parishioners is they do not wish the PC to support any additional mineral extraction.

Morville

Question 21: Do you agree that an extension to the existing site at Morville Quarry (which would open later in the Plan period, which ends in 2026, to limit the impact of these two sites being open at the same time) should be a preferred option for mineral extraction?

Responses were mixed (53% of 43 respondents against) to the proposed Morville Quarry extension, with concerns raised about environmental issues, including landscape impact, loss of agricultural land, light, noise, vibration and dust pollution on nearby residents, and insufficient road capacity to handle additional quarry traffic. Respondents note that the site

was previously rejected following comparison with alternative sites during preparation of the current Minerals Plan in 1997. There are also concerns about the track record of the proposed operator with respect to the restoration of the existing site. By contrast, the site promoter argues that the working of the quarry should not be delayed (to avoid concurrent working with Bridgwalton Quarry), and states that the site is justified in having a higher sustainability rating than currently stated. Tasley Parish council are opposed to the development due to the impact on the parish area. Morville PC do not support additional mineral working for the reasons set out under 'Bridgwalton' above.

Cannebuff

Question 22: Do you agree that a new site at Cannebuff should be a preferred option for mineral extraction?

A large majority of respondents (73% of 62 respondents) are opposed to the Cannebuff material extraction site, with a large number of comments relating to the impact of noise, light and dust pollution on the nearby residents. The adverse impact of the site on the area's wildlife and green spaces with regard to the increase of pollution was commented upon. Additional concerns were raised relating to the creation of bore holes for usage within the quarry and the effect this would have on the water table and aquifer. A large number of comments were received in relation to the nearby access road, which is already known to be dangerous, with fears increased traffic load would increase accident rates. Some respondents raised concerns about a potential increase in crime rates in the area due to the risk of theft from the quarry. Following the quarry's use, respondents queried the meaning of "inert backfill" and the use of the quarry as landfill.

Pattingham and Patshull Council are opposed to the development for reasons listed above. Claverley Parish Council has responded with uncertainty to the proposal, with a decision delayed until further information is made available, though they acknowledge the concerns raised above.

Alternative Sites

Respondents have raised a number of alternative sites through the consultation process, and include:

- Stanmore for Employment use.
- Oldbury Grove Lane, for 2+ dwellings.
- Land West of Church Road, for accommodation.
- Land at Race Course farm, between BRID020a/BRID020b.
- Field site to North West of Hilton House, Hilton, for housing.
- Site south of Eardington, for Leisure or Tourist use.
- Wackley Lodge, Cockshutt, as sand and gravel works.
- Land behind school at Ditton Priors, as housing.
- N.C.O. Married quarters at the Hobbins, for housing.
- BRID028 for housing.
- BRID032 for housing.
- BRID029-031 for later phased housing.
- South East 50% portion of BRID020a for housing.
- Land to the West of Tasley for high quality housing.
- Land bounded by A442, Daddlebrook Road and AVL006 for social club and 100% affordable housing.
- Land south of Kidderminster A442 for 100% affordable housing.
- Hobbins/Stanmore for housing development into village settlement.
- BRID020b/09 extended to Hook Farm Drive for green belt boundary.

- Land near Stourbridge Road, Brownfield.

Other Comments

One respondent comments that the Parish of Worfield and Rudge including Hilton should be considered as a cluster. Worfield and Rudge Parish Council comments that houses will not be affordable for local demographic, and that CIL will provoke over provision of housing. Another respondent comments that Claverly should be considered in place of Ditton Priors due to superior services; additionally, Oldbury and Cross Lane Head should be considered as a cluster centred on Bridgnorth due to service interaction.

Broseley Place Plan Area

Broseley Town

Question 1: Do you think that the target of 0 houses to be built in Broseley by 2026 (over and above those already committed and the balance/windfall to come forward of 36 houses) is appropriate?

The majority of interested parties have stated that the current target of no housing allocations (above those already committed and a windfall allowance of 36 homes) is insufficient to cater to Broseley's needs. Primary concerns are that without sufficient development the sustainability of Broseley as a market town will be in question. These concerns relate to the survivability of retail outlets and delivery of infrastructure, utilising the Community Infrastructure Levy that accompanies development. Other concerns raised include the provision of 36 houses as a shortfall to be insufficient to meet the priority for affordable housing in Broseley.

A number of respondents consider that Broseley is reliant too heavily on windfall with insufficient housing allocations planned and will not deliver sufficient affordable housing or open market homes over the time period.

Some commenters argue that Broseley would benefit from organic and incremental growth to its development boundaries, promoting small plots and consolidation of the settlement over creating a significant impact upon density in a single move. A dissenter voices a similar opinion and argues that Broseley cannot accommodate 36 additional houses as infill within the current development boundaries.

Question 2: Do you think that the target of 2 hectares of employment land to be provided in Broseley by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority of responses from interested parties are in favour of the proposed target of 2 hectares. However, a consenting party writes that despite the 2 hectare proposal being adequate, it should not disrupt any further proposals for other, possibly smaller, sites within or on the edge of the development boundary, and that to take the proposed site forward will require a 'significant investment' in infrastructure that is necessary before any land can be properly utilised.

The dissenting parties state that their concerns about the proposed target of employment land stem from inadequate infrastructure and road access to support additional industrial traffic, especially at the proposed site.

Question 3: Do you agree that site ELR016 (2Ha of a larger 5Ha site), being land between Coalport Road and Rough Lane, should be allocated for employment land? Please note that only 2 hectares of this 5 hectare site would be developed, leaving the remaining 3 hectares being allocated as a buffer to adjacent housing.

Responses via survey monkey (9/15) are in favour of the proposed site (ELR016), though favourable responses include a disclaimer that the site is the most appropriate out of the options available, though they do not recommend industrial development due to large traffic loads. A large proportion of written responses are in disagreement with the proposed site, which including the survey results, include comments that largely dispute the availability of access to the site, which is primarily past a primary school which already has problems with traffic and parking loads. These issues lead onto a raised concern of child safety around the primary school. One commenter believes that the site includes subsidence issues due to

mining, and development would disrupt flora and fauna contributing to green field conservation in addition to previous comments.

A large amount of comments raised alternative sites for consideration, including BROS007; a site off Avenue Road; an extension to Cherrybrook Housing Estate; and a site off Ironbridge Road by the Cemetery.

Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Broseley? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

The majority of commenters disagree with the proposed new development boundary for Broseley (14/17), and a large proportion of commenters write that they believe the boundary should be extended in a minor way around the town to include small undisclosed sites on the periphery of the town that would suit small self-build projects. One submitted comment designates a small plot of land on Hilltop to the west of the town to be included within the development boundary at potential for residential development.

Other potential routes of expansion include the township of Jackfield to the North East of the town, extending the development boundary from Ironbridge Road to Chapel Lane by the river. This would provide better consistency between those parts of Jackfield that lie within Shropshire Council's area and those that lie in Telford & Wrekin Council's area. A submitted plan in support of this boundary alteration also includes areas designated for potential employment development and areas to be designated as 'valued green space'.

Question 5: Alternative sites. Please use this section to suggest any alternative sites in the Place Plan area you think we should consider instead. If you are suggesting a site we have already considered and rejected, please use the relevant reference number. If you are suggesting a new site, please indicate where it is, e.g. land south of the High Street. For all sites please tell us why you think it should be allocated, and for what type of use e.g. housing or employment land.

Due to a large amount of comments against the proposed site (ELR016), a number of alternative sites have been proposed around Broseley, though many are on behalf of landowners with interest in these proposed areas.

A complete list of included sites includes the area of Jackfield; the area east and west of Ironbridge road, south east of Avenue Road; South of Pound Lane; North Coalport road (proposed residential areas opposite the proposed employment site ELO016); areas to the west and east of Dark Lane; the area west and south west of Mill Lane; Barrett's Hill, BROS23a/09; west of Cape Street; west of Bridge road (BROS007); an area adjacent to Little Gables, TF125QZ; north west of the development boundary; and the area east of Cherrybrook Drive.

Other Issues:

The Environment Agency stated that the issues of potential ground contamination and land stability have been recognised.

Church Stretton Place Plan Area

Church Stretton Town

Question 1: Do you think that the target of a further 147 houses to be built in Church Stretton by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority of respondents to this question, 78%, (286 out of 367), did not support the target of a further 147 houses for Church Stretton. The main concern was that the town's existing infrastructure would not be able to support this level of growth. Comments relating to the road system, car parking and road safety were the most common, along with insufficient capacity at the medical centre. Respondents also felt that the target was too high and that the need for new housing had not been demonstrated. Many people expressed the opinion that development would have an adverse effect on the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), on the environment or on views. Where there was support for new housing, this was mostly on the basis that it was affordable.

Eaton-under-Heyward and Hope Bowdler Parish Council did not support the target, on the basis that the need was not identified, existing houses are not selling and there is insufficient infrastructure capacity.

Church Stretton Town Council (6th August 2012) did not want any increase in housing numbers from those already built or committed by 2011.

Question 2: Do you think that the target of 1 hectare of employment land should be provided in Church Stretton (on site CSTR0014 or CSTR0018) by 2026?

The majority of respondents, 66% (210 out of 320) did not support the provision of employment land on the sites near the secondary school. The main issue was a perceived lack of need with empty units in the town centre being cited as evidence. Also of concern was the potential negative impact on the environment, particularly visual amenity, landscape character and the Shropshire Hills AONB. Many respondents felt that new employment land should be concentrated in Craven Arms and that the focus for the economy within Church Stretton should be on the tourism industry.

Church Stretton Town Council (6th August 2012) did not support the proposed allocation of either site for employment. This was re-iterated in their response of 26th February.

Question 3: Do you agree that site CSTR0014 (5.53 hectares), being land adjacent to Church Stretton school, should be allocated for a maximum of 90 houses? Please note that the site may be developed after 2016 for low density housing, or employment land, or replacement school playing fields, depending on the nature of development on the school playing fields (site CSTR0018). In addition, 1.2 ha of the site will be set aside as a habitat corridor.

The majority of respondents, 58% (201 out of 347) did not support the allocation of the land behind the secondary school for housing. Of these, many felt that the growth target for the town was too high or that the existing infrastructure would not be able to cope, particularly the road network at school picking up/dropping off times. Concern was also expressed about the impact on the AONB and visual amenity. Of those who supported housing on this site, the majority preferred it to other sites in the town.

The Environment Agency stated that the site would need a Flood Risk Assessment. English Heritage supported the need for development to address any potential impacts on the setting of the Conservation Area.

Church Stretton Town Council (6th August 2012) did not support the allocation of this site. In their response of 26th February 2012 they stated that they supported the upgrade of sporting and other facilities on this site but wanted any housing development to address the concerns of local residents as far as possible. These concerns are: loss of visual amenity; traffic flow on Shrewsbury Road; possible contamination of boreholes; encroachment on the town boundary and loss of open space between Church Stretton and All Stretton.

Question 4; Do you agree that site CSTR0018 (2.19 hectares), being the school playing fields on Shrewsbury Road, should be allocated for a maximum of 45 houses? Please note that the site may be developed after 2016 for low density housing, or employment land, or retained as a school playing field, depending on the nature of development on land adjacent to Church Stretton School (site CSTR0014).

The majority of respondents, 68% (212 out of 311) did not support the allocation of the school playing fields for housing (with replacement facilities behind the school). Many were concerned about the impact on visual amenity or felt that the site should remain as rugby pitches. Respondents commented that the existing infrastructure was not sufficient (especially with the potential for increased traffic around the school) and the issues of the overall need for housing in the town and potential adverse impact on the AONB were raised again. Of those who supported the allocation, most preferred this site to the other options available. Other respondents were prepared to support housing on the site provided that the school received replacement facilities.

Eaton-under-Heyward and Hope Bowdler Parish Council did not support housing on this site. English Heritage supported the need for development to address any potential impacts on the setting of the Conservation Area.

Church Stretton Town Council (6th August 2012) did not support the allocation of this site. However, in their response dated 26th February 2012 they asked that any housing development accommodate the concerns of local residents as far as possible (see answer to question 3 above for the nature of these concerns).

Question 5: Do you agree that site CSTR0020 (4.24 hectares), being land at Snatchfield Farm on Snatchers Lane, should be allocated for a maximum of 85 houses? Please note that the site may be developed after 2016 for low density housing and any development would need to ensure that the route of the Jack Mytton Way is maintained.

The majority, 82%, (259 out of 316) respondents did not support the allocation of CSTR020 (Snatchfields) for housing. Access from Clive Avenue/Chelmick Drive was the main issue but people were also concerned about the loss of green space. The impact on the AONB and insufficient infrastructure were mentioned along with a loss of footpaths and a consequent negative impact on tourism. Many respondents also felt that since the site had been turned down for development in 1986 it should not be built on now.

Eaton-under-Heyward and Hope Bowdler Parish Council did not support housing on this site, feeling that this part of the town is already over developed and that housing here would intrude into attractive countryside as well as being highly visible from the town. The Environment Agency commented that surface water would need to be managed carefully.

Church Stretton Town Council (6th August 2012) did not support the allocation of this site. This was confirmed in their response of 26th February 2012.

Question 6: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Church Stretton? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

The majority of respondents, 65% (154 out of 238) either didn't agree with the proposed new development boundary or wanted to keep it as it is now. The main issue was the impact on the Shropshire Hills AONB but many respondents questioned the need for development or did not want to see green fields developed (particularly the gap between All Stretton and Church Stretton). Others were concerned about an adverse effect on tourism.

Question 7. Please use this section to suggest any alternative sites in the Place Plan area you think we should consider instead.

In responding to this question, people listed the sites in Church Stretton that they felt could be developed instead of the preferred options. Of these, CSTR027/09 (land off Cwms Lane) received the most support for housing with 41% (23 out of 56) of the comments. The combined site of CSTR019/CSTR022 (The Leasowes) was also felt to be acceptable. CSTR013 (south of Churchway Business Centre) was proposed as an alternative to sites CSTR014/018 for employment.

In their response of 26th February 2013 Church Stretton Town Council suggested that the following sites would be suitable for housing; CSTR012 (the Wetlands); CSTR016 and CSTR024 (both off Burway Road); CSTR019/CSTR022 and CSTR028 (Land at Woodbank House). They also supported the use of CSTR013 for employment.

Cleobury Mortimer Place Plan Area

Cleobury Mortimer Town

1. Do you think that the target of a further 88 houses to be built in Cleobury Mortimer by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority of respondents (57% 21/37) disagreed with the proposed housing figures for Cleobury Mortimer with the majority of those who commented suggesting that the figure should be lower. A number of respondents raised concerns that there is a lack of infrastructure to support new housing development. Impacts on the surrounding road network, considered to be poor, and the lack of public transport were particularly highlighted as issues that should limit the amount of future development in Cleobury. The comments raise concerns over the lack of employment opportunities in the town and the potential increase in out-commuting for employment elsewhere. Many comments related to concerns about the number of recent housing developments, their impact on the character of Cleobury, and the fact that many new houses built recently have not been taken by residents local to the area.

2. Do you think that the target of 1 hectare of employment land to be provided in Cleobury Mortimer by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority of respondents (64% 21/37) supported the provision of 1 ha of employment land within Cleobury Mortimer recognising the importance of enabling additional employment opportunities. Many respondents, although supportive of identifying this level of employment land, were concerned about being able to attract employers into the town and the loss of employment land within Cleobury experienced in recent years (especially at the Mullers England site). The majority of those suggesting a lower target were concerned about protecting the environmental qualities of the town with some comments suggesting that there should be no further industrial development in Cleobury.

3. Do you agree that site CMO002, being land on Tenbury Road (1.12Ha) should be allocated for 28 houses?

The majority of respondents (64% 12/33) responded negatively to this site primarily on concerns regarding the principle of any new housing being built in Cleobury Mortimer at all (due to lack of employment opportunities, poor infrastructure and services, impact on character of Cleobury) rather than any specific concerns with the site itself. Some respondents raised concerns over the increase in traffic through the town centre. A couple of responses highlight concerns over the density of the site. The Environment Agency highlighted that careful consideration needs to be given regarding run off from sites in the area.

4. Do you agree that site CMO005, being land on Tenbury Road (0.57Ha) should be allocated for 10 houses?

A small majority of respondents (54% 19/35) supported the identification of the site. The majority of those who commented negatively were primarily based on concerns regarding the principle of any new housing being built in Cleobury Mortimer at all (traffic issues in particular were raised) rather than any specific concerns with the site itself. The Environment Agency highlighted that careful consideration needs to be given regarding run off from the sites in this area.

5. Do you agree that land adjacent to Cleobury Mortimer Industrial Estate on Tenbury Road (0.7Ha), should be allocated for employment land?

The majority of respondents (74% 25/34) supported the identification of this site for employment uses. Some concerns were raised about being able to attract businesses to the site. Of those who commented negatively they raised a general concern about not wanting further industrial estates/units in Cleobury Mortimer. Another comment suggested use of other sites within the town for employment (Precision engineering sites and SHW containers) as preferable to using this greenfield site.

6. Do you agree that land at the former JAG Glazing site (0.5Ha), should be allocated for employment land?

The majority of responses (83% 24/29) supported the inclusion of this site in the SAMDev for employment uses. Some concerns were raised by those who responded positively about being able to attract businesses to the site. Of those who commented negatively they raised a general concern about not wanting further industrial estates/units in Cleobury Mortimer. In addition the EA highlighted that there may be potential contaminated land issues. The landowner objected to the inclusion of the site due to the lack viability of re using the site for employment uses and has submitted a planning application for residential development.

7. Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Cleobury Mortimer? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

The majority of respondents (66% 20/30) agreed with the development boundary as proposed in the consultation document. There were some general concerns about the growth of the town in relation to changes to the boundary but overall responses highlighted that it was important to ensure that the boundary is drawn so as to keep Cleobury Mortimer at a similar size in the future.

Alternative sites:

Responses highlighted two sites in Cleobury Mortimer. The first site put forward is for a care home at Precision Engineering. This is a site that is already subject to pre application advice and the comment received suggests an application is forthcoming. This site is within the current development and the uses proposed would be compatible with the role and function of Cleobury Mortimer as a key centre. Another site was put forward to the east of Cleobury Mortimer at Townsend.

DODDINGTON AND HOPTON WAFERS

8. Do you agree that the villages of Hopton Wafers and Doddington should be a Community Cluster?

The majority of responses (55% 12/22) supported the inclusion of Hopton Wafers and Doddington as a Community Cluster. Some comments against the naming of the community cluster raised concern that the school is now closed in Hopton Wafers and there is a general lack of services between the two settlements. The EA made a general point in relation to non-mains drainage although reflected that the level of development envisaged is relatively small scale.

9. Do you think that the growth target of about 8-12 houses is appropriate?

The majority of respondents (64% 14/22) did not think the growth target for housing development was appropriate. One comment supporting the number of dwellings stated it was the right amount of housing and it was important that new housings are appropriate in scale and not just large dwellings. One of the comments against the growth target raised a general concern that the school is now closed in Hopton Wafers and there is a general lack of services between the two settlements.

10. Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Hopton Wafers and Doddington?

A slight majority (53% 9/17) agreed that there should not be a development boundary for Doddington and Hopton Wafers. Of those that answered 'no' one comment considered that there should be a development boundary due to fears that there will be a coalescence of settlements within the area whilst the need to protect the countryside was also raised as a concern.

NEEN SAVAGE

11. Do you agree that the settlements of Neen Savage, Baveney Wood, Papermill, Stepple, Barbrook, Detton, Wall Town, and Stonehouse should be a Community Cluster?

The overwhelming majority of respondents (95% 132/139) did not agree with the naming of the Community Cluster. Neen Savage Parish Council put forward a response seeking to remove the naming of Community Clusters. Those disagreeing with the Community Cluster felt this would have an impact on the rural character of the parish, and there was a general lack of infrastructure, services and facilities to support new development and therefore it could not be considered sustainable development. The roman archaeology around Wall Town was also raised a potential issue. The majority of respondents link themselves to local action group COPAG which seeks to retain a countryside designation. Of those that supported the naming of the Community Cluster comments related to allowing development to continue the sensitive growth of the hamlets as seen in the past, and a recognition that sensitive new development would not be inappropriate as they are areas of existing development. The Environment Agency raised a general concern with the lack of mains drainage within the area although recognised the low level of development expected.

12. Do you think that the growth target of about 8-12 houses is appropriate?

The overwhelming majority of responses disagreed with the proposed housing target (92% 123/134) for the Community Cluster. Of those that disagreed some comments suggested that a lower figure was more acceptable rather than a range. The majority of responses felt that no new housing development should take place within the parish. The majority of respondents link themselves to local action group COPAG which seeks to retain a countryside designation. The lack need for new development was raised as an issue. The lack of services was also raised as an issue as in the previous question. Other comments related the potential type of housing and whether it relates to conversions or new build. Those supporting the figure suggested that the number was comparable to past trends and therefore not unreasonable. The past trends of barn conversion to residential use is unlikely to continue so some single plots new build is needed.

13. Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Neen Savage, Baveney Wood, Papermill, Stepple, Barbrook, Detton, Wall Town, and Stonehouse?

The majority of responses (53% 25/47) agreed that there should be no development boundary. Many of the responses reiterated that there was no need for a development boundary because they did not wish any new development to take place. The majority of respondents link themselves to local action group COPAG which seeks to retain a countryside designation. The issues of lack of services and infrastructure were again highlighted by a number of respondents. A comment in support of no boundary being identified suggested that the proposals were for single plot development as infill and therefore development boundary was not needed.

ORETON, FARLOW and HILL HOUSES

14. Do you agree that the settlements of Oreton, Farlow and Hill Houses should be a Community Cluster?

A slight majority of respondents (52% 10/19) disagreed with the identification of Farlow, Oreton and Hill Houses as a Community Cluster. Comments against the naming of the Community Cluster said the settlements were remote with poor access. Farlow Parish Council reiterated their support for the identification of the Community Cluster. One comment suggested that Farlow should not be included in the Community Cluster but Oreton and Hill Houses should still be as they have more existing development. The Environment Agency raised a general concern about development in the rural area where there is primarily non-mains drainage although they recognise the level of expected development is low.

15. Do you think that the growth target of about 8-12 houses is appropriate?

A slight majority of respondents agreed with the proposed target (56% 10/18) for the Community Cluster. One response highlighted that there is a level of existing development and some level of facilities within the potential Community Cluster and the level proposed would not be out of character. Another respondent suggested that a lower figure might be appropriate due to the small size of the settlements.

16. Do you agree with the development boundary for Oreton? If you'd like to submit a revised proposal by email, please click here

The majority of responses (62% 10/16) agreed with the development boundary. Farlow Parish Council stated that they feel the boundary from the former Local Plan is no longer considered to be relevant for the settlement. General comments were received in relation to keeping the area as countryside with no new development. One respondent suggested that all plots of land should be considered potentially suitable if people want to build on their own land and proposed not having a boundary.

17. Do you agree with the development boundary for Farlow? If you'd like to submit a revised proposal by email, please click here

The majority of responses (62% 10/16) agreed with the development boundary. Farlow Parish Council stated that they feel the boundary from the former Local Plan is no longer considered to be relevant for the settlement. General comments were received in relation to keeping the area as countryside with no new development. One respondent suggested that all plots of land should be considered potentially suitable if people want to build on their own land and proposed not having a boundary.

18. Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Hill Houses?

The responses were evenly split with regards to this question (14/14). A couple of respondents suggested that Hill Houses is not suitable for any new housing development. Farlow Parish Council commented generally on development boundaries not being applicable in their view although there was not a boundary in the previous Local Plan.

SILVINGTON

19. Do you agree that the settlements of Silvington, Bromdon and Loughton should be a Community Cluster?

Overall there were slight majority against the naming of these settlements as a Community Cluster (53% 8/15). The Environment Agency raised general concerns regarding these settlements being on non-mains drainage although they recognise that there are low potential housing growth figures. Of those against the naming of the Community Cluster a couple of responses highlighted the small nature of the settlements and accessibility issues in the winter due to poor road conditions.

20. Do you think that the growth target of about 8-12 houses is appropriate?

The majority of respondents (60% 9/15) disagreed with the potential housing target for the Community Cluster. One respondent highlighted the need to have appropriate sized houses and no larger houses. Another suggested that all plots of land should be considered potentially suitable if people want to build on their own land and proposed not having a boundary.

21. Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Silvington, Bromdon and Loughton?

A majority of respondents agreed with no development boundary (62% 8/13). Comments related to the desire for no new development at all within the Community Cluster.

STOTTESDON

22. Do you agree that the settlements of Stottesdon, Chorley and Bagginswood should be a Community Cluster?

The number of respondents who agreed and disagreed with the question was the same (10/10). Of those in support of naming the Community Cluster a number of respondents recognise that there a range of facilities and services across the settlements including school, shop and pub. A couple of respondents suggested that Bagginswood, and in one case Chorley, should not be part of the Community Cluster as Stottesdon is a bigger settlement where the services/facilities are primarily located. The Environment Agency raised general concerns regarding settlements being on non-mains drainage although they recognise that there are low potential housing growth figures.

23. Do you think that the growth target of about 8-12 houses is appropriate?

A slight majority of respondents (55% 11/20) agreed with the potential growth figure. One respondent felt that there are the existing facilities to help support some new development whilst another suggested that new development would potentially help those people wishing to move back to the area who might have left due to lack of appropriate existing housing stock.

24. Do you agree with the development boundary for Stottesdon?

The majority of respondents (69% 11/16) agreed with the inclusion of the proposed development boundary for Stottesdon. Maintaining the rural nature of the area was highlighted as a concern.

25. Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Chorley?

A slight majority of respondents (53% 8/15) agreed that there should not be a development boundary for Chorley. There was concern from one respondent that no boundary would lead to the potential for greenfield sites to be developed. Another respondent highlighted that a boundary should be in place although each case should be judged on its merits.

26. Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Bagginswood?

The majority of respondents (60% 9/15) agreed that no development boundary should be drawn for Bagginswood. One respondent raised concerns about protecting Bagginswood as a rural area. Another respondent highlighted that a boundary should be in place although each case should be judged on its merits. Comments were also received relating to having no development within Bagginswood at all.

Alternative sites in the Place Plan area you think we should consider instead.

With regards to alternative sites, although no site promoters suggested alternatives within the Community Cluster settlements. Some comments suggested possible expansion of uses at existing Old Station Business Park, Neen Savage. Other comments focussed on more general concerns about having no new development in general.

Craven Arms Place Plan Area

Craven Arms Town

Question 1: Do you think that the target of a further 410 houses to be built in Craven Arms by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 59 respondents, 27 (46%) support the proposed housing target, whilst 29 (49%) object. The main reason for supporting the housing target was the understanding that growth is required to meet the local need for housing and encourage economic growth. A few respondents even commented that a higher target would be more appropriate to facilitate this. Some respondents also stated that they would support the housing target providing that provision was made for new educational and medical facilities; development would provide high levels of affordable housing to meet an identified need; development would lead to the enhancement of the character and appearance of the town and that off street parking was provided in all new development. A few respondents also stated that more employment was needed in the area, before additional houses should be developed. On the other hand, a number of respondents (29 out of 59 (49%)) objected to the housing target, due largely to the negative impact on the character and appearance of the town and the lack of current employment opportunities. Other reasons for objecting included; the lack of suitable infrastructure able to cope with additional housing; the impact on the road network which is already dangerous; the impact on the existing flooding issues; the lack of justification for the housing target and the fact that the target for Craven Arms seems disproportionate when compared to other towns in the country.

Question 2: Do you think that the target of a further 8 hectares of employment land to be provided in Craven Arms by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 48 respondents, a large majority (34 out of 48 (71%)) supported the employment target, largely due to the need for employment in the area. One respondent also stated that Craven Arms is suitable for expansion and that employment in the area will prevent commuting. CPRE supports the target for employment land; however they commented that any employment land should be located near to the existing industrial area. A few respondents also commented that employment should be retained for local people and the release of employment land should be linked to housing development. On the other hand, 14 respondents (29%) objected to the proposed employment target. The main reason for this was due to their objection to the preferred option site ELR053, rather than employment land in general. However a few respondents argued that the current employment sites are not fully utilised and further development will result in the loss of greenspace and have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the town. One respondent also raised concern that allocated land for employment does not mean that businesses will come to the area.

Question 3: Do you agree that the reserve employment land north of Long Lane should be allocated for employment use as Phase 2 of Long Lane Industrial Estate for 2009 to 2026?

Out of the 49 respondents, a substantial majority (43 out of 49 (88%)) support the allocation of the reserved site, as it has a good access and would make a logical extension to the existing employment land. This is support by CPRE, who favour development near to the existing industrial area. A number of respondents (6), including Wistanstow Parish Council, stated that this site should replace the preferred option site at Newington Farm (ELR053), for the relocation of the abattoir. A few respondents again stated that employment should be retained for local people. However 6 respondents (12%) objected to the sites inclusion, largely due to the inadequate road network, which they stated was too narrow and dangerous to accommodate further traffic. One respondent also stated that development of

this site would result in a spread of Craven Arms into Wistanstow Parish, and that employment sites should be retained in Craven Arms itself.

Question 4: Do you agree that site CRAV003, being land north of Greenfield Road, should be allocated for 200 houses?

Out of the 52 respondents, a small majority (29 out of 52 (56%)) objected to the allocation of this site. The two main reasons for objecting related to the existing flooding issues on the site and in the surrounding area and the traffic safety implications of additional traffic flow on an inadequate road network which is narrow and has limited visibility. Other general reasons included; negative impact on the character and appearance of the area; lack of employment opportunities; lack of infrastructure; loss of open greenspace. One respondent also stated that they objected to the widening of Watling Street as this will result in a loss of trees and impact on the character of the street. However 20 respondents (38%) supported the inclusion of the site as it is a good central location. The Highways Agency also confirmed that the additional pressure will not cause any severe implications for safety or free flow on the A49. A few respondents stated that they would support the allocation of the site providing that development; allow for provision of a new school; did not impact existing trees and provided sufficient road improvements. One respondent stated that a lower number of housing on the site would be more appropriate and overcome some of the issues raised. Whilst another stated that this site should be allocated for employment use instead of ELR053.

Question 5: Do you agree that site CRAV009, being laid off Brook Road, should be allocated for 35 houses, with an access provided from the adjoining site CRAV003?

Out of the 49 respondents, the majority (31 out of 49 (63%)) support the allocation of the site. One respondent stated that this site is a logical infill site for housing. The Highways Agency confirmed that the additional pressure will not cause any severe implications for safety or free flow on the A49. A few respondents stated that they would support the site providing that; access was through Brook Road and it was development in isolation and not in connection with CRAV003. However 17 respondents (35%) objected to the allocation of the site. The main reasons for this was traffic safety implications and the inadequate road network and the potential impact on the existing flooding issues in the area. Other reasons for objecting to the sites allocation included; negative impact on residential amenity; lack of employment opportunities and the lack of infrastructure and its ability to cope with additional houses.

Question 6: Do you agree that site CRAV009 should provide a pedestrian and cycling link into the adjoining Long Lane Industrial Estate?

Out of the 41 respondents, a substantial majority (35 out of 41 (85%)) agree that a pedestrian and cycle link should be provided as it will provide a safer route from this side of the town and encourage people to not use their cars. Some respondents comment that provision of foot and cycle routes/ links are essential and should be promote across the town.

Question 7: Do you agree that site CRAV004, being land at Watling Street/Clun Road, should be allocated for 35 houses?

Out of the 51 respondents, a small majority (30 out of 51 (59%)) support with the allocation of this site. The Highway Agency confirmed that the additional pressure will not cause any severe implications for safety or free flow on the A49. Some respondents stated that they would support the allocation of the site provided that; it includes local affordable housing; an appropriate access is achieved; development is in keeping with the surrounding development and providing an acceptable plan for the care home site has been agreed. However, 17 respondents (33%) objected to the allocation of the site, largely due to the inadequate road network, which is currently dangerous and unsafe due to limited visibility. Other site specific concerns raised included the increase in flooding events and an objection to the widening of Watling Street, which will result in loss of trees and a negative impact on the character of the area. General concerns about the lack of employment opportunities and the lack of infrastructure and its ability to cope with additional houses were also raised again.

Question 8: Do you agree that site CRAV024, being land off Clun Road adjacent to Alexandra Park, should be allocated for 20 houses, with accesses from the adjoining site CRAV004 and from Clun Road and Alexandra Park?

Out of the 46 respondents, a large majority (35 out of 46 (76%)) support the allocation of this site, largely due to its location within the development boundary and that it will act as a logical infill site. The Highway Agency also confirmed that the additional pressure will not cause any severe implications for safety or free flow on the A49. However 9 respondents (20%) objected to the sites allocation. The main reason related to concern over the access from Clun road, and to a lesser degree Watling Street. It was stated that these access points were unsuitable for additional traffic as there are already traffic safety issues on these roads. Other more general reasons for objecting to the site related to, the potential increase to flooding in the locality, the lack of employment opportunities and the lack of infrastructure and its ability to cope with additional houses.

Question 9: Do you agree that the partially developed care home site, at Roman Downs, should be allocated for 25 houses to deliver an innovative redevelopment scheme with sites CRAV004 and CRAV024?

Out of the 47 respondents, the majority (32 out of 47 (68%)) support the allocation of this site. The main reason for this was that development of this site would lead to an enhancement of the locality, as the site is currently a blight in the area. It was also stated that it was important that Roman Downs is completed and allowing housing to facilitate this is appropriate and will integrate the accommodation for the elderly with the community. Some respondents raised concern that the Care Home should be provide as it is a needed facility in Craven Arms. 12 respondents (26%) objected to the allocation, mainly due to the fact that the site was allocated for a care home facility and associated sheltered housing and therefore should not include other development. It was again confirmed that a care home is a priority for Craven Arms, with an obviously demand for this facility. General concern was also raised again about the inadequate road network and lack of employment opportunities and infrastructure and its ability to cope with additional houses.

Question 10: Do you agree that new housing developments in Craven Arms should be linked to highway, pedestrian and cycling routes in existing housing areas to improve accessibility through the town?

Out of the 44 respondents, a large majority (34 out of 44 (77%)) support the idea that development should be linked to existing highway, pedestrian and cycling routes. The main reason for support related to the improvement of pedestrian and cycling routes as this will encourage walking and cycling in the town and make it safer. One respondent also stated that it is essential to spread traffic movement around the town, in order to limit the burden on certain roads. Some respondents suggests possible location for improvements, including; better crossing to community centre; a link from community centre to Halford and footpaths along length on Watling Street and Clun Road. On the other hand some respondents stated that no development should take place off Watling Street, Greenfields Road or Clun Road as they are not suitable to take additional traffic.

Question 11: Do you agree that site CRAV002 (0.8 hectares), being land west of Watling Street adjoining properties ‘Sunningdale’ and ‘Castle View’, should be allocated for 20 houses?

Out of the 51 respondents, a small majority (28 out of 51 (55%)) object to the allocation of this site. The main reason for this objection related to the location of the site, to the western side of Watling Street. It is considered by many that Watling streets acts as a boundary to Craven Arms and development should not extended passed this boundary. It was also suggested that due to this the site is divorced from the main development and services in Craven Arms. These main objections are supported by Sibdon Carwood Parish Council who added that the site falls within their parish and they are opposed to any development, choosing to be classed as open countryside. As such they proposed that the site is removed from SAMDev. Some respondents also highlighted that there has been no evidence or justification as too the need for an exception site. Other reasons for objecting to the site included; inadequate road network; the negative impact to visual appearance and landscape, due to the sites prominent location in a sensitive landscape area; the loss of agricultural land; the location of natural springs on the site and that properties are already not selling in the area and therefore there isn't the need. A number of respondents stated that there are other more suitable that this site. However 22 respondents (43%) support the allocation of the site, stating that it will help to meet the need for affordable housing in the area. A few respondents stated that they would support the site providing that there is; a proven local need for affordable housing and development is limited to the North side of existing properties.

Question 12: Do you agree that an allowance for 75 new houses should be made to improve the range and choice of housing sites in Craven Arms for 2011 to 2026?

Out of the 44 respondents, the majority (28 out of 44 (64%)) agree with the windfall allowance for Craven Arms. Some respondents stated that they support the allowance providing; the additional housing is needed; brownfield sites are utilised; self-build options are include; development are small scale and backland/ garden development is allowed as its preferable to greenfield sites. One respondents also stated that a lower number would be more appropriate, as the existing development boundary would not be able to accommodate this figure, a suggestion of 30 dwellings was put forward, with the other 45 being accommodated on an additional allocated site. However 14 respondents (32%) objected to this allowance, with one respondent stating that there are already enough proposals for housing with the preferred options in place. Another stated that there are currently empty properties in the town, suggesting there is no need for more housing.

Question 13: Do you agree that site ELR053 (8 hectares of a larger 25 hectare site) at Newington Farm should be allocated for new employment land?

Out of the 57 respondents, a small majority (32 out of 57 (56%)) support the allocation of the site for employment uses, largely due to the fact it will provide economic benefit, allows the expansion of an

existing business and provide additional employment for Craven Arms. Some respondents stated that they would support the sites allocation providing that the development; provides a suitable access and road improvements for A49; provides a buffer zone along River Onny to protect wildlife and environment; incorporates the existing trees into the scheme; is concentrated on the northern end of the site; provides public open space around the existing ponds and is limited to just the abattoir. However 21 respondents (37%) object to the sites allocation, including Wistanstow Parish Council. This objection is largely due to the loss of open space and historic parkland and the fact that the site is liable to flooding. Some respondents also state that there is no suitable access to the A49 and that development should be located in the existing industrial area, with suggestions that CRAV028sd or the reserve site would be more appropriate alternatives. Concern was also raised about the location of the site, as it is outside of Craven Arms district and could create strip development to the north of the Town. Other reason for object including; no need for employment sites, as there are existing empty industrial units; development would have a detrimental impact on character and appearance of area; development would have a negative impact on wildlife habitats and it's against the previous Inspectors decision.

Question 14: Do you agree that 6 hectares of this new employment land at Newington Farm should be used to accommodate the relocation and expansion of the abattoir from Corvedale Road?

Out of the 56 respondents, the majority (35 out of 56 (63%)) support the uses of the site for the relocation of the abattoir. The main reasons for this was that it would provide a better location than the current site, which is located near residential areas; will improve traffic congestion in the town centre and would allow an existing business to expand, providing an economic benefit to the town. One respondent also stated that the site is well screened and won't cause any detrimental visual impact. Some respondents stated that they would support the relocation providing that; development was limited to just the abattoir and not the valued add processes; no development took place on land near The Lodge, as it's a sensitive visual location; a suitable access could be provide form the A49; development includes improvements to the road network and a buffer zone along the River Onny, in order to protect the sensitive environment and wildlife and incorporates the existing trees into any scheme. However 19 respondents (34%, included Wistanstow Parish Council, object to the relocation on this site. The main reasons for this included; loss of historic parkland; the likelihood of flooding, as it adjoins the flood plain of River Onny; allocation is against the previous Inspectors decision in 2004 and the development will have a detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the area and the approach into Craven Arms. Several respondents stated that alternative sites, such as the reserve site or CRAV028sd, would be more suitable for the relocation of the abattoir as they would have less detrimental impacts. Other issues raised included; the lack of a suitable access to A49; negative impact on wildlife habitats; the prominent location of the site, being seen by lots of people entering the town; no evidence has been produce that a 6ha site is required; development should be contained in existing industrial area and it would create strip development outside of the Craven Arms district.

Question 15: Do you agree that Newington Farm should be used to accommodate further employment uses (another 2 hectares of land) to improve the range and choice of employment sites in Craven Arms?

Out of the 52 respondents, a small majority (29 out of 52 (56%)) support the uses of the site for other employment. A few re4spodnnets stated that they would support the site providing that; a suitable access is provided form the A49; development would preserve the public footpaths and improve the road network; the development was sympathetic to rural setting and surroundings and

the jobs created would be for local people. However, 21 respondents (40%) object to the site, stating that development is against the previous Inspectors decision and would result in; a loss of historic parkland; potential flooding issues, due to its location adjoining flood plain and a detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the area. Again several respondents suggest that alternative sites would be more suitable, as they have fewer constraints.

Question 16: Do you agree that the existing abattoir site should be promoted as a 'key area of change' to regenerate Corvedale Road as the principal shopping street and the eastern gateway to Craven Arms?

Out of the 42 respondents, a large majority (31 out of 42 (74%)) support the key area a change, stating that the area needs regenerating and could provide an economic benefit for Craven Arms. A few respondents stated that they would support the key change area providing that; redevelopment does not include large scale supermarket development; the existing open vista/ countryside views are protected and that sufficient investment is put in place to attract business into the area, but not at the detriment of existing businesses. One respondent stated that the area should be extended to include CRAV012 and the Morris Corfield site, which could provide strategic redevelopment of the whole area to provide housing and a linear park, which is an aspiration of the Town Council. However 10 respondents (24%) object, with one respondent stated that the abattoir should be retained on the site and any required improvements made at this location. Other issues raised included; that the site is not appropriate for principal shopping area, as it is too far out of the town centre and that the surrounding area around the abattoir should be left as an open space area.

Question 17: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Craven Arms?

Out of the 44 respondents, 22 (50%) agree with the proposed development boundary, whilst 21 (48%) object. The majority of the comments received related to the exclusion or inclusion of sites, with respondents stating that preferred sites ELR053 and CRAV002 should be excluded and alternative sites CRAV001 and part of CRAV007 should be included. Other general comments received stated that the plan needed to; make provision for a new school within the boundary to accommodate the increased population; upgrade Watling Street along its full length; improve public transport infrastructure; allocate more employment land and fully utilised brownfield site before greenfield development.

Question 18: Do you agree that the settlements of Aston on Clun, Hopesay, Broome, Horderley, Beambridge, Long Meadow End, Rowton and Round Oak should be a Community Cluster?

Out of the 42 respondents, a substantial majority (35 out of 42 (83%)) support the community cluster designation. One respondent did state that development should be focussed on the East of South side of Aston-on-Clun. However 6 respondents (14%) object to the designation, with one respondent stating that there should be a wider provision across the parishes. Another stated that Broome and Aston-on-Clun had a range of facilities and should be included but the other settlement should only be included if robust evidence shows there is a strong functional relationship between them.

Question 19: Do you agree that the growth target of 15 houses is appropriate for this Community Cluster?

Out of the 37 respondents, 92% (34) support the housing target for the Cluster, whilst 3 respondents (8%) object. Only one additional comment was received, which stated that a target of 5 houses would be more appropriate for the Cluster.

Question 20: Do you think that appropriate, small-scale employment developments should be supported in this Community Cluster to diversify local employment opportunities?

Out of the 37 respondents, a substantial majority (34 out of 37 (92%)) support the development of small-scale employment units. The comments received stated that they would support this providing that developments were small scale and in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

Question 21: Alternative Sites.

The following alternative sites have been put forward by respondents;

- 1. Land to west of Watling Street (CRAV015), suitable for employment use (support by 2 respondents)*
- 2. Land south of Halford (CRAV012), suitable for housing (support by 2 respondents)*
- 3. Brownfield site at The Temperance Hall (CRAV021) & Old Warehouses to West of A49, suitable for redevelopment for housing*
- 4. Land to South, between Clun Road and Railway line, suitable for housing*
- 5. Land off Watling Street (CRAV001 and part of CRAV007) should be included with preferred option CRAV002 for mixed of open and affordable housing.*
- 6. Land West of Rail Line CA north (CRAV028sd) is suitable for employment*
- 7. Land at Tanglewood Farm (CRAV008)*
- 8. Land off Shrewsbury Road (CRAV023) suitable for employment*

Other general comments about the location of development in Craven Arms and surrounding areas were received. A few respondents stated that any employment use should be restricted to the areas surrounding the existing industrial estate in Craven Arms. In terms of additional hubs or cluster the following were put forward;

- 1. Wistanstow should be a community hub- the settlement already acts as a hub and has a large number of services and some employment opportunities.*
- 2. Should be an additional cluster to the east of Craven Arms- in order to prevent development being concentrated to the west and allow for settlements in the east to sustain their current levels of sustainability and growth. One respondent suggest that Diddlebury parish should be a cluster.*

Ellesmere Place Plan Area

Ellesmere Town

Question 1: Do you think that the target of a further 321 houses to be built in Ellesmere by 2026 is appropriate?

A total of 68 people answered this question online, of those 24 (35%) people support the proposed proposed target whilst 44 (65%) do not. The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues.

The majority of comments concern town infrastructure which needs improving including schools, medical facilities, roads & drainage none of which could cope with a population increase. A few respondents are concerned with drainage and sewage capacity generally whilst one respondent comments that the town's drainage flows into a watercourse near Tetchill which will not be able to cope. A number of comments state that there is little employment in the area and the town is becoming a commuter town. A few respondents say that local shops are not being supported and are being lost & parking charges are not helping. The Town Council support the proposed growth target but state that land for the cemetery is of prime importance and should not be forgotten. A few respondents question the evidence that new houses are required, stating that population projections are over inflated and that existing sites have remained undeveloped. It is felt by a number of people that the level of development will destroy the rural feel of the Town. A small number of people comment that new houses are needed but must be appropriate to Ellesmere and its rural setting and should not impinge on the Mere or the canal. A few comment that brownfield sites should be built first and more emphasis should be placed on providing affordable properties for local people.

Question 2: Do you agree that no additional employment land provision is required to cover the period up to 2026?

A total of 65 people answered this question online, of those 37 (57%) answered 'Yes' therefore agreeing that no more employment land is required, and 28 (43%) Answered 'No' to the question, which means that they would like to see more land allocated for employment. . The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues.

The Town Council support a further allocation of land to the west of the business park as phase 3 in response to increased housing in town and loss of other employment sites (ELL008). Several respondents comment that the town will need more employment especially if it is growing by 321 new houses and that there is a real need for local employment & land will therefore be required. A small number go on to say that local employment will to reduce commuting and reliance on poor public transport. A number of comments relate to small businesses located in the town centre stating that these should be the focus for more support as it would benefit the community whilst providing employment opportunities. One person added that land for a hotel and other tourism related development was required. A few respondents are not in favour of increased employment land & raise the following points: Employment land should be located outside of town & not adjacent to existing housing as it will impact on highway safety as well as being a source of noise and pollution; Increased industrial development will have a negative impact on Ellesmere's natural environmental assets; Roads are not suitable for heavy traffic; and, the land already allocated should be sufficient.

Question 3. Do you agree that site ELL004 (3.37Ha), being land at Grange Road, should be allocated for about 82 houses?

A total of 58 people answered this question online, of those 27(47%) agreed that the site ELL004 should be allocated for about 82 houses and 31 (53%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues.

Town Council are opposed to development of this site & Members agreed to reject this site for housing as in 2010 and support its exclusion on grounds of unsuitability.

A number of objections relate to flooding and poor drainage; very poor drainage of land exacerbated by overflow from lake at Lake House; at times sewers have been unable to cope and effluent has ended up in gardens; properties on Teal Drive are subject to flooding and some have had to be piled; more development will make matters worse; will create problems downstream in the Tetchill Brook. The Environment Agency state: *Ellesmere area is underlain by complex sequence of superficial deposits comprising clays, silts, sands and gravels. This is in turn underlain by the Permo-Triassic Sandstone. The sandstone is of regional strategic importance in terms of water supply and more local scale water requirements and baseflow to watercourses can arise from the superficial deposits. The depth to groundwater across the area is highly variable with shallow groundwater systems present within the shallow drift deposits. **There is a landfill located 100m to the east of the site.*

A similar number of objections relate to highway and access issues: access onto grange road is poor due to speed, narrow railway bridge & pavement and relationship to industrial sites; existing water run off/poor drainage results in hazardous black ice on the estate roads which are narrow and would be inadequate as access to new development as used as informal play area by local children as well as the official play park. One comment suggested that a new access further along Grange Road should be provided.

Wildlife and other environmental comments; loss of mature oaks and other trees on site will be damaging to the environment, wildlife and drainage; site provides important habitat for many species, is important source of water flow to the Mere; development would ultimately damage the ecosystem and an environmental impact assessment should be carried out. Site is used and enjoyed by local residents for walking. The attractive rural landscape will be destroyed; greenfield sites such as this should be protected and development directed to brownfield sites. A small number of respondents state that projected population figures are hugely overestimated and that Ellesmere does not need the number of new homes that are being proposed. A small number of supporting comments as follows; adjacent to existing housing and so suitable; already developed on 2 sides – would not spoil any views. Not social housing. A small number of people prefer to have future development southwest of the town as this is the location of the schools, playing fields and employment with potential for further development. The area has good road links without having to drive through Tesco junction at the traffic lights

Question 4: Do you agree that site ELL008 (1.7Ha), comprising the station building and yard, should be allocated for about 52 houses?

A total of 61 people answered this question online, of those 49(80%) agreed that the site ELL008 should be allocated for about 52 houses and 12 (20%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

Most comments are supporting the development stating that the site is; ideal for development; brownfield sites are preferable to greenfield sites; within built up area and close to local amenities; it could accommodate more than 52 houses. A few respondents noted the historical interest of the old station building should be preserved and opened up to the public. One person commented that low cost affordable housing is required for local young people. A few responses oppose the development for the following reasons: density is too high; the site should be used for commercial development as it will be subject to contamination and flooding; and that development of the site may have a negative impact on adjacent areas in the flood plain, this issue needs investigation. The Town Council support this site with a clause that an alternative route to Fullwoods is considered & that the Station Building is protected from building in close proximity. The Environment Agency state:

*Ellesmere area is underlain by complex sequence of superficial deposits comprising clays, silts, sands and gravels. This is in turn underlain by the Permo-Triassic Sandstone. The sandstone is of regional strategic importance in terms of water supply and more local scale water requirements and baseflow to watercourses can arise from the superficial deposits. The depth to groundwater across the area is highly variable with shallow groundwater systems present within the shallow drift deposits. ** The station yard and building have potential contaminated land issues, which need to be adequately addressed.*

Question 5: Do you agree that site ELL016 (1Ha), being land adjacent to the cemetery, should be allocated for about 22 houses? Please note that this scheme is subject to the provision of an agreed area of land along the south west boundary (adjacent to the cemetery) to be used for additional burial ground and/or an access footpath between Swan Hill and The Mere/open space.

A total of 69 people answered this question online, of those 7(10%) agreed that the site ELL016 should be allocated for about 22 houses and 62 (90%) disagreed. A further 24 objection letters and emails, 90 community organised response forms and a petition containing 2693 signatures were received.

The comments received online, by email, letter and community organised response forms were unanimously opposed to the development of the site raising the following issues:

The Town council oppose this site due to visual impact on the Mere. Shropshire Wildlife Trust (SWT) object to the site as inappropriate for development due to numerous factors including proximity to the Mere (County Wildlife Site). The local SWT branch add further comments to the objection, including; being at odds with Section 11 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment) of the NPPF; the likelihood of pollution to the Mere which is in itself an important and fragile ecosystem, a recognised local wildlife site; & planned work of the Meres & Mosses Partnership to improve the water quality of the Mere which would be jeopardised by development of this site. Other comments can be summarised as follows: The beauty and tranquillity of Mere & Cremorne Gardens should be protected for future generations and because of its ecological importance as a fragile ecosystem supporting rare flora and fauna. Water run-off from site is likely to pollute the Mere and the trees on site are subject to a Tree Preservation Order. It would be in direct conflict with the Government's White Paper (The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature, June 2011). There would be a significant negative impact on tourism because of the damaging visual effect on the Mere. Trade and revenue in the town would suffer as a consequence by damage to the Mere as it has a significant economic value to the town as it is the Mere that makes Ellesmere unique. The proposed 5m strip for cemetery expansion is paltry, diversionary and short term. The Town Council/Burial Committee should look elsewhere for new land or the site should be obtained and used to expand cemetery. Development here would be too close to the cemetery as well as the Mere. This parcel of land provides a crucial buffer zone between Mere park and the town. Development would have a negative impact on character of surrounding area and the amenities of neighbouring properties, highway safety on Swan Hill will be compromised and a new footpath link between Swan Hill and the Mere is not required. The proximity to town centre is insufficient justification. Development of site ELL016 would be at odds with the local vision statement in the Core Strategy and the Ellesmere Place Plan, which both say that development (should) recognise the high quality landscape. There are other available sites around the town some of which are brownfield and therefore preferable. Concern has been expressed that population projections have been over estimated.

Question 6: Do you agree that sites ELL017a (2.88Ha) and ELL017 (1.14Ha), being land to rear of The Hawthorns and land off Almond Drive, should be allocated for about 88 houses? Please note that this scheme is dependent on a highway improvement at Trimpley Street which requires relocation of the Medical Centre and is therefore not likely to come forward until the latter part of the plan period (post 2021).

A total of 54 people answered this question online, of those 35(65%) agreed that the sites ELL017 & ELL017a should be allocated for about 88 houses and 19 (35%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The Town Council support this site subject to better access routes.

Several supporting comments were made stating that this site was better than the others (ELL004 & ELL016), that the land is available and deliverable with no physical constraints. A few people comment that development here would be an acceptable location but that 88 is too many, one person suggested that 70 would be more acceptable. Another respondent comments that development here will not degrade the town. A few comments state that the new medical centre and highway improvement scheme must be complete before development commences. There were several comments about the medical centre and one respondent pointed out that land has been set aside and is available for the relocation. Other people state that the wider infrastructure in the town is inadequate including the schools whilst one person states that the site is too far out of town with insufficient public transport. One comment states that Elson Park estate access is already very cramped with cars parking on Cherry Drive and that the development would be very close to the expanding industrial park. Again, a preference for brownfield sites to be developed before greenfield sites was expressed and that large housing estates are not appropriate for Ellesmere which needs smaller more sympathetic developments. One person comments that the site is an attractive greenfield site outside of development boundary with mature trees and hedgerows. A small number of people made comments about the proposed traffic improvements at Trimpey Street, one saying that it may have a negative impact on the Conservation Area, whilst another says It will not be possible to make adequate highway improvements to Trimpey Street because of the presence of listed buildings stating that a new road link back to Oswestry Road may be required. Other comments include; More people will result in more problems and that this development is not needed.

Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed Primary Shopping Area in Ellesmere?

A total of 54 people answered this question online, of those 50(93%) agreed with the proposed Primary Shopping Area and 4 (7%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The Town Council do not support the Primary Shopping Area due to the exclusion of Watergate Street, Church Street and other areas. The criteria in Policy direction MD12 should be modified to allow inclusion of these shops.

Several people comment that the Primary Shopping Area has missed out some important parts including TG Builders Merchants, parts of Watergate Street and Cross Street. The majority of comments received state that more needs to be done to build on what the town already has whilst adding in diversity and flexibility.

Question 8: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Ellesmere? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

A total of 59 people answered this question online, of those 18(31%) agreed with the proposed development boundary for Ellesmere and 41 (69%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The Town Council would like the development boundary amended to exclude an area at the rear of Church Street and Talbot Street, adjacent to the Mere to protect it from development.

A number of respondents also commented that the land known as Horton's Field (ELL009) should be removed from the development boundary in order to protect it.. A large number of people said that they agreed with the proposed boundary apart from the inclusion of ELL016. Several other comments said that they would like to see land to the south of Oswestry Road to the south west of the school included. Another comment said that land around the canal

depot should be included. Some people made comments that the boundary should not be changed so as to; keep development to a reasonable level; avoid greenfields; protect current infrastructure; prevent Ellesmere becoming a commuter town; not detract from beauty, as tourism would suffer; and, make better use of brownfield land. One person commented that the current area is too small to allow for flexibility, whilst another said that the economy needs to recover first so that it can support new development.

Cockshutt

Question 9. Do you agree that Cockshutt should be a Community Hub?

A total of 32 people answered this question online, of those 29 (91%) agreed that Cockshutt should be a Community Hub and 3 (9%) disagreed. No comments were received that object to Cockshutt being designated as a Community Hub.

Question 10: Do you think that the target of a further 50 houses to be built in Cockshutt by 2026 is appropriate?

A total of 32 people answered this question online, of those 20 (62.5%) agreed that the target of a further 50 houses to be built in Cockshutt by 2026 is appropriate and 12 (37.5%) disagreed. The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues: The Parish Council support the target on the basis that this includes outstanding permissions of 17, 'windfall' of 13 and a maximum of 20 houses to be allocated on sites of no more than 5 houses on the west side of the A528. Some respondents commented that Cockshutt could accommodate more than 50 dwellings, one person felt that this figure was too high and should be limited to 30, whilst 2 people commented that the outstanding development should be completed and occupied before any more new houses are permitted. One comment stated that preference should be given to affordable homes for local people.

Question 11: Do you agree that site CO018b (0.22 Ha), being land south of Chapel House Farm, should be allocated for up to 5 houses?

A total of 30 people answered this question online, of those 23 (77%) agreed that site CO018b, land south of Chapel House Farm, should be allocated for up to 5 houses and 7 (23%) disagreed. The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues: The Parish Council would like extra information regarding highway and pedestrian safety at the access point onto the A528 and one other comment raised a similar issue regarding the lack of a continuous pavement to the village centre.

Question 12: Do you agree that site CO002 (9.23 Ha), being land west of Cockshutt, should be allocated for 10-15 houses? It is proposed that a maximum of 1 hectare of land at the south western end of the site, adjacent to The Parklands, be allocated for 2 or possibly 3 separate sites of 5 houses.

A total of 31 people answered this question online, of those 19 (61%) agreed that site CO002, land west of Cockshutt, should be allocated for 10 to 15 houses and 12 (39%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The Parish Council do not support any development on the Jubilee Field or the playing field, both of which are included in site CO002. The PC does however recognise that as CO002 is a very large site it would be possible to develop a small part without compromising either of the aforementioned fields. Development of parts of the south west corner of the site would be well related to village facilities but it should be noted that the PC request a mix of property types to include some bungalows suitable for older people.

A petition of 171 signatures organised by the Village Hall Management Committee object to any part of the village playing field being used for housing development. One other objection comment is based on not developing the playing field and that dividing the developable areas in to two or three separate areas would be artificial. Another respondent objects to access via the existing cul-de-sac. One supporting comment refers to the site being in a good location on the south west side of the village away from existing commercial agriculture operations to the north.

Question 13: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Cockshutt? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

A total of 29 people answered this question online, of those 20 (69%) agreed with the proposed new development boundary for Cockshutt and 9 (31%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The Parish Council is unable to agree with the development boundary until it is clear exactly which sites or parts of sites will be included. Other comments received did not agree with the proposed development boundary as it did not include their own or their client's site.

Dudleston Heath (Criftins) and Elson

Question 14: Do you agree that Dudleston Heath (Criftins) and Elson should be a Community Hub?

A total of 30 people answered this question online, of those 25 (83%) agree that Dudleston Heath (Criftins) and Elson should be a Community Hub and 5 (17%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The Parish Council support the proposed Hub. The Environment Agency comment that any developments need to ensure adequate foul drainage and water supply as discharge of foul effluent to ground may not be appropriate. One other comment received also supports the proposed Hub due to the existing range of facilities and services. One further comment does not support the inclusion of Elson within the Hub unless any development in Elson is limited to employment land only.

Question 15: Do you think that the target of a further 40 houses to be built in Dudleston Heath (Criftins) and Elson by 2026 is appropriate?

A total of 29 people answered this question online, of those 19 (66%) agree with the proposed growth target for Dudleston Heath (Criftins) and Elson and 10 (34%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

Forty houses would be too many. Twenty five would be more realistic. More houses should be allocated and less left to windfall, otherwise the target would not be met.

Question 16: Which, if any, of the 3 possible housing sites shown on the map (DUD001/DUD002/ELS001/09) would be the best location for an allocation of up to 20 new houses?

A total of 31 people answered this question online, of those 17 (55%) support site DUDH001, 5 (16%) support site DUD002, 3 (10%) support site ELS001/09, and 6 (19%) ticked the box for 'None of the above'. The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

One respondent said that expansion to the Hill park estate at DUD001 would result in a very large estate development which would be disproportionate with the scale of the village.

Another thought that it would be better to keep the residential development close together and avoid building on the greenfield site at DUDH002. A third respondent states that DUDH002 is slightly more preferable to DUDH001 as it could provide a balance to the village. An 85 signature petition was submitted objecting to development of site DUDH001 for reasons of lack of infrastructure, poorly related to village facilities, highway safety and damage to wildlife. One person commented that ELS001 is not at all well related to village facilities and services which are in Dudleston Heath.

Question 17: Do you agree that the development boundary for Dudleston Heath (Criftins) needs to be reviewed and that a new section will be drawn up around Elson? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary. We welcome comments and suggestions for the revised/new boundary.

A total of 28 people answered this question online, of those 15 (54%) agreed with the development boundary for Dudleston Heath (Criftins) needs to be reviewed and that a new section should be drawn around Elson and 13 (46%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

One respondent comments that it may be possible to meet the housing target without changes to the development boundaries particularly if development is concentrated in small groups. Another person says that sites DUDH001 & DUDH002 could be included. One respondent suggests re-instatement of development boundary at Greenhill Bank as Chapel lane offers no opportunities for infill. Another respondent does not agree with Elson being included within a development boundary.

Question 18: Do you agree that the settlements of Dudleston and Street Dinas should be a Community Cluster?

A total of 26 people answered this question online, of those 15 (58%) agree that Dudleston and Street Dinas should be a Community Cluster and 11 (42%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The Parish Council support the proposed Cluster. The Environment Agency comment that any developments need to ensure adequate foul drainage and water supply as discharge of foul effluent to ground may not be appropriate.

Of the other comments received around half do not support the Cluster due to the rural nature of the area whilst the other half agree and think it should cover a wider area. One respondent would like Sodyllt Bank included in the Cluster.

Question 19: Do you think that the target of a further 15 houses to be built in Dudleston and Street Dinas by 2026 is appropriate?

A total of 27 people answered this question online, of those 14 (52%) agree with the proposed housing target for Dudleston and Street Dinas is appropriate and 13 (48%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The Environment Agency comment that any developments need to ensure adequate foul drainage and water supply as discharge of foul effluent to ground may not be appropriate.

The majority of comments are concerned with highway safety on the narrow roads and lack of infrastructure. Most comments regarding infrastructure are concerned with foul drainage and the risk of contamination of ground water as many people use wells for their water supply. Two people comment that most of the new housing should be located in St Dinas due to its location on the main road. One comment states that approximately half of the target would be more appropriate.

Tetchill, Lee and Whitemere

Question 20: Do you agree that the settlements of Tetchill, Lee and Whitemere should be a Community Cluster?

A total of 50 people answered this question online, of those 18 (36%) agree that Tetchill, Lee and Whitemere should be a Community Cluster and 32 (64%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The Parish Council support the proposed Cluster as do a small number of respondents. The majority of respondents are concerned that there are no amenities or services in any of the villages. Some people have commented that the 3 villages are not well related to each other and that highway safety would be compromised especially on the already busy road between Ellesmere and Tetchill. A few people have commented that the peace and tranquillity of the villages would be harmed. One person states that Whitemere should not be included because of its proximity to the Ramsar SSSI. Another person is concerned about the possible effects of affordable housing in Tetchill.

The Environment Agency comment that any developments need to ensure adequate foul drainage and water supply as discharge of foul effluent to ground may not be appropriate.

Question 21: Do you think that the target of a further 20 houses to be built in Tetchill, Lee and Whitemere by 2026 is appropriate?

A total of 50 people answered this question online, of those 13 (26%) agree that the target of a further 20 houses to be built in Tetchill, Lee and Whitemere by 2026 is appropriate and 37 (74%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The majority of comments raise very similar issues to the previous question with most people objecting to any development due to a lack of amenities and services in Tetchill and that highway safety would be compromised especially on the already busy road between Ellesmere and Tetchill. One suggested highway improvement suggested is an upgrade to the towpath between Tetchill & Ellesmere so that it could be used by cyclists. One person has commented that it should be a requirement that any new houses must connect to the new sewage pumping station. Others have commented that there is a lack of outdoor recreation space/play space in the village and that there is no connection to mains gas.

The Environment Agency comment that any developments need to ensure adequate foul drainage and water supply as discharge of foul effluent to ground may not be appropriate.

Question 22: Do you agree that site TET001, being land south of Cairndale, should be allocated for about 10 houses?

A total of 50 people answered this question online, of those 16 (32%) agree that site TET001 should be allocated for about 10 houses and 34 (68%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

A small number of respondents support the proposed allocation. The Parish Council also support the site provided sewerage system is linked to main sewerage system and access to roads within the village should be improved and should be a condition.. The majority of respondents object to the allocation due to lack of facilities and services within Tetchill. A similar number of object comments were made due to highway safety around Tetchill which is served by narrow lanes. A few comments relate to the site being too close to the new wind turbine which will impact on occupiers of proposed new dwellings as well as site size and layout. One person states that the site is on good quality agricultural land. Two comments say that the village needs a play area for children and one person says that there is no need to allocate a site when the target is only 20 and could be met through windfall.

The Environment Agency comment that any developments need to ensure adequate foul drainage and water supply as discharge of foul effluent to ground may not be appropriate.

Question 23: Do you agree that in Lee and Whitemere, development should be strictly limited to single infill plots within the existing villages?

A total of 49 people answered this question online, of those 41 (84%) agree that development in Lee and Whitemere should be strictly limited to single infill plots within the existing villages and 8 (16%) disagreed. The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The Environment Agency comment that any developments need to ensure adequate foul drainage and water supply as discharge of foul effluent to ground may not be appropriate.

One person has commented that all development should be adjacent to existing development and limited to either infill or barn conversions and that it should have a high proportion of affordable housing. One person has said that there should be no building adjacent to the Mere and two other respondents have objected to any new building in these villages as it would damage the character of the area.

Question 24: Do you agree with the development boundary for Tetchill? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

A total of 50 people answered this question online, of those 17 (34%) agree with the proposed development boundary for Tetchill and 33 (66%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

One respondent registered support for the proposed new development boundary for Tetchill whilst the majority object to changes. Most comments relate to a lack of facilities and services to support any development with some people commenting on highway safety issues and a need for a play area and village hall.

Question 25: Do you agree that development boundaries should not be introduced for Lee and Whitemere?

A total of 41 people answered this question online, of those 29 (71%) agree that development boundaries should not be introduced for Lee and Whitemere and 12 (29%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

None of the responses received would like to see development boundaries introduced for Lee or Whitemere

Welsh Frankton, Perthy, New Marton and Lower Frankton

Question 26: Do you agree that the settlements of Welsh Frankton, Perthy, New Marton and Lower Frankton should be a Community Cluster?

A total of 26 people answered this question online, of those 16 (62%) agree that Welsh Frankton, Perthy, New Marton and Lower Frankton should be a Community Cluster and 10 (38%) disagreed. The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues: A small number of respondents including the Parish Council support the proposed Cluster. A similarly small number object to the designation of a Cluster. One person commented that the only settlement that should be included is Welsh Frankton. The Canal & River Trust have stated that any development in Lower Frankton should not have any negative impact on the canal or its environs.

Question 27: Do you think that the target of a further 30 houses to be built in Welsh Frankton, Perthy, New Marton and Lower Frankton by 2026 is appropriate?

A total of 31 people answered this question online, of those 11 (35%) agree that the target of a further 30 houses to be built in Welsh Frankton, Perthy, New Marton and Lower Frankton by 2026 is appropriate and 20 (65%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The majority of respondents are of the opinion that the proposed target is too high pointing to a lack of facilities and poor road network. A few comments state that around half the amount would be more appropriate, one person thought that 5 houses would be a better figure whilst one response placed that figure at 20. One person offered support for the level of development as does the Parish Council.

Question 28: Which, if any, of the 2 possible housing sites shown on the map above (WFTN001/WFTN002) would be the best location for an allocation of 10 to 15 new houses?

A total of 32 people answered this question online, of those 4 (12.5%) prefer site WFTN001, 12 (37.5%) prefer site WFTN002 and 16 (50%) ticked the box for 'None of the above'.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

The Parish Council support lies with WFTN001 but restricted to half of the site with access off of Lower Frankton Road. The majority of responses received do not support either site for reasons that they are both prominent in the wider landscape, a negative impact on the character of the area and highway safety around the already poor junctions. One respondent comments that both sites are far too large and suggests that one or two houses on each may be more appropriate.

Question 29: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce a development boundary for Welsh Frankton? We welcome comments and suggestions for the new boundary.

A total of 21 people answered this question online, of those 14 (67%) agree with the proposal to introduce a development boundary for Welsh Frankton and 7 (33%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

Around half of the comments received would welcome the introduction of a development boundary provided that it was drawn closely around existing development. The other half of the comments would prefer that a new boundary was not introduced as it may lead to more development.

Question 30: Do you agree that development boundaries should not be introduced for Perthy, New Marton and Lower Frankton?

A total of 22 people answered this question online, of those 15 (68%) agree that development boundaries should not be introduced for Perthy, New Marton and Lower Frankton and 7 (32%) disagreed.

There were no comments received either online or by email and letter that would like to see the introduction of a development boundary in any of these villages.

Welshampton and Lyneal

Question 31: Do you agree that the settlements of Welshampton and Lyneal should be a Community Cluster?

A total of 27 people answered this question online, of those 17 (63%) agree that Welshampton and Lyneal should be a Community Cluster and 10 (37%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:
The Parish council support the designation of this Community Cluster. There were no comments received that object to this proposal.

Question 32: Do you think that the target of a further 20 houses to be built in Welshampton by 2026 is appropriate and that all new houses should be located within the existing development boundary and on sites of no more than five houses?

A total of 24 people answered this question online, of those 19 (79%) agree that the target of a further 20 houses to be built in Welshampton by 2026 is appropriate and that all new houses should be located within the existing development boundary and on sites of no more than five houses and 5 (21%) disagreed. The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

One respondent commented that there is insufficient community infrastructure and another expressed concern that the target is too high. The Parish Council support the target provided that all new development is within the existing development boundary.

Question 33: Do you think that the target of a further 5 houses to be built in Lyneal by 2026 is appropriate and that all the new houses should be located within the development boundary?

A total of 26 people answered this question online, of those 20 (77%) agree that the target of a further 5 houses to be built in Lyneal by 2026 is appropriate and that all the new houses should be located within the development boundary and 6 (23%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

Half of the responses received agree with the target provided that it includes conversions, the other half comment that the village is already over developed and has no services.

Question 34: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce a development boundary for Lyneal

A total of 24 people answered this question online, of those 20 (83%) agree with the proposal to introduce a development boundary for Lyneal and 4 (17%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

One person supports the introduction of the proposed development boundary as do the Parish Council.

Question 35: Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Welshampton?

A total of 24 people answered this question online, of those 20 (83%) agree with the proposed development boundary for Welshampton and 4 (17%) disagreed.

The comments received online and by email and letter raised the following issues:

One comment received suggests that the developable area (the boundary) should be expanded. The Parish Council support the retention of the existing boundary.

Countryside Areas in Place Plan Area

Question 36: Do you agree that Wood Lane Quarry should be a preferred option for mineral extraction?

A small majority of respondents (52% of 46 respondents) do not support identification of the quarry as a preferred option. The Parish Council highlights the need to ensure appropriate

enhancement of the highway infrastructure. Together with other respondents, the Environment Agency note that potential adverse impacts on the local water environment will require detailed modelling since the site is in close proximity to a number of protected sites and species which could be highly sensitive to any changes. There is some support for the continued operation of the business as an important local employer and, together with other respondents, the Shropshire Wildlife Trust note that, provided that these sites can be appropriately protected, then restoration may deliver potential biodiversity gains and enhancements.

A number of respondents are concerned about the proximity of the proposed extension to the Shropshire Union Canal, Colemere Country Park and the footpath which links it to Ellesmere, which are important assets in the local tourism economy. Specific concerns about the potential for adverse impacts on the infrastructure of the canal were raised by the Canal and River Trust. A standoff distance and screening may be required and appropriate controls to manage the potential for adverse impacts on the canal will be needed during the construction and operation of the site. It is unclear why the potential southern extension to the site was rejected in favour of the northern extension. Other respondents including the Colemere Residents' Association are concerned that the elevated location will cause problems of noise, dust and visual intrusion for the residents of Colemere and properties in the Little Mill area which would be directly in line of the prevailing wind from the proposed site. There are also concerns about heavy vehicles using the narrow lanes and the poor junction at Spunhill Farm for access and the potential use of the site for landfill on restoration.

Highley Place Plan Area

Highley

1. Do you think that the target of a further 30 houses to be built in Highley by 2026 is appropriate?

A slight majority of respondents (52% 16/31) disagreed with the housing growth figure suggested. Most of the respondents felt that the housing figure was too high. Respondents highlighted impacts on the capacity of infrastructure, facilities, services and the lack of employment opportunities in Highley as reasons for having a lower housing figure. The local road system, medical provision and distance to centres of employment were particularly highlighted as concerns. The surrounding countryside and biodiversity of the area were also highlighted along with concern about retaining Highley as a village not a town. A number of respondents suggested that the housing figure should be higher to reflect Highley's position as a key centre, to help contribute to investment in infrastructure improvements, and due to the role of Highley in the east 'spatial zone' of the Core Strategy. Of those that agreed with the figure many felt it was an appropriate amount of future development in Highley but should not be exceeded in the Plan period. A couple of respondents highlighted the type of housing developed should be bungalows to accommodate the needs of the elderly. The Environment Agency commented more generally that there is potential for ground contamination issues in Highley due to its industrial heritage.

2. Do you agree that site HIGH003 (0.78 hectares), being land at Rhea Hall, adjacent to Park View, should be allocated for about 30 houses?

The majority of responses (56% 18/32) agreed with the site proposed at Rhea Hall. A number of respondents stated that the type of housing on the site should be bungalows to help meet the needs of the elderly. Traffic, parking and access issues along Coronation Street and Rhea Hall were raised as a concern. A couple of respondents stated that the site was previously allocated and had not come forward and therefore the deliverability of the site in this Plan was not clear. The distance of the site from the primary school and medical centre compared to alternative sites and the high density, allowing for onsite infrastructure for the site, was also raised by one respondent who put forward an alternative site.

3. Do you think that no new site allocations should be made for employment land in Highley up to 2026, over and above site LB2004_00017, adjacent to Netherton Workshops, that has previously been allocated?

The majority of respondents (68% 19/28) agreed that there should be no further land identified for employment uses. A couple of respondents disagreed highlighting that further land should be identified to allow for more flexibility up to 2026 and help to avoid further out commuting. There were general concerns about the ability of local roads to cope with large vehicles coming into Highley, and whether much of the existing employment land is currently in use. Some comments supported employment development only if it is in keeping with the character and status of Highley as a village.

4. Do you agree that site LB2004_00017 (0.6 Ha), being land adjacent to Netherton Workshops, should continue to be allocated as employment land?

The potential site allocation was supported by the overwhelming majority of respondents (83% 25/30). The Environment Agency made a general comment that the site was around 70m to the east of a landfill site.

5. Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Highley? If you'd like to submit a revised proposal by email, please click here

A slight majority of respondents (52% 14/27) agreed with the proposed development boundary. A couple of respondents suggested that the development boundary should be extended to allow more potential to meet future housing needs and self-build opportunities (potentially changing by Woodhill, and south of Ashleigh Gardens was identified by one respondent). Others suggested that the development boundary should be drawn more tightly (west of Hawthorn Drive identified by one respondent). Many respondents supported the development boundary with a number highlighting concerns with a particular development proposal at Jubilee Drive as it is outside the development boundary.

ALTERNATIVE SITES.

The majority of responses focussed on the potential alternative site at Jubilee Drive (now subject to a current planning application) which was not put forward in the Preferred Option. A number of issues were raised in relation to the site, namely: concerns over safe access with regards to the capacity of Jubilee Drive, Redstone Drive and particularly so in relation to the school; the impact on the landscape and setting of Highley; that the site is used for informal recreation purposes; that there is significant wildlife on the site; that the new houses will have significant strain on infrastructure and facilities; and that it is not included in the Parish Plan. There were also wider concerns regarding the lack of employment opportunities and roads into Highley being of a poor quality. Other sites were also put forward for consideration including land off Redstone Drive (HIGH016) and land north of Vicarage Lane (HIGH012).

Ludlow Place Plan Area

Ludlow

1. Do you think that the target of a further 245 houses to be built in Ludlow by 2026 is appropriate?

A slight majority of respondents (53% 10/19) agreed with the proposed housing figure. A number of issues were raised in relation to the housing figures for the town. Of those respondents who disagreed a number of respondents suggested that the figure was too high and would lead to impacts and pressures on the town's infrastructure and facilities including water supplies, gas and electricity supplies. Other respondents responded more generally that the bypass should be considered to be the boundary whilst re-using existing empty buildings within the town was also suggested rather than allocating new sites.

Others who disagreed with the level of growth considered the level of development to be set too low considering the historic rates of development in Ludlow in recent years and the role of Ludlow as a market town. Other respondents considered the housing target to be too low in relation to policies in the Core Strategy (CS1) and with regards to the role of Ludlow as a main market town in the southern 'spatial zone'; and too low in light of publication of the NPPF's approach to boost housing supply significantly. One respondent highlighted that the figure should be higher due to the number of current applicants for social housing in the town.

2. Do you think that the target of 6 hectares of employment land to be provided in Ludlow by 2026 is appropriate?

The overwhelming majority of respondents agreed with the employment land figure as proposed (94% 15/16). One respondent questioned the type of employment that would be attracted to the town.

3. Do you agree that site LUD017 (8.93 ha), being land south of Rocks Green, should be allocated for 200 houses?

The majority of respondents (65% 17/26) disagreed with the potential site allocation. A couple of respondents stated that the proposal will change the character of the Rocks Green area and wider views of Clee Hill. A number of respondents commented that brownfield opportunities should be developed first before looking to develop greenfield sites outside the bypass. Ludlow Town Council and Ludford Parish Council commented that they preferred development north/east of the Eco Park after brownfield development first. Ludford Parish Council suggested only 50 new houses should be planned for outside the current development boundary at the present time. The Town Council also felt that the site represented ribbon development along the A4117. Others raised concerns about the site in relation to the proximity to services and connections to the town; that the site encroaches into open countryside; and permeability within and beyond the site. Concern was raised about how the site represented a strategic direction for future growth and how this site might fit in with a potential longer term potential masterplan approach for the area to the east of the A49. English Heritage identified the need to ensure that the design takes account of the setting of the town and impact on wider landscape setting. The Highways Agency identified that exploring longer term impacts of development on the junction at the Rocks Green should be considered. The Environment Agency highlighted the importance of protecting existing housing water supplies in the area. That the site was not on the sensitive southern and western approach to the town was supported by the Ludlow Conservation Area Advisory

Committee. The site promoter provided an amended site plan bringing the eastern boundary of the site in closer to the A49.

4. Do you agree that land east of the Ludlow Eco Park (7Ha) should be allocated for employment land?

The majority of respondents (82% 14/17) agreed with the identification of this land for employment uses. English Heritage identified the need to ensure that design takes account of the setting of the town and impact on wider landscape setting. The Highways Agency identified that exploring longer term impacts of development on the junction at the Sheet should be considered. One respondent raised concerns over enabling a longer term approach to the area and how the site might fit in with the potential housing allocation to the north. The Environment Agency highlighted that there may potentially be surrounding contaminated land issues.

5. Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Ludlow?

The majority of responses (60% 12/20) disagreed with the proposed development boundary. The majority of those the against the development boundary raised issues with the potential flood risk at the Linney. A couple of respondents provided detailed comments on the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) carried out on the land by the landowner and the Environment Agency also commented further on the FRA but did not object to the inclusion of the area within the development boundary. The Civic Society commented on the impact of potential the change on the Conservation Area as well being concerned in relation to flood risk. Others also commented on potential impacts on the Conservation Area with one respondent highlighting concern over impact on views from St Leonards Church. Other potential amendments to the boundary at the Linney, and around the Camp Lane area, were also suggested.

ALTERNATIVE SITES.

A number of alternative sites were advocated in response to this question. A number of sites were put forward that have been put forward in the process already at Foldgate Lane (LUD002/LUD015), south of Sheet Road (LUD014), around Elm Lodge (LUD001), and off Bromfield Road (LUD033). The current hospital site was also put forward for inclusion in the SAMDev Plan as a new site for consideration. The Town Council and Ludford Parish Council also suggested a general location around the north and east of the Eco Park as their preferred approach to the development of future sites.

BURFORD

6. Do you agree that Burford should be a Community Hub?

All respondents (9/9) agreed with the naming of Burford as a Community Hub including Burford Parish Council. The response from Malvern Hills District Council recognised the importance of neighbouring Tenbury Wells which has a functional and physical relationship with Burford. In support of being named a Community Hub, the Parish Council stated a wish for limited housing development and the importance in supporting industry. CPRE South Shropshire area raised general concerns about protecting the character of the countryside and the need to address the pressures that new housing put on infrastructure development.

7. Do you think that the growth target of about 25-40 houses for Burford is appropriate?

The majority of respondents (88% 7/8) agreed with the proposed target for Burford. Malvern Hills District Council reaffirmed the need for housing provision to accord with that in neighbouring Tenbury where in the region of 70 dwellings are proposed in their emerging Local Plan. One respondent felt the numbers were too high although recognised that there may be some opportunities for infill housing.

8. Do you agree with the development boundary for Burford? If you'd like to submit a revised proposal by email, please click here

All respondents (9/9) agreed with the proposed development boundary. Malvern Hills DC commented that the boundary was sensible approach to managing future development needs.

Alternative sites:

No new sites were put forward for consideration in Burford. One respondent stated that a number of sites in Burford (BUR001; BUR007 and BUR010) were not appropriate due to flood risk issues.

CLEE HILL

9. Do you agree that Clee Hill should be a Community Hub?

All respondents (7/7) supported the inclusion of Clee Hill as a Community Hub including Caynham Parish Council. Clee Hill was identified as having a level of services and facilities that would support this role. CPRE South Shropshire area raised general concerns about protecting the character and scenery of the countryside and the need to address the pressures that new housing put on infrastructure development. The Environment Agency raised a general concern regarding the amount of non-mains foul drainage in the area.

10. Do you think that the growth target of about 15-30 houses for Clee Hill is appropriate?

All respondents (7/7) agreed with the proposed growth figure. One respondent suggested that although the indicative range suggested was appropriate it may be more desirable to have a slightly higher figure of 20-35 dwellings over the Plan Period taking into account the extant permission at Springfield Park.

11. Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Clee Hill?

All respondents agreed with the proposed development boundary including Caynham Parish Council. The Parish Council supported the proposed boundary and reiterated their desire for existing permissions to come forward first. The promoter of the site supported the inclusion of the site with extant permission in the boundary as it could enable improvements to the long standing permitted scheme.

ONIBURY

12. Do you agree that Onibury should be a Community Hub?

The inclusion of Onibury as a Community Hub was supported by all respondents to this question (7/7). CPRE South Shropshire area raised general concerns about protecting the

character and scenery of the countryside and the need to address the pressures that new housing development put on infrastructure. The Environment Agency stated that the protection of private water supplies was an important consideration.

13. Do you think that the growth target of about 10-25 houses for Onibury is appropriate?

All respondents (7/7) agreed with the growth target put forward for Onibury.

14. Do you agree that site ONBY003 (0.34Ha), being land at Onibury Farm, should be allocated for 8 houses?

The majority of respondents (86% 6/7) supported the inclusion of this site as an allocation. One respondent suggested potential for live-let units reflecting the employment uses in the converted barns adjacent to the site.

15. Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Onibury?

The majority of respondents (86% 6/7) agreed that there should not be a development boundary for Onibury.

Alternative sites

A number of additional sites were put forward for inclusion in the Plan. These were land south east of Church Close (ONBY005 - which has been subject to discussions for affordable housing) and land off Allcroft Close (ONBY006) which have been previously assessed. A new site at Bridge Farm for possible conversion, north of Pippin Cottage, and another new site at Whitty Tree to the west of Onibury were also put forward.

Alternative sites in Place Plan area

No alternative sites were put forward in the Place Plan area but alternative Community Hubs were suggested for Bitterley and Knowbury but not by the Parish Councils.

Market Drayton Place Plan Area

Market Drayton

Question 1: Do you think that the target of a further 660 houses to be built in Market Drayton by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority, 66% (23 respondents) support the target of 660 homes in Market Drayton while 24% (12 respondents) opposed the target. A number of people were concerned about the lack of facilities and infrastructure to cope with more development or that infrastructure needs to be improved before further housing is built. The following issues were also raised: no need for more housing because of number of vacant properties and houses for sale; consideration should be given to building single storey houses only; houses should not be built on the flood plain; jobs are needed to support housing; a higher number of houses could be accommodated; targets should be seen as minimums; affordable housing is required; Market Drayton already has the facilities and services to support a much larger community; housing is supported provided that consideration is given to managing the pressure that it would bring to existing facilities and the retention of environmental and recreational facilities.

Question 2: Do you think that the target of 16 hectares of employment land to be provided in Market Drayton by 2026 is appropriate?

77% of respondents (23 people) support the employment land target for Market Drayton with 23% (8 people) against. In support, the issues raised were: Market Drayton is the most dynamic of the settlements in the North East Zone and there has been a healthy take-up of serviced employment sites; employment land will complement the proposed residential allocations and help to redress the net outward flow of commuters from the town; access around the town is good; support as long as local people are employed; need for more local work opportunities as future transport will be an issue; target should not be seen as a straightjacket if development is delivered early; an additional site at Spoonley is proposed. Other respondents raised the following concerns; a significant proportion will be taken up by timberyard, potentially leaving insufficient land to meet Market Drayton's employment needs; already many redundant buildings in the area which should be regenerated before greenfield land used; promote and regenerate town centre instead; no projections of demand or indication as to what type of employment has been seen; the area is too large and unlikely to be taken up before 2026; without the increase in population there will be less need for this; where will we grow our food if we build on this land?

Question 3: Do you agree that site MD030-part (4.03Ha), being land off Rush Lane (west), should be allocated for about 110 houses? The proposed development would be subject to access improvements, cycle and pedestrian links towards the town centre, the provision of open space and a landscaped buffer along the A53 bypass.

A majority of respondents, 68% or 23 people, supported the proposed allocation of this site and 32% or 11 people were against. Of those who commented four considered it a logical extension within the bypass and in a sustainable location and another considered made the point that the site had limited wildlife valued compared to the Tern Valley, as it is improved pasture grassland. Another accepted that the Preferred Options sites are appropriate as long as there is a genuine need for housing. The site promoter, while supporting the site, considered that the exact number of dwellings should not be set at this stage, a flood risk assessment was being undertaken to assess the extent of the flood zone area, which could be utilised as open space and that it was not considered appropriate to create a new access off the A53, although it would be feasible if required. The following concerns were also expressed, however: loss of greenspace; flood issues, increase in traffic; noise and light

pollution; density of housing; impact on wildlife; increase of existing sewage problems. Some residents in the Rush Lane requested that if development were to take place, there should be single storey housing in the vicinity of the existing bungalows. There was also concern that the sports field should remain inside the bypass for safety reasons.

Question 4: Do you agree that site MD030-part (9.48Ha), being land off Rush Lane (east), should be allocated for about 214 houses? The proposed development would be subject to access improvements including a new access off the A53, cycle and pedestrian links towards the town centre, provision of appropriate flood mitigation measures, provision of open space and a landscaped buffer along the A53 bypass.

62% (21 people) supported the allocation of this site for housing and 38% (13 people) were against. Of those who gave support to the site, a number considered it a logical extension within the bypass and in a sustainable location and another considered made the point that the site had limited wildlife valued compared to the Tern Valley. The site promoter, while supporting the site, considered that the exact number of dwellings should not be set at this stage, a flood risk assessment was being undertaken to assess the extent of the flood zone area, which could be utilised as open space and that it was not considered appropriate to create a new access off the A53, although it would be feasible if required. A number of respondents expressed concerns regarding: the loss of agricultural land or green space; the lack of facilities in the town to cope with more development; impact on wildlife; increase in traffic; an increase in existing sewage problems; a new access being provided on the already dangerous A53; flooding issues and a concern about increased run off; too many houses or lack of need for houses; opposition to the proposed cycle and pedestrian links to Rush Lane as these may become a place for youngsters to hang out; loss of privacy; residents own part of the land on Rush Lane and therefore need to be consulted; the existing sports field should not be moved across the bypass as it would be dangerous for children and lead to more car journeys.

Question 5: Do you agree that sites MD010 & MD028, being land between Croft Way and Greenfields Lane (3.62Ha), should be allocated for about 76 houses? The proposed development would be subject to access improvements at Greenfields Lane, footpath and cycle links through the site towards Greenfields Lane and the former railway towards the town centre and to the provision of open space within the site.

78% of respondents (25 people) supported the allocation of this site for housing and 22% (7 people) against. In support respondents commented that this site is a sustainable location, close to facilities including the recreation facilities at Greenfields Lane, could be suitable to provide the initial amount of Market Drayton's housing requirement and would have a lesser impact on wildlife than development in the Tern Valley area. The site promoter also commented that preliminary traffic assessments show that access could be achieved utilising an access that effectively formed an extension to the existing Hampton Drive and that all 3 sites offer the opportunity to provide pedestrian and cycle routes linking the sites to existing networks. There was, however, concern that the former railway should not be built on due to its wildlife value, that the open nature of the area should be retained as such spaces are important for the wellbeing of residents and that the proposed open space within the development would be used as a meeting point for older children due to the lack of facilities in the town. Concern was also expressed about the potential loss of the Greenfields Sports facility, as the site provides one of the best natural, level, free draining sites for miles around and that the facility should remain within the A53 bypass for access and safety reasons.

Question 6: Do you agree that the Sych Farm site (16Ha) should be allocated for employment land?

81% of respondents (26 individuals) agreed that the Sych Farm site should be allocated for employment development and 19% (6 individuals) disagreed. The site promoter points out that Phase 1 of the Sych Farm site has proved a successful location for employment having delivered jobs and inward investment and considers that there is no appropriate alternative location due to constraints elsewhere in the town. Others have agreed that the existing development at Sych Farm is an obvious nucleus for expansion, having good vehicular access and being within easy walking and cycling distance from the town. However, some concern was also expressed, the issues being: doubt about the capacity of the existing access to cope with further development; that the proposed timber yard could take up 40% of the site leaving insufficient land for future employment needs and that a larger area of land should be allocated and that development will not improve the attractiveness of the town for visitors. One respondent suggests that an additional site opposite Spoonley Farm should be allocated for employment uses.

Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed Primary Shopping Area for Market Drayton?

30 individuals responded to this question, of whom 26 or 87% agreed with the proposed Primary Shopping Centre for Market Drayton and 4 or 13% disagreed. Of the comments received, two people considered that Stafford Street should be included within the primary area, one because the number of boarded up shops on a main entrance reflects badly on the town. There was also concern about the type of shops and the need to promote the town's market identity supporting locally produced goods rather than larger nationals, takeaways or charity shops. The proposed Sainsbury's development and the existing Morrison's store were also considered to weaken the viability of the town centre.

Question 8: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Market Drayton? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

The majority of respondents (60%, 18 respondents) agreed with the proposed development boundary for Market Drayton and 40% (12 respondents) disagreed. A number commented that they supported the revision of the development boundary, one considering that it should also include the dedicated employment uses referred to in the Preferred Options document, should they be approved. There was also concern expressed, four considering that it was unnecessary to change the existing boundary. Another comment made were that development on the north side of the A53 would divide the town and that there would be an increased risk to safety, environmental implications as there would be more car journeys and there was no natural boundary beyond the A53 so little to stop Market Drayton becoming a sprawl. One respondent considered that Market Drayton's southern boundary is as far as it should go, as it's a natural boundary, the majority is flood plain, wildlife habitat and the surrounding highways are currently unsuitable for more development. A further comment was made that to limit development inside the A53 means that the town will lose more internal green space and two site promoters considered that their sites should be included within the development boundary.

Adderley

Question 9: Do you agree that Adderley should be a Community Hub?

17 people responded to this question, 15 of whom (88%) agreed that Adderley should be a Community Hub and 2 (12%) disagreed. One person has suggested a site between Adderley and Spoonley for development.

Question 10. Do you think that the target of about 25 houses to be built in Adderley by 2026 is appropriate?

Of the 17 people who responded to this question, 14 (82%) considered the target of about 25 houses to be appropriate and 3 (18%) did not. One person considered that development would help to keep the school open and one other that there appeared to be insufficient land to accommodate 25 dwellings, without compromising the rural appeal of the village.

Question 11: Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Adderley?

17 people responded to this question, 94% of whom (16 people) agreed with the proposed development boundary for Adderley and only one (6%) did not. No other comments were made.

Cheswardine

Question 12: Do you agree that Cheswardine should be a Community Hub?

73% of the 22 people who answered this question agreed that Cheswardine should be a Community Hub and 27% (or 6 respondents) disagreed. Two commented that it was appropriate due to the range of services and facilities in the village, although one considered that because Cheswardine had lost the majority of its services over the last few years and is accessed via narrow roads, it was unsuitable for further development. One other response was made that further information was required such as spatial capacity, environmental impact, current and forecast need etc. before the question could be answered adequately.

Question 13: Do you think that the target of about 50 houses to be built in Cheswardine by 2026 is appropriate?

A majority of the 23 responses received to this question (65%) agreed that the target of approximately 50 houses was appropriate for Cheswardine, with 35% (8 respondents) disagreeing. Comments made in support of the scale of development were that Cheswardine is ideal for young families and that affordable housing for local people is needed to keep the community spirit and support the school. There was concern that the character of the village needed to be retained if it were to support further growth. A number commented on the scale of development either that there should be a higher target or that a lower number, perhaps 40 or 10 due to the capacity of the road network or the amount of development already with planning permission. Others commented that there was no need for further housing, that there were empty homes or properties for sale and that the village infrastructure won't cope with the scale of development proposed. Cheswardine Parish Council has responded that, following an open meeting in village, it no longer supports further development in village.

Question 14: Do you agree that site CHES001 (0.42Ha), being land at New House Farm, should be allocated for about 12 houses?

21 responses were received to this question, 15 of whom (71%) agreed that land at New House Farm should be allocated for development. The remaining 6 (29%) disagreed. One respondent considered the site appropriate but that additional land should be allocated to meet the growth target for the village. Another considered that affordable housing should be included within the site. Concerns about the site were that there was insufficient community gain; Westcott Lane is unsuitable for additional dwellings; impact on adjacent dwellings; outside current development boundary; away from the central core of the village and that development would extend the village so that it will soon join Soudley.

Question 15: Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Cheswardine? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

76% of the 21 respondents supported the proposed development boundary for Cheswardine and 24% (5 respondents) were against. Comments made were that Westcott Lane/Marsh Lane provides an obvious and defensible southern boundary to the village and that the development boundary to the south of Lawn Lane was important to protect the Conservation Area and its setting, the Scheduled Ancient Monument and the pond and its habitat for great crested newts. Proposals have also been made to extend the development boundary to include land south of Rose Cottage, land north of Haywoods Lane and land off Copelea and Podmore Road.

Childs Ercall

Question 16: Do you agree that Childs Ercall should be a Community Hub?

16 people responded to this question and 15 of these (94%) agreed that Childs Ercall should be a Community Hub with one (6%) disagreeing. One respondent provided further comment in support. The respondent considered that Childs Ercall has good transport links to Market Drayton and Newport and as such constitutes a sustainable settlement with capacity for managed growth, including affordable housing and employment which would secure the survival of the village and provide a balanced rural community. There is a need, however, to consider the policy position within the context of the identified needs of the parish through either the Place Plan or Parish Plan.

Question 17: Do you think that the target of about 10 houses to be built in Childs Ercall by 2026 is appropriate?

A majority of respondents, 87% or 13 people, considered that the target of approximately 10 dwellings was appropriate for Childs Ercall, with 2 (13%) in disagreement. Four people commented on the target, all of whom considered there to be scope to increase the target. A respondent, promoting a site, added that there is likely to be a need for affordable housing and for accommodation to allow young people to remain in the village, that it was not appropriate for the target to be satisfied by windfall alone Childs Ercall having previously been considered suitable for housing allocation.

Question 18: Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Childs Ercall?

16 people responded to this question, 14 (87.5%) agreeing with the proposed development boundary for Childs Ercall, 2 (12.5%) were in disagreement. One person considered the development boundary should be amended for the purposes of housing allocation to include a mixed development of market units and affordable. This site would also be suitable and available as an exception site for affordable housing or for the purposes of a gypsy and traveller site.

Hinstock

Question 19: Do you agree that Hinstock should be a Community Hub?

Of the 20 people who answered this question, 18 (90%) agreed that Hinstock should be a Community Hub and 2 (10%) did not. Two people provided further comments stating that Hinstock is an important village with good facilities; that there are good communication links

via the A41 which means that the village could sustain such development and that growth would help the local pub to become a more attractive business proposition.

Question 20: Do you think that the target of about 63 houses to be built in Hinstock by 2026 is appropriate?

19 people answered this question, 13 or 68% agreeing with the target of approximately 63 houses to be built in Hinstock and 6 or 32% disagreeing. Of those who provided comments, two suggested that Hinstock had capacity to accept a higher target, the Parish Council consider that there should be a maximum of 60 houses, with one respondent considering that the target is far too high. One respondent stated that the development of land between the village and the bypass would only produce more of the same form of estate type development, which is inappropriate for the village and that sites away from the By-pass should be identified and built upon. Two respondents stated that they would object to the development of land now in use as allotments. One person commented that development was needed to keep the school open.

Question 21: Do you agree that site HIN002 (0.56Ha), being land west of Manor Farm Drive, should be allocated for about 8 bungalows?

14 people (74% of those responding) agreed that the site HIN002 should be allocated for approximately 8 bungalows, with 5 disagreeing. The site promoters wish to see consideration given to lightly higher density of housing and that as the immediate area is surrounded by two storey family it would be more appropriate to have a mix of house types rather than single storey. Another respondent questions whether bungalows would be the best use for the land. Hinstock Parish Council have reiterated preference for 8 bungalows. A further comment has been received that the site is too close to the A41 and air pollution.

Question 22: Do you agree that site HIN009 (2.25Ha), being land at Bearcroft, should be allocated for about 30 houses? The proposed development would incorporate an extension to the existing recreation area, including a sports pavilion, bowling green and additional amenity area.

19 people responded to this question, 13 of whom (68%) agreed that HIN009 should be allocated for approximately 30 houses with 6 (32%) against. Hinstock Parish Council support the site for the development of 30 dwellings but with an access off Chester Road to the north of the site. Some comments have been made expressing doubts about the deliverability of an access in this location due to the proximity of the A41 junction. One comment has been made that the improvements to the village's sports facilities which this development would facilitate would be very beneficial, while another states that this is an obvious site between the bypass and the existing village with good access to services and which prevents incursion into the undeveloped countryside. Another comments that while new houses are needed a better site could surely be found.

Question 23: Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Hinstock? Please note that sites allocated for development, if confirmed, will be incorporated into the development boundary.

19 people responded to this question with 68% (13 people) supporting the proposed development boundary for Hinstock and 6 (32%) against. A number of comments have been made putting forward alternative or additional sites for housing, recreation and employment development. Support has been given for the exclusion of HIN003, which is in use as allotments, from the development boundary. One respondent proposes the removal of the development boundary and development of infill sites and brownfield land be given priority.

Hodnet

Question 24: Do you agree that Hodnet should be a Community Hub?

78% (18 people) of the 23 people who responded agreed that Hodnet should be a Community Hub with 22% (5 people) disagreeing. Of those who commented further the following points were raised: Hodnet has the potential to have a strong community and has the services and social aspects to support this; parts of Hodnet (derelict, waste ground) should be used for new housing; there should be a limited and appropriate number of dwellings in keeping with the village; Hodnet has poor infrastructure, the medical and school facilities are near maximum capacity, the last shop building is to become apartments and there is inadequate street lighting; there is enough housing already; and Hodnet should be considered for a hub only if there is clear and fair participation and involvement between the parish council and local community.

Question 25: Do you think that the target of about 77 houses to be built in Hodnet by 2026 is appropriate?

24 responses were received to the question of whether the target of about 77 houses to be built in Hodnet is appropriate, 50% (12 responses) agreeing and 50% disagreeing. Of those who commented further a number expressed concerns about the number of houses proposed for the following reasons: no rationale or evidence that up to 77 houses are required; few if any employment opportunities; would have a detrimental effect on present community as well as proposed occupants; concern that it would introduce anti-social behaviour and parking problems; school already over-subscribed, medical surgery at full capacity and infrastructure including road surfaces, street lighting and sewage plant would be over-stretched; several properties have been empty or for sale for a long time, suggesting little need for new properties; number of houses proposed excessive for size of village; high density will not be in keeping with village; smaller number, approximately 20-25 units more appropriate; this is not limited development in keeping with parish vision statement. There was also support for more development with the comment that Hodnet could support more developments due to the spread out nature of the village and its facilities, its potential to be a buzzing village full of young families due to the range of services and facilities that exist and its location with good access to Shrewsbury and Telford for commuting.

Question 26: Do you agree that site HOD001 (0.38Ha), being land at the Divisional Surveyors Sub Depot, Old Auction Yard, should be allocated for about 12 houses?

A majority of 62.5% (15 people) of the 24 who responded to this question agreed that HOD001 should be allocated for approximately 12 houses with 37.5% (9 people) disagreeing. Whilst the majority of those who commented considered that the site was suitable in principle, a number considered either that 12 houses should be the maximum or that a lower number of houses would be appropriate. A comment was made that traffic is already at saturation point.

Question 27: Do you agree that site HOD009 (0.46Ha), being land behind Shrewsbury Street, should be allocated for about 10 houses? Please note that this development is subject to the provision of a village green fronting Station Road, the enhancement of the public footpath which runs along the back of existing properties and the provision of a footway between the new road junction at Station Road and Shrewsbury Street.

24 responses were made to this question. Of these, 13 (54%) supported the allocation of HOD009 for approximately 10 houses and 11 (46%) against. A number of points were raised

against the proposal, with the following comments made: fewer houses should be permitted; impact on tranquillity, environment and wildlife; no proven rationale or evidence of need to support development; site is in a Conservation Area; would be better used as public parkland; land could be accessed off Abbots Way if lower density development permitted and this would be more in keeping with existing properties; no need for another village green as there is already a park and recreation area in Hodnet; enhancement of public footpath should be carried out regardless of development; density proposed will turn area into a car park with incidental housing.

Question 28: Do you agree that site HOD010 (1.11Ha), being land off Station Road, should be allocated for about 30 houses? Please note that this development will be served by a new access off Station Road and is subject to the provision of a village green fronting Station Road, the enhancement of the public footpath (no. 6) which runs along the back of existing properties and the provision of a footway between the new road junction at Station Road and Shrewsbury Street.

23 responses were made to this question with 52% (12 responses) against the proposed allocation of HOD010 for approximately 30 houses and 48% (11 responses) in support. The following concerns about the proposed development of this site were raised: density of the proposed development too high; no rationale or evidence to support housing; disruption to existing occupants of Abbots Way; loss of open space for walkers; loss of agricultural land and loss of views of countryside.

Question 29: Do you agree that site HOD011 (0.29Ha), being land at Shrewsbury Street Farm, should be allocated for about 10 houses?

22 responses were received to this question, 12 of whom 55% supported the allocation of land at Shrewsbury Street Farm for approximately 10 houses, with 10 (45%) against. Comments raised were that fewer houses should be built; rural properties should be designed with space around them; the site is in a Conservation Area; no proven need or rationale to support development and that the site could be accessed off Abbots Way.

Question 30: Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Hodnet?

Of the 24 responses to this question, 14 (58%) supported the proposed development boundary for Hodnet and 10 (42%) were against. Of the comments received 3 supported the development boundary apart from the inclusion of HOD010. Comments were also made that the boundary was too restrictive for the amount of development proposed; that local people should decide the fate of their villages; and that there are suitable plots off Websters Lane and Station Road outside the proposed boundary.

Woore, Ireland's Cross and Pipe Gate

Question 31: Do you agree that Woore should be a Community Hub with Ireland's Cross and Pipe Gate?

19 responses were made to the question, 16 of whom (84%) agreed that Woore should be a Community Hub with Irelands Cross and Pipe Gate. 3 respondents (16%) did not agree. Of the comments made the following points were raised: the 3 areas clearly have a functional link and combining them together gives the best opportunity to consolidate service delivery; the Parish Council has not included local residents in determining the extent of future development; and that Norton in Hales should be made a Community hub.

Question 32: Do you think that the target of about 90 houses to be built in Woore, Ireland's Cross and Pipe Gate by 2026 is appropriate?

A 75% majority (12 respondents) agreed that the target of about 90 houses to be built in Woore, Ireland's Cross and Pipe Gate is appropriate, with 4 respondents against. Of the comments received the following points were raised: existing commitments will provide more than enough development; more houses are needed to help to retain services and address the needs of the community; as one of the most sustainable villages in the North East Spatial Zone, Woore should have a higher target to enable the Core Strategy target for rural areas to be delivered; consideration should be given to allocating sites rather than relying on windfall. Woore Parish Council commented that they now support an additional 50 properties and also that they are considering the possibility of a 'micro hydro-electric generation' scheme on the River Tern between this Parish and Market Drayton and consider that this possible venture be entered into the SAMDev Plan. A comment was made that Norton in Hales should have an allocation of housing also.

Question 33: Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Woore, Ireland's Cross and Pipe Gate?

16 responses were made to this question, 69% of whom (11 responses) agreed that no development boundary should be identified for Woore, Ireland's Cross and Pipe Gate with 31% (5 responses) in disagreement. Three people commented further that a development boundary should be drawn to avoid ambiguity over where development would be permitted. A further comment was made that it would be difficult to identify a meaningful boundary encompassing Woore, Ireland's Cross and Pipe Gate and that the absence of a settlement boundary would provide greater flexibility should it be necessary to identify additional land later in the plan period.

Colehurst, Tyrley, Woodseaves (Sutton Lane), Woodseaves (Sydnall Lane)
Question 34: Do you agree that the settlements of Colehurst, Tyrley, Woodseaves (Sutton Lane), Woodseaves (Sydnall Lane) should be a Community Cluster?

A majority of respondents, 75% or 15 people, supported the identification of the settlements of Colehurst, Tyrley, Woodseaves (Sutton Lane), Woodseaves (Sydnall Lane) as a Community Cluster, with 5 of the respondents (25%) against. Comments in support of the Cluster were that development on appropriate sites would bring people to live and work in the area, support local amenities, including schools and businesses, and expand the outlook of the area. Comment was made that there was no wish from residents to increase the density of these hamlets; that development would increase traffic, noise and light pollution; and that there is no existing "community" within these settlements and that developing housing would not aid the development of a sustainable community in any way. Three respondents referred specifically to the proposed inclusion of Sydnall Lane in the Cluster, with the following points raised: no local services, facilities or community life; no apparent housing need other than affordable and agricultural workers houses which are already achievable under Policy CS5; no suitable brownfield or infill plots at Sydnall Lane; other more suitable sites in parish such as brownfield sites at Tern Hill and Crickmerry; access from Sydnall Lane to A529 is dangerous; wish to protect countryside and wildlife. One respondent refers to Norton in Hales which is considered should be included as a separate Hub or alternatively a Cluster with Betton and Ridgewardine.

Question 35: Do you think that the target of about 10-15 houses to be built by 2026 is appropriate?

19 responses were received to the question, 13 (68%) supporting the target of about 10-15 houses to be built in the Cluster, with 6 (32%) against. Of the comments received one considered that the area could support more housing. Concerns raised were that there was no evidence of need for additional housing; that brownfield sites should be used first,

that development should take place in villages with facilities such as Cheswardine or Hinstock; and that Sydnall Lane at present has a good mix of houses and more would have a detrimental impact to existing residents, there being no turning points on the lane, no infill or brownfield plots, no mains drainage or gas and development would lead to traffic and parking problems, noise and increase drainage difficulties.

Question 36: Do you agree that no development boundaries should be identified for Colehurst, Tyrley, Woodseaves (Sutton Lane) and Woodseaves (Sydnall Lane)?

A large majority, 88% (15 responses) agreed that no development boundaries should be identified for Colehurst, Tyrley, Woodseaves (Sutton Lane) and Woodseaves (Sydnall Lane) with 12% (2 responses) disagreeing. One respondent commented that there should be no development boundaries as the Sydnall Lane area should be kept as open countryside, while two comments were made that development boundaries would provide some certainty about future development locations and to protect the identity of the communities.

Marchamley, Peplow and Wollerton

Question 37: Do you agree that the settlements of Marchamley, Peplow and Wollerton should be a Community Cluster?

17 people responded to this question, 71% agreeing that Marchamley, Peplow and Wollerton should be a Community Cluster and 29% disagreeing. Two people commented further, both stating that Hodnet should be the central hub of this community cluster.

Question 38: Do you think that the target of about 15 houses to be built by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority of the 17 people responding to this question 65% (11 respondents) considered the target of approximately 15 houses to be appropriate, with 35% disagreeing. Of those who commented further, one felt the target to be reasonable but that the nature of development would need to be of a rural rather than urban character and a second respondent considered there to be great potential for more development in this area.

Question 39: Do you agree with the development boundary for Marchamley?

12 of the 13 people who responded to this question (92%) agreed with the proposed development boundary for Marchamley with one against (8%). One respondent wished to see the development boundary amended to incorporate a single plot for the development of one dwelling.

Question 40: Do you agree that there should be a development boundary identified for Peplow?

13 people responded to this question, 10 of whom (77%) agreed that there should be no development boundary identified for Peplow and 3 disagreed (23%). Comments made were that the lack of a centre to the settlement made it hard to designate a development area and that future applications should be considered on their individual merits.

Question 41: Do you agree with the development boundary for Wollerton?

10 people of the 14 who responded (71%) agreed with the development boundary for Wollerton with 4 (29%) against. Two people commented further, one stating that as the settlement is dispersed the development boundary should be removed and an allowance

made for windfall development and the second that the development boundary incorporated only a small part of the village and there may be other suitable areas for development outside.

Moreton Say

Question 42: Do you agree that Moreton Say should be a Community Cluster?

13 people responded to this question with a majority of 85% (11 people) agreeing that Moreton Say should be a Community Cluster, 15% (2 people) were against. Moreton Say Parish Council commented that it would like Longslow and Longford to be included in the cluster.

Question 43: Do you think that the target about 10 houses to be built in Moreton Say by 2026 is appropriate?

10 of the 13 people who responded to this question (77%) agreed that the target of approximately 10 houses for Moreton Say was appropriate, 3 (23%) disagreed. No further comments were made.

Question 44: Do you agree with the development boundary for Moreton Say?

12 people responded to this question, all of whom agreed with the development boundary for Moreton Say. No further comments were made.

Question 45: Do you agree that an extension to the existing quarry at Tern Hill quarry should be a preferred option for mineral extraction?

Most respondents (90% of 19 respondents) support identification of the quarry as a preferred option. No response was received from the Parish Council. The site operator highlights the need to correct an error in the mapping of the extent of the proposed site.

Question 46: Alternative Sites

Market Drayton

1. Housing Site Reference: MD002 (Land of Adderley Road). This site is owned by my clients, Mr and Mrs Whittingham as part of their overall Sych Farm land holding. We promoted this site through the SAMDev (Issues and Options) explaining that this potential residential development site of approximately 4.5 ha. could deliver over 100 new homes, including affordable, and would complement the employment proposals at Sych Farm to form a mixed-use sustainable development. The Council's Site Assessment response considered that on balance the site is not suitable for allocation for development, primarily because of its location on the north side of the by-pass, separating it from amenity greenspace, a children's play area and primary school to the south. Amenity greenspace and children's play area can be provided within the development itself. A controlled crossing point on the A53 by-pass can be installed to allow pedestrians to cross and access public transport facilities within walking distance. The site has been identified in the past for potential employment allocation, but a residential allocation is felt more appropriate to deliver a mixed-use residential/employment location within close proximity to the town centre with its general services, facilities and amenities. Services are available for the site and the site has a long frontage to Adderley Road from where vehicular access may be taken. The Council are urged to reconsider the residential allocation of this particular site. It is developable and it is deliverable by Mr and Mrs Whittingham within 5 years.

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

2. I wish to protest against the proposal for housing on MD046 which is currently used by Fordhall Farm. This would jeopardise their ability to continue farming organically.
3. Increasing the housing in Market Drayton means the schools need to expand. The schools in their current sites do not have room for this. I suggest that all school sites the Drayton development boundry are sold for development for housing . The money raised pays for : 1) Pre-school through to sixth form college at the site proposed for the sports development. 2) A foot bridge linking Greenfields with the new school 3) Access to the new school site off the A53 4) Buy Greenfields as a social enterprise and develop, a sports hall, changing rooms, club house, astro turf, That all the school children can access . Encouraging sport from 3-70y. Improve Market Drayton Town FC facilities and the Rugby Club in line with RFU and FA rules especially sharing changing rooms, club house facilities
4. MD047 should be allocated for development purposes. Considered suitable for range of potential uses, residential, residential institution, specialist older persons' housing, commercial uses subject to market interest. Development would be contiguous with spur of development that has taken place and is planned for around Sych Farm. Site has suitable access, no beneficial agricultural use, is in single ownership and free from constraints.
5. No alternative sites are required for Market Drayton. Given the state of the housing market and the numbers of empty houses in the town, this should be the main focus of the Council.
6. Objects to development on MD031/09 and MD036/09 proposed by site promoters. Development would be contrary to the Market Drayton Community Partnership's Action Plan which seeks to protect the Tern Valley as a "living landscape". This initiative seeks to reflect the wishes of the vast majority of the town's respondents to survey. Within Tern Valley Area of Special Environmental Interest and development would surely be detrimental to what is currently an important wild life habitat, including otters and water voles. Flood risk, these sites being situated substantially within 'flood zone 2'
7. Objects to development on MD031/09 and MD036/09 proposed by site promoters. Flood risk and development would jeopardise part wooded, natural wildlife habitats.
8. Objects to development on MD031/09 and MD036/09 proposed by site promoters. Flooding and wildlife issues.
9. Objects to development on MD031/09 and MD036/09 proposed by site promoters. Flooding, traffic and wildlife issues. Many more suitable development sites in town.
10. Objects to development on MD031/09 and MD036/09 proposed by site promoters. Forms natural buffer for wildlife and environment between town and country. Traffic Issues. Alternative sites have been identified.
11. Objects to development on MD031/09 and MD036/09 proposed by site promoters. Integral part of Tern Valley Area of Special Environmental Interest. Haven for wildlife including water voles. Wooded semi-natural area with many mature trees. High flood risk.
12. Objects to development on MD031/09 and MD036/09 proposed by site promoters. The sites have wildlife value and are part of the Tern Valley Area of Special Environmental Interest, affected by flooding from river and also subterranean water.
13. Objects to development on MD031/09 and MD036/09 proposed by site promoters. Traffic congestion, flood risk, existing sewage problems in area, wildlife habitat including water voles and otters.
14. Objects to development on MD031/09 and MD036/09 proposed by site promoters. Traffic congestion, visual impact, loss of greenfield site close to town of which there are few remaining, flood risk, loss of wildlife habitat. Within Area of Special Environmental Interest.
15. Objects to development on MD031/09 and MD036/09 proposed by site promoters. Visual impact, within Tern Valley Area of Special Environmental Interest, flood risk, greenfield land outside development boundary.

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

16. Objects to development on MD031/09 and MD036/09 proposed by site promoters. Within Tern Valley Conservation Area which allows wildlife to thrive undisturbed. Within flood plain.
17. Objects to development on MD046 proposed by site promoter. Would damage viability of Fordhall Farm which is valuable tourism and educational facility.
18. Objects to development on MD046 proposed by site promoter. Would damage viability of Fordhall Farm which is valuable tourism and educational facility.
19. Objects to development on MD046 proposed by site promoter. Would damage viability of Fordhall Farm which is valuable tourism and educational facility. Farm and community initiative employs 25 local people. Farm supports an abundance of wildlife.
20. Objects to development on MD046. Fordhall Farm a growing tourism and educational facility, half a million £ having recently been invested. Field forms a vital part of our organic farming system and development would affect viability of farm. Success of Fordhall Farm relies on it being treated as an integrated whole. Farm depends heavily on the few sandy and free draining fields near the A53 where cattle spend winter. MD046 constitutes approximately 40% of the farm's free draining land. Farm supports abundance of wildlife including otters and water voles. Jobs would be at risk if land developed. Farm employs 7 people and community trust approx 20 local people. Fordhall Farm is England's first community owned farm and has received worldwide media coverage.
21. Objects to development on MD046. The Cottage Field is integral to the entire farm business which employs a number of local people and redundancies may have to be made if the farming enterprise was reduced in scale. The FCLI is a significant employer in the locality and provides tangible local community benefit. Field is of high ecological importance and is adjacent to SAM and development may have unacceptable impact on it.
22. Objects to proposal to develop MD046 proposed by site promoter.
23. Please refer to the representations submitted by HOW Planning on behalf of Danbank Developments Ltd, John Bratton and his late brother's trustees along with the Williams Family relating to land at Rush Lane and land at Greenfields Lane.
24. Propose that MD046 is allocated for employment use. Has capacity to provide on site parking at requisite levels and cycle and pedestrian links to key services in Market Drayton. No significant constraints. Site will meet demand for employment premises over plan period. Provides a key location for employment growth with excellent access to A53. In single ownership, all services accessible. There has been active interest from a commercial company. Would provide suitable and sustainable location for employment development in close proximity to Market Drayton.
25. Proposes MD011 for development. A high quality residential scheme could be developed on this site, in a key position on one of the gateway access routes into the town. Existing vehicular access directly onto site frontage, but also scope for shared access with the adjacent Raven House entrance/car park. Flood risk assessment carried out in 2010. No other known constraints. Former planning permission (now expired) for high density housing scheme on frontage part of site. Brownfield site with scope for high density residential development, complementary to the adjacent Raven House development
26. Proposes MD031 for development of 8 river houses with gardens running down to river and 5-6 starter homes parallel with Walkmill Road with a buffer of trees between the two. Access could be provided off Sutton road, site has not flooded in 40 years, not a designated wildlife site. Tern Valley Area of Environmental Interest does not preclude development.
27. Proposes MD034/09 for inclusion within the development boundary. Residential development on 3 sides, represents a logical and sustainable rounding off, with Bottom Lane forming a clearly defined development boundary. proposal will not physically nor visually encroach upon the open countryside, nor would it adversely impact on the quality or appearance of the landscape setting. Due to its limited size, sloping gradient,

- the presence of trees, and the fact that the site is surrounded on 3 sides by residential development, there is no prospect of future agricultural use.
28. Proposes MD040 & MD041 for marina, leisure and recreation employment land. Site has strong linkages to Market Drayton and surrounding hinterland and has potential to create tourist destination that could be catalytic regenerative tool that would benefit town. No significant environmental factors. Majority of trees would be protected. Proposed sports facility at Longslow House Farm would be better located here.
 29. Proposes MD045 for development. As part of a wider exercise, the existing recreational facilities could be relocated to a more and accessible suitable location within the town, and the present site could be considered for further housing, subject to existing constraints. Current access along Greenfields Lane has limitations in terms of its standards, and although improved in recent years by the connection to the adjacent housing estate, the the existing width of the highway abutting the sports playing pitches is not to a standard to adequately cater for high volumes of traffic. No known flood risk and no known environmental or archaeological constraints.
 30. Reference MD046. This refers to land at Fordhall Farm which is a Community Land Trust farm and run by tenants whose father developed an unusual but successful way of not using any fertiliser on the land so the meat produced by the animals grazing on it is organic. There are many volunteers who work regularly on the farm and there are also thousands of people worldwide who have bought shares in the Land Trust and are very committed to ensuring that the farm continues to operate in its present form. There are also national celebrities, including Prince Charles, who support the farm and the way that it functions. Locally, the farm has engaged with schools and offers a range of opportunities for young people to learn about food growth and organic farming; the educational aspect of the farm has been considerably extended to the wider community of Shropshire and beyond. Any change of use to the land at Fordhall would result in considerable negative publicity for whoever agreed it. I would personally like to recommend that there is no change of use.

Cheswardine

31. CHES004 - land adjacent Rose Cottage is a natural and logical extension to the adjacent CHES007 site, which already has consent for 24 dwellings.
32. Cheswardine - CHES005 is proposed as a suitable alternative site to the preferred option. A sympathetically scaled and designed development is proposed which compliments the village whilst providing self-build opportunities. Hinstock - HIN001 is a proposed alternative site to the land at Bearcroft which doesn't appear to be accessible from the A529 (Chester Road). Market Drayton - MD036/09 is proposed as an 'additional' site, as opposed to an alternative site, which is capable of accommodation circa. 10 dwellings. Marchamley - an amendment of the development boundary to include a small parcel of land at Chirbury Farm capable of accommodating 1 additional dwelling. Additional information has been forwarded to Shropshire Councils planning policy team.
33. CHESWARDINE SITE CHES004 Notwithstanding the proposed allocation of allocation and redevelopment of the farmstead at New House Farm, it is considered that there would still be a need to either modify the proposed development boundary of Cheswardine or make a further small housing site allocation to help deliver the Parish Council's aspirations for housing during the course of the Plan period. A proportion of the balance could be delivered through the allocation of a site extending to approximately 0.20 hectares located immediately to the south of Rose Cottage, off High Street. This site has previously been advanced at the Issues and Options stage and also by way of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), the site reference for which is CHES004. The site is well-related to the built form of the village and the proposed residential development at Cheswardine Farm. Development

of the site would not breach the defensible physical boundary to the south of the village which is defined by Westcott Lane / Marsh Lane and would contribute to the logical rounding off of the southern fringe of the village. The site has been identified within the SHLAA as a 'site with future potential' and is available and deliverable.

34. Proposes land at CHES005 as alternative or additional allocation. Well designed, low density residential development to be targeted at self-builders to develop both open market and affordable homes are proposed.
35. Proposes land at CHES006 for approx 5-6 houses.
36. Proposes land at CHES009

Childs Ercall

37. A plan is attached incorporating that land identified in Question 17 (CER001) for the purposes of housing allocation to include a mixed development of market units and affordable. (Question 18 is also relevant as to the proposed development boundary.) If notwithstanding the above submissions, the Council does not consider the site as an allocation for housing, the site is suitable as an exception site for affordable development, having regard for the facilities and services located within the village and it should be allocated for that purpose. Whilst it is more sustainable and desirable to mix market dwellings with affordable units, rather than to isolate the affordable units at the edge of a village, the location of this site is such as to enable occupiers of affordable units to feel a part of the community and have ready access to facilities within the Hub. In the alternative, this location is also suitable for the purposes of a gypsy and traveller site, being a Community Hub with transport links to Market Towns. The site is reasonably accessible to services and facilities, it is of a sufficient size to incorporate appropriate design and screening and it has suitable access and ample space to provide for parking and manoeuvring. Indeed, both business uses and recreational facilities for gypsies/travellers using the site could also be accommodated. It should be noted that there is an identified need for gypsy/traveller pitches in this part of the County and that this site would seem to meet the necessary criteria.

Hinstock

38. Affordable housing site needs to be specified as either old A41 Newport Road or from a widened Marsh Lane. The Parish Council is very keen that HIN003 to stay as allotments. The land was cleared and fenced using public money, and the Allotment Holders have worked very hard to develop the allotments. Councillors feel that there is a much better site in the Parish for affordable homes. HIN001 is not supported by the Parish Council at the present time.
39. HIN007 proposed for residential development of approx 80 houses, phased over the plan period or perhaps extending beyond. Close to village facilities and could link two parts of village together. Access directly off main highway. Foul sewerage capacity available. Not at risk from flooding, screened from road by mature trees and hedges. Open space for community use could be incorporated into development.
40. Objects to development of HIN003, proposed by promoter. To lose the allotment land would be a real blow to the village.
41. Objects to development of HIN003, proposed by site promoter. Allotment site which is valued community facility.
42. Proposes HIN011 for development.
43. Proposes HIN017 for residential allocation. Existing business on site needs to expand to large warehouses which cannot be accommodated on this site. Residential development could be seen as enabling development essential to fund moving existing business to Ollerton. Would have benefit of retaining existing employment and creating additional jobs. Existing commercial use of site would be replaced by residential proposals with lower impact on landscape in terms of scale and massing. Extremely unlikely that alternative commercial operation could be found for site.

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

44. Proposes land at HIN001 as alternative to HIN009, as latter has access constraints. HIN001 could provide housing and recreation facilities.
45. The site indicated on the attached plan, located to the east of the main road running through the village, would be a realistic alternative or additional housing site to the sites indicated as the preferred option in the SAMDev consultation paper. Development of this site would unify the northern and southern elements of the village, and thus help create a more cohesive community. The site is close to all the main village facilities, and has ready access and drainage opportunities.
46. The site shown on the accompanying plan, being OS 5073 located to the south of the former Dale House Garage off Marsh Lane, Hinstock would be ideal for development as a rural employment site, in that it is situated just outside the built up area of the village, so there would be minimal chance that any of the employment uses would cause loss of amenity to any residential property, but very close to the A41(T) By-pass, meaning that any industrial traffic associated with the use would not have to travel through the village in order to access the main County Highway network. The site is well screened from view and lies immediately adjacent an existing small employment site. It is flat, and well drained, in short ideal for such use. Its development for employment uses would provide local jobs and reduce the resident's dependence on the motor car for transport to other employment areas. The development boundary for the village should be adjusted to include this site, with a specific allocation for employment uses.
47. The village of Hinstock has an alternative site off the old A41 (now the A529) road at the old garage (grid reference SJ695259). The site is brownfield and extends to around 0.5 acres. The site is outside the central core of the village but would provide an accessible, suitable and deliverable housing option.

Hodnet

48. We would like to put forward the plot of land off station road between The White House and 60 College Houses TF9 3JF. This land is currently an old orchard and houses stabling for one equine. We would like to suggest that this plot of land be approved for no development to be used as a private residence. We would ideally put forward a timber frame construction 3/4 bed detached home of around 150m² with traditional features to be sympathetic to the Georgian facade of the College Houses Terrace. This plot of land currently belongs to my parents. I have lived in Hodnet all of my life and my partner is also local (Waters Upton). I play an active part in the Hodnet community and really believe that Hodnet's potential is currently not fully realised with respect to the community spirit of the village. My job is situated in Battlefield, Shrewsbury and I volunteer for a musical charity in Market Drayton, therefore Hodnet is an ideal situation. In the current economic climate, it would be impossible for my partner and myself to buy a first home in the village or surrounding area and we feel very strongly that this is somewhere where we would like to settle down in a long term family home. Both having lived in a rural area for all of our lives we would not feel comfortable living in an estate development in a town which realistically would be the only sort of house that we could afford. Building on this plot of land would not impede on the general ambience of the road as it is an infill piece of land. Access is good and as you know, mains sewage has recently been installed in the fields behind to service this line of development. My parents are elderly and living close to them would allow them to remain in their home and village throughout their retirement and old age without having to worry about being isolated within a rural area. We also have livestock and myself remaining in the local area would allow me to help them manage this aspect of their lives also. In conclusion, we feel that our connections to Hodnet are strong and we could offer the village a great deal in the near future and in the long term.

Norton in Hales

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

49. I think that Norton in Hales should be made a Hub or alternatively a Cluster with Betton and Ridgewardine.
50. Proposes development site off Bearstone road to include low cost accommodation alongside live work units in an attempt to stimulate local commercial activity in the village. The low cost element does not have to be encumbered by housing association overheads and added cost. The free hold could be visited in the parish council with annual ground rents and leased. All the property should have solar cell panels fitted as standard, heated by ground heat pumps with high spec insulation factored in for maximum efficiency. An extensive tree planting scheme would not only enhance the visual impact of the development but (completed with the above) would reduce the carbon footprint of the ongoing activity on site. Based on 99 year lease the parish will always be able to have a future influence on local housing much as the structure of Alms Housing. The most rewarding social mix for the village would be a number of low cost housing, some live work and some open market housing thereby emulating the idyll of a traditional village both in scale and type of housing and the various aspects of social cohesion.
51. Proposes land to rear of Beckside Cottage, Norton in Hales for residential development. Site is bounded along north east boundary by a brook forming a natural boundary to village. Aim to construct highly efficient sustainable buildings, including 3 live work properties and allow future needs of village to be catered for by having serviced plots laid out so that building can take place when local needs arise. Hedging and tree planting within site to provide wildlife habitat. Aim is for a partnership of like-minded villagers to achieve enhanced future for village.

Spoonley

52. I would suggest that the 15.36 acres which at present is agricultural land opposite Spoonley Farm, but is not owned by the local farms would be ideal for employment land, services or housing.

Sutton upon Tern Parish

53. Proposes area at Sutton Lane, Woodseaves (WOO003), immediately adjoining the twelve houses at Hillside. Would be ideal for some development. The land is free draining and the sewerage pipeline goes across the corner of the field from the Hillside houses to the sewage beds. Water and electricity are available close by. We believe it is by far the most suitable site in Sutton Lane for a limited development. However there is also the possibility that Sandy Lane, down the side of the Four Alls Pub, has an area which could be suitable as it is also a quiet lane with limited housing already there.
54. See our comments on the main part of the submission but in brief if the Parish residents agree there should be more housing (no engagement from Parish Council as yet....) then more appropriate would be brownfield sites at 1. Tern Hill - Stormy Petrel pub currently not a business and up for sale. 2. Crickmerry - Garage site on the A41 currently for sale.

Woore

55. Object to development of WOR009 proposed by site promoter. Access to any proposed public facilities such as bowling green and/or tennis courts, or a club house would lead to gross overuse of the residential road currently serving the residents at Grove Crescent. Proposal to build 25 houses, plus leisure facilities would constitute over intensified development. Concern that Woore Parish Council is now supporting further development but has not consulted local community. Land is agricultural, managed organically and required for food production. Proposed 'additional' public facilities listed as tennis facilities and bowling green, are already catered for either within Woore

- village or should become available at the proposed new sporting facility to be built in Pipe Gate. Site is greenfield land.
56. Object to development of WOR009 proposed by site promoter. When Woore Parish Plan was prepared, Grove Crescent was one of least popular sites for development. Woore Parish Plan results suggest that recreational site may not be wanted by majority of residents. Circular walking routes and decent pavements may be more appropriate.
 57. Propose allocation of site (WOR015) or inclusion within settlement boundary and provision of high quality family housing, lifetime homes or specialist older persons housing. Development would accord with linear expansive nature of the cluster without compromising the clear spatial separation between the 3 villages. Propose sub-division of site currently occupied by large house with extensive private gardens, as there is unlikely to be a genuine user for this in future. Suitable site, available for development, free from constraints and with safe access.
 58. Propose WOR012 as sustainable extension to comprise woodland, recreational uses, housing, community use building, improved local footpath network and other suitable community needs and uses. Development would be determined by respondent working together with LPA and community together to prepare a deliverable, sustainable and viable masterplan.
 59. Proposes development at the coal yard opposite the new development in Pipe Gate for future building.
 60. Proposes redundant land at Pipe Gate for residential use. Development will be low carbon sustainable build. Potential to include community retail services and live work units. Site is brownfield and has road frontage to A51 where safe access can be achieved.
 61. We believe that Land North of Cherry Tree Lane, Woore should be allocated for housing development. Details of this site, including an indicative site layout have been emailed to the Council separately. Site currently in agricultural use. No landscape or ecological designations affecting site. Site entirely within Flood Zone 1, no known archaeological constraints. Located within easy walking and cycling distance from centre of village and its facilities. Proposed that site will be accessed via Cherry Tree Lane which is un-adopted. Initial work has found only minor improvements to Cherry Tree Lane and A51 junction is required. Site developable and deliverable.

General

62. I think the types of housing should range across the whole spectrum, with mixed size houses. Studies have shown that social mixing is beneficial to the community

Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area

Minsterley and Pontesbury

Question 1: Do you think that the target of a further 86 houses to be built in Minsterley and Pontesbury by 2026 is appropriate?

Of the Survey Monkey responses (18) 72% agreed that the target was appropriate. This was qualified in one case by requiring that development is appropriate and sensitive to local character and that current development boundaries are retained.

Of those that commented (either in Survey Monkey or by other means) and did not agree with the target, more replies (5 versus 3 responses) suggested that the target was too high. The reasons for suggesting that the development target is too high included : no need for the housing ; expansion would negatively impact on the rural character and identity of the villages ; key centre status is inappropriate as limited facilities ; housing should be located where there is existing sufficient employment, services and infrastructure or in smaller villages to enhance sustainability and that there has already been significant large housing developments in Minsterley over the last 20 years. It was also submitted that the location of family housing in Minsterley would increase carbon footprint due to the need for travel to school. Support for the target by a respondent suggested that the numbers are substantiated by accurate data relating to housing need and that the key centre role is appropriate given level of facilities, services, employment and role in supporting wider rural community. In support of a higher figure it is suggested that there is overreliance on windfalls and that the low housing target will increase pressure for an unsustainable and inappropriate scale of development in Hubs and Clusters. It was also highlighted by a couple of respondents that additional housing development will bring the investment necessary to deliver necessary community infrastructure, economic and other benefits. Another reply suggested that review of numbers is required in light of the NPPF and its greater emphasis on flexibility and sustainable development.

Question 2: Do you agree that provision should be made for an additional 2 hectares of employment land to come forward in the Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area by 2026?

The response to this question showed a moderate tendency to agreement amongst the 18 respondents with 56% agreeing (44% disagreeing). Of the 9 comments submitted the need to use brownfield land was highlighted by 3 respondents. 2 replies suggested that employment development more appropriate in Pontesbury ,whilst one suggested that better placed in Minsterley, with a further respondent highlighting existing provision and failing industrial land in that settlement , together with broader road network and accessibility issues. The issue of lack of need due to unimplemented permissions and need to consider land within the boundary was also raised.

Question 3: Do you agree that site MIN002 (0.7Ha), at Hall Farm, Minsterley, should be allocated for approximately 12 houses?

Of the 13 Survey Monkey respondents, 8 (61.5 %) agreed with the allocation. Objectors highlighted limited capacity, high risk of groundwater flooding, potential impacts on village rural character and listed building issues and suggested that the site would not be realistic as required by NPPF, with better site options available. Supporters identified that the site is a previously developed land within the existing development boundary with scope for development with care regarding existing uses, design and layout and its heritage value. English Heritage highlight that the allocation is adjacent to a Grade II* listed building and that the historic farm buildings may be deemed curtilage listed. Any development which would

harm the heritage asset would not supported by English Heritage and they suggest that the allocation should seek to secure the viable use and conservation of surviving historic buildings and enhance the significance of the listed building. The Environment Agency suggested that groundwater is likely to be shallow at this site and there is potential for land contamination issues associated with the farming activities or the area's industrial mining heritage.

Question 4: Do you agree that site MIN007/R (1.95Ha), at Callow Lane, Minsterley, should be allocated for a phased development of about approximately 32 houses?

The 13 Survey Monkey responses were roughly equally divided with 6 agreeing with the site and 7 disagreeing with the allocation. Whilst no specific supporting comments were received, objectors highlighted: local road network limitations; traffic impacts; erosion of farmland; effect on village character and historic interest; need to protect the AONB, SSSI, Green belt and open space. Furthermore, comments referred to the impact of moving the development boundary into the countryside, inappropriate rural development density and that development would be better dispersed through the village. It was also suggested that existing development buffer zone is unsatisfactory and that the site forms a required barrier between development and adjoining land with special ecological interest. Other respondents highlighted that developable capacity is reduced by a watercourse and as development of the site could harm the SSSI it would therefore not be appropriate or in line with the NPPF, with better site options available. It is also commented that there are no existing facilities and that development must benefit local people. Natural England indicated that they are unlikely to be able to support the allocation due to its location on priority habitat adjoining a SSSI.

Question 5: Do you agree that site PBY018/R (about 1Ha), being land off Hall Bank, Pontesbury, should be allocated for approximately 17 houses?

Of the 14 Survey Monkey respondents 10(71%) agreed with the allocation. Supporters highlighted appropriate location adjacent the main road. Objectors identified increased traffic, drainage issues and flooding. Other respondents indicated that alternative brownfield sites outside the flood zone should be prioritised. It was argued that due to small development size the site would not be attractive to house building industry therefore there may be deliverability issues and conflict with NPPF requirements, particularly as better site options are available. The site promoter highlighted community support for and the central location of the site. They also submitted supporting information which provides: identification of location and constraints; illustrative site layout, commitment to master planning and identifies flexibility regarding site extent and final development form. Other comments suggested that the site would be better used for retail/employment and that if developed for housing, that it should overlook recreational facilities and the landowners could facilitate the provision of allotments and affordable housing. The Environment Agency highlights the need for a Flood Risk Assessment to determine extent of floodplain.

Question 6: Do you agree that site PBY019 (0.9Ha), being land off Minsterley Road, Pontesbury, should be allocated for approximately 16 houses?

Of the 12 Survey Monkey respondents 8 (67%) agreed with the allocation. Support for the development was qualified in one case regarding loss of farmland and the need to retain village character. Supporters suggested that this site, as outside flood zone, should be prioritised and adjoining land allocated. Objectors highlighted the elevated nature of the site and overbearing, visual and loss of light effects, together with loss of privacy and other amenity impacts. They also identified impact on village character, loss of green space, access issues, land stability, increased traffic and associated pollution, inadequate sewerage, need for surface water management, run off and flooding issues. It was argued that due to small development size the site would not be attractive to house building industry, therefore there may be deliverability issues and the allocation would not be effective or appropriate as required by NPPF, with better site options available

Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Minsterley?

The response to this question showed a moderate tendency to disagreement amongst the 18 respondents with 57% disagreeing (43 % agreeing). Specific disagreement (5 respondents) related to the exclusion of sites (MIN020, MIN027, Land at The Grove and Little Minsterley). It was suggested that the development boundary should be amended to include commercial buildings and to reflect planning permissions and on the ground boundary changes. The site promoter for land at The Grove highlights the appropriateness of the site (no overriding constraints), ability to develop around flood constraints and connectivity to the settlement and services and suggests that this site would provide a more realistic, deliverable option of an appropriate and attractive scale of development for developers. Alternatively other respondents (3 replies) oppose extension of development boundary on the basis that : no additional development required; it would result in inappropriate infill; there would be impact on Minsterley Brook wildlife; closure of Creamery would result in population loss; Minsterley and Pontesbury should be kept separate and there is a need to protect countryside. English Heritage suggests that the Historic Farmsteads and Landscape Project work needs to be used in defining boundaries.

Question 8: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Pontesbury?

The response to this question showed a moderate tendency to agreement amongst the 12 respondents with 58% agreeing (42% disagreeing). Specific disagreement (3 respondents) related to the exclusion of sites encompassing 2 properties (Polesgate Cottage & Yew Tree Cottage)and land adjoining allocated site PBY019. A further respondent opposed change on basis that the village is already large enough with an inadequate main road. One respondent who agreed qualified this by seeking no further boundaries changes and that boundary maintained to the southern AONB side of the village. English Heritage suggest that the Historic Farmsteads and Landscape Project work needs to be used in defining boundaries

Question 9: Suggested Alternative sites, housing or employment land.

There were 6 survey Monkey responses. Alternative sites promoted included MIN027 (Off Leigh Road) MIN020 (Off Horsebridge Road) MIN019 (The Grove) MIN018(Little Minsterley) for employment rather than housing. Also land adjoining preferred site PBY019 & PBY023 is promoted. These are all sites that have had initial assessments. The Rea Valley Tractors site at Pontesford , not promoted, was also suggested as providing development potential. Also two properties are seeking individual houses to meet personal needs at Polesgate Cottage, Pontesbury Hill & Yew Tree Cottage, Habberley Road, Pontesbury. Sites are also promoted at Asterley & Plealey.

Several, detailed neighbour objections have been received to MIN018 relating to lack of need, alternatives available, green field status, flooding, pollution, amenity impacts and highway issues. The promoter's submission suggests that this is an appropriate location with potential for highway improvements & absence of flooding issues. Supporting evidence submitted in respect of MIN019 suggested no evidence of flooding to restrict allocation of the site. The supporting submissions for MIN020 & MIN027 focused on the appropriate scale & location of the sites, lack of ecological, flood and heritage issues, site sustainability, community and strategic fit and realistic delivery of development, highlighting constraining issues associated with other sites. The promoter of the unallocated land next to PBY019 suggests that it is brownfield land adjoining the development boundary which should be given priority for allocation. In respect of PBY023 it is submitted that it is well located, sustainable and would not be as visually sensitive as other land. Information to support the site at Asterley highlights local housing provision, its sustainability and accessibility to nearby settlements and employment. Also that illustrative schemes show potential layouts and possible enhancements including allotments, a village green, open space, hedgerow , new footpaths and wildlife habitat. The Plealey land is promoted as a family owned site which provides the only viable option for members of that family to live within the village.

Other Issues

- Need for flood plain extent to be amended in light of local knowledge. No development in flood plain.
- Key centre status inappropriate for village.
- Late submission of proposals for MIN018 allowed no time for local consultation & publicity
- Too much reliance on electronic consultation
- Sites identified don't accord with Government directives or adopted Core Strategy Policy which require priority to brownfield sites outside flood zone;

Much Wenlock Place Plan Area

Much Wenlock has not been included in the SAMdev Preferred Options consultation process, due to the Town Council decision to develop a Neighbourhood Plan in conjunction with Shropshire Council for the whole of the parish. Points though have been raised in relation to Much Wenlock and other settlements in the wider Place Plan area by 10 respondents in the SAMdev Preferred Options consultation. These points are set out below.

Much Wenlock

Seven respondent provided comments on Much Wenlock. A respondent highlighted a number of points with regards to why development shouldn't take place in Much Wenlock, namely: that empty properties and brownfield sites in Shrewsbury and Telford should be utilised before greenfield land; that Much Wenlock's character is being damaged by over development; that there is a lack of road infrastructure to support development; that development will be of poor quality design; and that the temporary car park on Stretton Road will become a permanent feature.

Other points raised by respondents were that: that the Neighbourhood Plan process must start a genuine call for sites and select sites for development; that there is community support for Bridgnorth Road site being allocated for development; and that the Neighbourhood Plan process must engage all stakeholders effectively to result in a deliverable plan.

The Environment Agency stated that development in Much Wenlock needs to be carefully located and designed as parts of the town fall within SPZ1, 2 and 3 of a public water supply source. English Heritage raised the point that an in-depth assessment of sites need to be carried out as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process. The Highways Agency highlighted the point that the quantum of small development in Much Wenlock is unlikely to have an impact on the Strategic Road Network. Much Wenlock Town Council raised a number of points, namely; that the Neighbourhood Plan will set the scale and location of housing development based on a residents survey and evidence from the house builders; and that it supports establishing policy criteria to manage housing supply provides a positive framework for the development of industry.

Cressage

Two respondents provided comments on Cressage. Both respondents highlighted the point that Cressage should be formally recognised as a Community Hub, due to its size, the range of facilities and its accessibility to other parts of the county. Sites CRES004 and CRES010 were also promoted individually by both respondents as sites suitable for development in Cressage.

Buildwas

One respondent provided comments on Buildwas. The respondent highlighted that Buildwas should be identified as Community Hub or Community Cluster, as a lack of new development will make Buildwas an unsustainable settlement.

Easthope Shipton and Stanton Long

Easthope Shipton and Stanton Long Parish Council stated that it is happy to remain an area of open countryside with only affordable housing on suitable sites.

Shifnal Place Plan Area

Shifnal

Question 1: Do you think that the target of a further 415 houses to be built in Shifnal by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the total 60 respondents, 27 (45%) supported the housing target and 30 (50%) objected to the target. The main reasons for supporting the housing target were that respondents considered Shifnal to be a sustainable settlement that required growth to meet the housing need and support the existing local facilities and services. It was also noted that development would allow for required infrastructure improvements through CIL monies. Some respondents stated that they would support the target providing that new development includes; improvements to local services, facilities and road infrastructure; a large number of affordable housing and well designed, high quality houses. One respondent stated that a review of the housing target throughout the plan would be beneficial, as it will allow the target to reflect the local housing need across the plan period.

Out of the 30 respondents that object to the target, 5 (17% of objections) stated that the housing target should be increased in order to meet the current and future housing needs and allow for additional housing sites to be allocated, which will balance development across the town. However the other 25 respondents objected to the housing target, largely due to the inability of the existing road infrastructure to cope with the additional housing. Many respondents also stated that the existing services and facilities, particularly the Doctors Surgery and schools, would not be able to accommodate the additional population. Other reasons for objecting to the overall housing target related to; the negative impact on the character of the town; lack of employment available in the area; capacity of the sewerage network; concern that the development would result in more flooding; negative impact on the wildlife and that there are already housing not selling on development in the area.

Question 2: Do you think that the target of 2 hectares of employment land to be provided in Shifnal by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 53 respondents, a majority (34 out of 53 (64%)) support the target for employment land in the town, largely due to the need for additional employment. Some respondents stated that they would support the target providing that incentives could be provided to new business, in order for Shifnal to compete with Telford and attract small business to the area. It was also suggested by a few respondents that more land could be allocated for employment, one suggest was that land at Lamledge Lane could be dedicated as an employment area. One respondent also noted that the current allocation only include existing employment site and that in order to meet demand new potential sites should also be allocate. However, 19 out of the 53 respondents (36%) objected to the employment target for the following reasons; employment units are available in Telford and nearby areas; the existing employment land is a visual blight on the town; the demolition of existing units seems irrational and that the employment in not in proportion with the town.

Question 3: Do you agree that sites SHI004 (150 houses on 9.9Ha), SHI006 (250 houses on 11.6 Ha) and ELR021 (2Ha) should provide a mixed use scheme for 400 houses and 2 hectares of employment land?

Out of the 66 respondents 35 (53%) supported the sites allocation, whilst 28 (42%) objected. Firstly in terms of the general comments received, the reasons for supporting the 3 sites, related largely to their central location, close to amenities and the provision of key community benefit, particularly the new medical centre. It was also suggested that any new development

should provide improvements to the road network. However, on the other hand some respondents argued that the development should be allocated a lower housing target and the remaining allocation should be spilt across the alternative sites that are being promoted. A few respondents also commented that the combination of these 3 sites would cause overdevelopment on the south side of the town and have a negative impact on the character of the area.

In relation to site SHI004, additional comments in support of its allocation solely connected to the relocation of Springhill. Some respondents raised concern that the supermarket could have a negative impact on the vitality of the town centre, something that would need to be addressed in any application. One respondent also stated that they would support this site if it was retained solely for employment land in the plan. However a number of comments objecting to the sites inclusion were also received. The main reason for objecting to the sites inclusion related to impact on the road network, which is already busy, narrow and hazardous for pedestrians and as such not suitable to take the additional traffic. Other reasons included; detrimental visual impact to the character of the area, as it is a prominent location; loss of habitat, local amenity space and agricultural land; the sites poor connectivity and that there are more suitable alternative sites available.

In relation to site SHI006, a few respondent stated that the housing allocation should be reduced, to prevent the coalescence of development forming a 'mini town' to the south of Shifnal. Concern was also raised that the development of this site should not occur without securing the linkage underneath the railway line, as without this link the site is not well connected. However a few respondents have stated that there is no evidence that the link is deliverable. Other reasons stated in objection to the site include; the loss of open space/ local amenity area; loss of habitat for protected species and that there is already an overconcentration of development to the south of Shifnal.

In relation to site ELR021, the inclusion of the site is supported as it provides needed employment land. One respondent stated that the site should be extended to include the Lamledge Lane site. Whilst another respondent stated that the cleared area which forms part of ELR021 should be included within the mixed use allocation (SHI004) as it would allow more flexibility.

Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed Primary Shopping Area for Shifnal?

Out of the 47 respondents, a large majority (36 out of 47 (77%)) support the proposed Primary Shopping Area, as it is important to maintain and encourage people into the town centre. Some respondents suggested in order to maintain the town centre incentives for new businesses was required and others suggested that the area should be pedestrianized as it would make it easier and safer to access. There was also concern that the potential supermarket could be detrimental to the town centre. With a few respondents stating that there was no need for the supermarket in the first place. A few respondents also suggested that the Primary Shopping Area should also include land to the south of the railway bridge, market street and north of Broadway. One respondent also suggested that Patons Garage site could be relocated and the site turn into a GP Surgery.

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Shifnal?

Out of the 52 respondents, 26 (50%) support the proposed development boundary, whilst 24 (46%) object. The majority of comments received related to the inclusion or exclusion of preferred or alternative sites. A number of respondents support the inclusion of the following sites; SHI005 (7 respondents); SHI002 (3 respondents); SHI017/ A (3 respondents); SHI004 (2 respondent); SHI006 (1 respondent); ELR021 (1 respondent); SHI018 (1 respondent). One respondent also suggest that there should be an allocation for a medical centre next to the village hall. Respondents also stated that the following sites should not be included within the boundary; SHI005 (1 respondent); SHI017/A (1 respondent); SHI004 (1

respondent). A few respondents also raised concern that the boundary has been extended, beyond the land contained within the preferred options, as these areas contain important wildlife, includes too much green field development and is too large.

Question 6: Alternative Sites

Land at Haughton Road (SHI005):

Out of the 16 respondents who commented on the alternative site at Haughton Road (SHI005), 12 (75%) support its inclusion for housing, including the Parish Council, whilst 4 (25%) object. The reasons for supporting the inclusion of the site relate to; good and easy access to the site; the potential community benefits of the scheme and the limited landscape impact of development of the site. However some respondents commented that there are already existing traffic and highway safety problems along Haughton Road, with two fatal accidents over the last two years. As such the road network is not suitable to accommodate additional capacity.

Land off Wolverhampton Road (aka The Uplands, SHI002)

Out of the 13 respondents who commented on the alternative site at The Uplands (SHI002), 8 (62%) support its inclusion for housing, including the Parish Council, whilst 5 (38%) object. The reasons for supporting the inclusion of the site largely related to the potential community benefits of the scheme. One respondent also stated that the site is in a sustainable location, is deliverable and will have no detrimental impact on the road infrastructure, character of the area or protected species. However some respondents object to the inclusion of this site as it will have a detrimental impact on; wildlife habitat and protect species; road network; character of the area and localised flooding, as the site acts as a drainage area at present. It was also stated that the site was too removed from the town centre and development would result in a loss of open space. One respondent argued that a reduction in the number of houses would be appropriate.

Coppice Green Lane (SHI017/A)

1. This area could be accessed from Coppice Green Lane and Newport Road
2. The site offers 50% affordable housing which is a community benefit. It is also offering land for a possible swimming pool and walk/cycle ways. This site would complete development to North Shifnal up to M54
3. should be allocated for residential development. The site is well positioned, lying immediately adjacent to Idsall School and is well contained by existing features. The site is accessible and capable of accommodating a number of the expressed requirements for the town identified in the Town Plan. The site could accommodate up to 150 dwellings with associated community benefits.

Summary:

5 respondents support the inclusion of site SHI017/A, including the Parish Council. The reasons for support related to the sites location and potential community benefits.

Land north of Meadow Drive (SHI018)

1. SH018 seems to have been discounted on the basis of an arbitrary sustainability assessment. The development of this site would provide early housing delivery within an existing residential location and would provide the opportunity for the delivery of affordable housing. Highways and access issues can be easily resolved. The site

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

benefits from a sound location in terms of access to public transport and proximity to local services and facilities.

2. Both sites have good road access. Idsall school would be easily accessible from both sites if appropriate foot / cycle paths are provided. M54 provides a natural northern boundary to the town so wouldn't want to see any further development to the north after this

Other Alternative sites

1. Land south of Stanton Road (SHI030) - Consider Land to south of Stanton Road as Employment site, to ensure that sufficient land for employment growth. The site is adjacent to existing employment premises, has direct link to M54 and could be link to site at off Lamledge Lane (SHIF2) for a long term growth area for employment in Shifnal. It is recognised that the site is within the allocated Green Belt. However it is considered that in view of a long term strategy for provision of employment areas for Shifnal a review of the exiting areas of safeguarded land could take place.
2. Land at Aston Hall (SSH1029/09) - Site SHI029/09 allocated for delivery of affordable housing for Shifnal. The delivery of such large development areas have the potential to be delayed and only delivered consecutively. In this case it is considered appropriate that alternative location could be brought forward to meet the need for affordable housing within Shifnal, at a scale appropriate to the on-going need whilst considerate of the strategic housing growth areas. The site has existing access and is considered to be developable with a sympathetic design. The site is in a highly sustainable location due to its proximity to school, open space and the town centre.
3. Relocation of Patons Garage to Lamledge Lane to provide a site for new GP Surgery.
4. CP of waste land (owned by Mr Paton) adjacent to the existing GP Surgery, for use to redevelop the existing GP Surgery Site.
5. Agree ELR021 for employment but in addition to current employment land (no 'moving' of Springhill industrial estate but rather add to it). Access would be from Lamledge lane. High speed broadband to be provided to the site to encourage take up of units.
6. Medical centre - why not just knock down the existing GP surgery and build a two-storey replacement to get the space required?
7. Lamledge Lane premises should be identified as safeguarded employment land.
8. Aston Street Car Park and Allotments – not favoured at all. Would cause loss of allotments and the Village Hall. Suggested supermarket would be much too close to town centre and would decimate local shops, which are already under stress.

Shrewsbury Place Plan Area

SHREWSBURY

Question 1: Do you agree that allowance should be made for a further 4,235 houses to be built by 2026?

Of the 161 respondents who answered this question 62% disagreed and 38% agreed with the target, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (7). Of those that qualify their answer with a comment the majority appear to suggest that the target is too high.

The main reasons for challenging the development target included: Lack of employment to support new residents; lack of need; loss of green space and additional traffic impact in areas of existing high traffic. Others suggested that the development target was inappropriate unless inadequate infrastructure is addressed, empty properties are brought into use and brownfield land is utilised. A number of respondents also state that there has been a failure to clearly justify the housing need. There was some criticism of the types of development that have tended to come forward with respondents suggesting that housing design, mix and type, including provision of open space and affordable housing needed to be improved and flood issues considered. The development challenges in the current economic climate, impacts on wildlife and the environment and likely change in character of Shrewsbury to a commuter town are also put forward by a few respondents, as is the need to control housing in East Shrewsbury.

In support of housing provision it is highlighted that delivery of sufficient housing is critical for economic and social success of Shrewsbury and that provision of sites, without too much reliance on windfall, is needed to meet Core Strategy target.

Points highlighted by the public at Shrewsbury Town Council events were: that there needs to be clarification over the allocation of greenfield over brownfield sites; that the overall allocation is unjustified for what is needed and unrealistic in the current climate; that this amount of houses would potentially create a commuter rather than a sustainable town; and that key infrastructure and facilities may struggle cope with development.

Question 2: Do you agree that provision should be made for an additional 35 ha of employment land to come forward by 2026?

Of the 148 respondents who answered this question 51% agreed with the target and 49% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (2). A number of respondents who disagreed with the amount of new employment land stated that the priority should be to make use of existing employment sites and brownfield opportunities first before allocating new land. Others suggested that there is not enough demand to justify the level of employment provision suggested.

Others supported the allocation of new sites, and an appropriate diversity and choice, to help meet the employment needs of the residents. There were some general concerns regarding the importance of not allowing retail uses on designated employment land and ensuring suitable road infrastructure is in place to accommodate new employment development. A point raised by the public at Shrewsbury Town Council events was that it is important to promote and enhance economic prosperity in line with any new land allocations.

Question 3: Do you agree with the extent and broad arrangement of land uses proposed for Shrewsbury South Sustainable Urban Extension (sites SHREW028, 029, 075, 107, 114, and 127/ELR02 and 66)?

Of the 135 respondents who answered this question 64% agreed with the target and 36% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (7). Respondents that

disagreed with the proposal commented that the development of 900 houses was too large for the area, that development of this scale will lead to further to traffic problems on already busy roads, and the proposal would mean the loss of greenfield land on the edge of the town. Others suggested that existing empty properties should be reused in preference to this proposal. The importance of integrating green space into the scheme and enhancing or preserving existing green spaces was raised by a number of respondents. That sufficient infrastructure needs to be integrated into the scheme was also raised many of the respondents as a key issue. Other comments received related to specific considerations including preserving the setting of the Greek Orthodox Church and integrating room for expansion; ensuring appropriate pedestrian and cycle links; ensuring an appropriate mix of housing; and questioning of the inclusion of a supermarket as part of the local centre. Bayston Hill PC supported the proposal but stated that it is important the site should not extend south of the A5. The Environment Agency commented on possible constraints that should be taken account, namely: a number of landfill sites within or in close proximity and also a potential private water supply on the eastern part of the site.

Question 4: Do you agree with the extent and broad arrangement of land uses proposed for Shrewsbury West Sustainable Urban Extension (sites SHREW002, 035, 083, and 128/ELR64, 67, and 68)?

Of the 125 respondents who answered this question 66% agreed with the target and 34% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (6).

Respondents that disagreed with the proposal commented that the development was too large for the area, that the proposal would mean the loss of greenfield land/ green space. Issues surrounding infrastructure were also highlighted as a problem which should prevent development of the site, with respondents stating that development of this scale will lead to further to traffic problems on already busy roads, that the proposed Oxon Link Road will not serve any purpose and will have a negative impact on the amenity of local residents and patients at Shelton Hospital. Respondents additionally raised the point that the area lacks key infrastructure such as schools to support development.

The importance of enhancing and preserving valuable green spaces on the site such as Oxon Pool was raised by a number of respondents, also that the development shouldn't have a negative impact on the river. Respondents raised the point that new infrastructure investment is needed in schools, public transport and roads in the local area to support the development proposed. A number of respondents support the allocation of new employment sites as part of the development, but the point was raised that new employment development shouldn't detract from the economic viability of the town centre.

Other comments received related to specific considerations including design quality of the development and the need for safety improvements on Churncote Island. Ford Parish Council supported the proposal and the inclusion of employment land as part of development, but stated that has particular concerns about safety on the Churncote roundabout and would wish to be closely consulted on the design of safety measures. Additionally that during the construction phases of the link road that consideration should be given to the imposition of temporary speed limits on local diversion routes to improve safety and discourage excessive use.

The Environment Agency commented on possible constraints that should be taken account, namely: that the site falls within a public water supply source, therefore close control/ design of land use and the link road will be required to ensure the protection of the water supply.

Question 5: Do you agree that sites SHREW210/09, 030/R, 094 and 019, being land between Mytton Oak Road and Hanwood Road (36 hectares) should be allocated for the phased development of approximately 550 houses?

Of the 131 respondents who answered this question 53% agreed with the target and 47% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (12). Additionally a petition of

37 signatures was submitted by local residents (primarily on Falcons Way), objecting to the proposed site allocation. If these signatures are added to the total respondents, the outcome would become 40% agreed and 60% disagreed. A number of respondents that disagreed with the proposal commented: that the development in this location will worsen traffic issues; that the site suffers from flooding; that development will increase surface run off in to the Rad Brook; that it will mean the loss of green space/field on the edge of the town and loss of habitat; and the proposal will affect the amenity of local residents. The proximity to the main areas of employment and lack of local services was also raised as a general concern regarding the location of the site.

The importance of providing sufficient infrastructure as part of the scheme was raised many of the respondents as a key issue. School, social and health provision was raised in particular. The need to include sufficient road infrastructure to mitigate potential traffic impacts was also highlighted by a number of respondents. A number of respondents supported the inclusion of a country park in the proposal.

The public at Shrewsbury Town Council events raised a number of issues with the proposed site, namely: that its large size will have an overbearing impact on services and facilities; that there is need for green space separation between the development and existing residential properties; and that the development will result in the loss of habitat. The Environment Agency highlighted that there is a landfill site around 100m south of SHREW019.

Question 6: Do you agree that part of site SHREW027, being land at Weir Hill Farm/Robertsford House, Preston Street (17 hectares), should be allocated for the phased development of approximately 400 houses?

Of the 253 respondents who answered this question 15% agreed with the proposed site and 85% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (31).

A large number of respondents that disagreed with the proposal commented that this development will worsen the already bad traffic conditions on local roads, with special reference made to Column Roundabout, Preston Street and Portland Crescent. Issues surrounding infrastructure were also highlighted as a problem, with respondents stating that the development will deteriorate the already poor water pressure in the area; the education infrastructure is currently oversubscribed and unable to handle further demand; and that the area lacks medical facilities to support the development as local surgery is near capacity.

Issues relating the natural environment and green space were raised by a large number of respondents, with the key issues being that; the development would not comply with the Agricultural and Fishery Policy, as the development will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land. Additionally this site allocation will result in the loss of wildlife habitat, local open green space and will damage a character of a landscape sensitive area. Other issues raised were that the area lacks employment; that the development of this site will result in a negative impact on residential amenity; and that brownfield land should be utilised before greenfield.

The need to protect the green corridor close to the river and preserving existing wildlife habitats (As Bats are present in the area) such as hedge rows were raised by a number of respondents, as a key element as part of any development. Respondents highlighted the point that new infrastructure investment is needed in schools, public transport and water network in the local area to support the development, with special reference made to road infrastructure and in particular creating new access point on London Road.

Another suggestion raised by respondents was to reduce the number of houses proposed for the site, as lower number would be more suitable. Councillor Miles Kenny disagreed with the proposal on the grounds that there is no public transport serving this area and that the proposed road improvements on Preston Street will still remain inadequate to support increases in traffic.

The National Grid stated that development on the site shouldn't take place directly beneath overhead lines, and that the land beneath the overhead lines should be designed to make a positive contribution to the site. The public at Shrewsbury Town Council events raised

number points about the site, namely: inability of local infrastructure to cope with development, loss of wildlife habitat/ open green space, already bad congestion on the local road network and proximity to power lines.

Question 7: Do you agree that site SHREW016, being land off Hillside Drive, Belvidere (2.1Ha) should be allocated for about 20 houses?

Of the 130 respondents who answered this question 52% agreed with the proposed site and 48% disagreed, with the remainder (10) not indicating their overall view. Additionally a petition of 85 signatures was submitted by local residents of Hillside Drive and St James Road, objecting to the proposed site allocation. If these signatures are added to the total respondents, the outcome would become 32% agreed and 68% disagreed. A large number of respondents against the proposal raised concerns about exacerbating existing traffic issues with access off a cul-de-sac; the loss of valued local amenity green space; and the damage to wildlife habitat. Others pointed to the lack of sustainable transport options; oversubscribed local schools (also in light of larger proposal off Preston Street); and the impact on the river corridor as reasons to oppose the proposal. Other respondents highlighted the importance of incorporating sustainable design and ensuring that development is in keeping with local character; the importance of respecting the amenity of adjacent occupiers; and the incorporation of green space into any scheme.

Question 8: Do you agree that site SHREW120/R, being land off Woodcote Way (1.9Ha) should be allocated for about 50 houses?

Of the 127 respondents who answered this question 51% agreed with the proposed site and 49% disagreed, with the remainder (15) not indicating their overall view. A large number of respondents against allocating the site felt that the access to the site would be liable to flooding, making it unsuitable for development; and, allocation for residential development would exacerbate existing traffic and parking issues in the area, particularly on Riverdale Road and Dale Road. The impact on the visual quality, wildlife habitat and local amenity of the river corridor; that schools are already over-subscribed and this will be exacerbated further; and impact from surface water flooding were also raised a concerns by a number of respondents.

Other issues raised by respondents included the level of development proposed being too large; and that it is important to incorporate appropriate provision of greenspace into the development. The Environment Agency commented that consideration needs to be given to the effects of climate change when considering the developable area and also question whether access from Dale Road is achievable or whether it needs to come through flood zone 3. The public at Shrewsbury Town Council events also highlighted concerns with access and potential flood risk. Councillor Miles Kenny disagreed with the proposal due to issues surrounding flooding, access to the site, wildlife and loss of a public amenity.

Question 9: Do you agree that site SHREW105, being land off Shillingston Drive (10Ha) should be allocated for about 250 houses?

Of the 234 respondents who answered this question 31% agreed with the target and 69% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (14).

A large number of respondents that disagreed with the proposal commented that this development will worsen the already bad traffic conditions on the local roads network. Respondents also highlighted an issue surrounding access to the site, stating that Shillingston Drive road is too narrow to support extra demand and that site entrance is located too close to an existing play area which raises safety issues.

Issues relating to the natural environment and green space were raised by a large number of respondents as a reason for the site being suitable for development, with the key issues

being: that the development of this site will remove valuable green space and local amenity; that Ghost moths and Barn Owls and other wildlife utilises this site as habitat; and that the ecological survey carried out was not comprehensive as didn't pick up on Barn owls and Ghost moths.

Other key issues raised were that development shouldn't take place as it is outside the development boundary; that other locations in North Shrewsbury are more suitable for development; that flooding is an issue on the site; and that sequential approach to site allocation should be taken with brownfield developed before greenfield sites.

A large number of the respondents commented that to make the development more acceptable a larger buffer zone around Lion Coppice is needed to protect this ancient woodland from impacts of development. Additionally sizable amount respondents stated that existing green spaces should be enhanced and preserved as part of any development, with particular reference made to Lion Coppice.

Other points raised by respondents were that the number of houses proposed for the site needs to be reduced as lower number would be more suitable, and that any development taking place on the site should be mixed use. The National Grid stated that development on the site shouldn't take place directly beneath overhead lines, and that the land beneath the overhead lines should be designed to make a positive contribution to the site.

The public at Shrewsbury Town Council events raised number points about the site, namely: the ability of local infrastructure to cope with development e.g. schools and roads, loss of wildlife habitat/ open green space, need for a mix of housing types to meet demographic groups requirements, and that high quality design should be utilised which links to character of the town. The Environment Agency commented on possible constraints that should be taken account, namely: that the site falls within a Flood Zone 1, therefore focus should be placed on controlling surface water run-off on the site through design measures such as SUDS. West Merica Police stated that it has no objections to the site with regards to the proposed highways network; that the layout of any proposals should ensure it achieves Secured by Design Standards; and that they do not seek the provision of on-site police infrastructure.

Question 10: Do you agree that sites SHREW095 and 115/ELR006, being land west of Battlefield Road (6.3Ha) should be allocated for about 100 houses?

Of the 103 respondents who answered this question the majority (73%) agreed with the proposed site and 27% disagreed, with the remainder (5) not indicating their overall view. Those against the proposed raised a number of issues with the site. There was a general concern from some respondents that there is already enough land for housing and employment identified in the town which means there was little need to identify this land. A number of respondents expressed concern that the number of houses proposed was too high whilst others felt development here would contribute to traffic congestion on a major route into the town. Others supported the proposed employment development as it is consistent with other existing uses in the area. The impact on the setting of the historic battlefield was raised as a specific concern.

English Heritage commented that these sites are in close proximity to the Registered Battlefield and consideration will need to be given to any potential implications for its setting and also the archaeological potential of these sites. The Environment Agency highlighted that the water table is variable in the location.

Question 11: Do you agree that site SHREW212/09, being land west of Longden Road (6.9Ha) should be allocated for about 175 houses?

Of the 115 respondents who answered this question (50%) agreed with the proposed site and 50% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (5). Those against the proposal raised a number of issues with the site. There was a general concern from some respondents that this development will increase traffic and congestion in the local area

and reduce safety, with particular focus on the impact of increased traffic in Meole Village, along Longden Road and Mousecroft Lane. A number of respondents expressed concern that development will damage existing wildlife habitats and will result in the loss of valuable green space/ open countryside, whilst others felt that existing local education infrastructure is oversubscribed and unable to handle increased demand, and that flooding on the site make it unsuitable for development.

Other respondents raised the point that number of dwellings proposed is too high and that a lower number would be more suitable. A number of respondents supported the proposed site allocation as it was seen as sustainable location for development, as the site close to local services, employment and infrastructure, whilst some respondents highlighted the need for new pedestrian infrastructure along local roads, in particular new crossings, new footpaths and traffic calming.

The Environment Agency raised the point that this site is located in proximity to a number of potential private water supplies. The public at Shrewsbury Town Council events raised number points about the site, namely: loss of wildlife habitat/ open green space, congestion along Longden Road and the need for traffic calming measures, flooding on the site and the need for drainage infrastructure, and possible disturbance to BUPA Hospital patients.

Question 12: Do you agree that site SHREW023, being land at Corner Farm Drive (1.3Ha) should be allocated for about 25 houses?

Of the 103 respondents who answered this question the majority (57%) agreed with the proposed site and 43% disagreed, with the remainder (3) not indicating their overall view. Those against the proposed site raised a number of issues. A number of respondents suggested that development of the site would increase traffic and reduce pedestrian safety along Corner Farm Drive, and that it would lead to a loss of green field land on the edge of the settlement with the associated loss of wildlife.

There were also concerns about the effect of development on the local character of the area and that improvements to access through the widening of Corner Farm Drive would impact upon wildlife habitats. The site was also identified as acting as a buffer between areas of existing development. Some respondents suggested that the site might be suitable for fewer houses and any development should be well designed. Others suggested that the general area (Welshpool Road, Bowbrook) has plans for significant housing development already and therefore this isn't needed. The public at Shrewsbury Town Council events raised a number of points, namely: loss of local amenity; potential for an increase in traffic; and concern over loss of 200 year old hedgerows on the site.

Question 13: Do you agree to the identification of a potential further phase of development of 300-400 dwellings to the south of the land proposed as a preferred option at Weir Hill Farm/Robertsford House (Site Shrew027 – further part)?

Of the 129 respondents who answered this question (27%) agreed with the proposed site and 73% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (1). Those against the proposal raised a number of issues with the site. There was a general concern from some respondents that this development will result in the loss valuable green space, wildlife habitat and local amenity, and that development in this location will damage a character of a landscape sensitive area on the rural edge of the town. A number of respondents expressed concern that development on this site will increase congestion in the local area and reduce safety, with particular focus on the impact of increased traffic in Preston Street and Belvidere Road.

Other respondents raised the point that number of dwellings proposed is too high and that a lower number would be more suitable. A number of respondents supported the proposed site allocation, but highlighted: that green corridor close to the river should be protected from development as it's a local amenity, wildlife habitat and has a key rural aspect; and that new

road infrastructure will be required to mitigate traffic issues along Preston Street and Belvidere Road.

The National Grid stated that development on the site shouldn't take place directly beneath overhead lines, and that the land beneath the overhead lines should be designed to make a positive contribution to the site.

Question 14: Do you agree that site SHREW001, being land north of London Road (5 hectares) should be allocated as a reserved site for about 50 houses?

Of the 113 respondents who answered this question a slight majority (51%) agreed with the proposed site and 49% disagreed, with the remainder (4) not indicating their overall view. A number of respondents raised concerns with the site as it will result in the loss valuable green space/open countryside on the edge of Shrewsbury, has wildlife habitat, and is important to the amenity of the area (in regards to being part of the River Severn corridor).

Others including CPRE Shrewsbury pointed to the high/medium landscape sensitivity of the area as part of the setting of the town. Ensuring the setting of the peaceful setting of the crematorium was also highlighted in the response. Of those that agreed with the proposals some respondents highlighted that it was important to ensure low density development on the site as suggested in the Preferred Option report.

Question 15: Do you agree that site SHREW073, being land off Ellesmere Road (3.9Ha) should be allocated for about 146 houses?

Of the 105 respondents who answered this question (78%) agreed with the proposed site and 22% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (2). There was a general support from respondents with regards to utilisation of brownfield land for development. Respondents also highlighted that new road infrastructure will be needed to mitigate traffic issues resulting from the development.

Those against the proposal raised a number of issues with the site. There was a general concern from some respondents that this development would worsen already bad traffic on the local road network, and that this site would be more suited to employment uses rather than housing development. The Environment Agency stated; that the site appears to have potentially contaminative land uses (including landfill); that the site is in Flood Zone 2, although may be as a result of misalignment of the flood map, it is recommended that the developer undertakes some work through providing a topographical survey to verify the extent of the flood map.

Question 16: Do you agree that site SHREW195, being the former Tesco site, Arlington Way (2.1Ha) should be allocated for about 106 houses?

Of the 119 respondents who answered this question a large majority (88%) agreed with the proposed site and 12% disagreed, with the remainder (5) not indicating their overall view. Respondents supported this site as brownfield redevelopment that will contribute to the redevelopment of the area. Although a couple of respondents suggested that the number of houses proposed was too high and others stated that the site was more appropriate for employment development. The site is now being developed via an existing planning application.

Question 17: Do you agree that site SHREW047, being the former Gay Meadow (2.8Ha) should be allocated for about 179 houses?

Of the 119 respondents who answered this question 78% agreed with the proposed site and 22% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (1). There was a general support from respondents with regards to utilisation of brownfield land for development. Respondents also highlighted that that a lower number of dwellings would be more suitable

for the site, and that any development on the site needs to be designed to mitigate the impact of flooding.

Those against the proposal raised a number of issues with the site. There was a general concern from some respondents that this development would worsen already bad traffic on the local road network, that the site is unsuitable for development due to flooding, and that this site would be more suited to public open space rather than housing development. The Environment Agency stated; that the site appears to have potentially contaminative land uses (including landfill). This is acknowledged in the report. We have been formerly consulted regarding contaminated land issues associated with the site.

Question 18: Do you agree that site SHREW138, being land at Mousecroft Lane (1.6Ha) should be allocated for about 40 houses?

Of the 133 respondents who answered this question a majority (64%) agreed with the proposed site and 36% disagreed, with the remainder (8) not indicating their overall view. A number of respondents supported the identification of this site as it is brownfield land.

A number of respondents against the allocation of the site raised a number of issues including the impact it will have already bad traffic and pedestrian safety (especially along Mousecroft lane); and that further greenfield use beyond the existing site would result in the loss valuable green space/open countryside on the edge of Shrewsbury, and impact on wildlife habitat and local amenity. Others supported reuse of the site for employment uses due to the loss of jobs if redeveloped, and did not support additional greenfield land for 74 houses. CPRE Shrewsbury felt that the redevelopment of brownfield land would be acceptable but development of greenfield land proposed for more residential use would not be acceptable.

There were concerns raised over the proposed density of the site suggesting a lower number would be more appropriate; that it was important to have mix of house types and ensure development was sympathetic to location; and it was important to integrate new pedestrian and road infrastructure into the scheme.

Question 19: Do you agree that sites SHREW095 part/ELR006 (3 hectares), being the southern part of land west of Battlefield Road, be allocated for employment land?

Of the 102 respondents who answered this question 83% agreed with the proposed site and 17% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (3). There was support from respondents for this allocation, as it was highlighted that the site has good road access which makes a suitable location for development.

Those against the proposal raised a number of issues with the site. There was a general concern from some respondents that new employment land shouldn't detract from the town centre trade and employment development should be focused in the town centre. Respondents also raised the point that there is no need for extra provision of employment sites, as the empty unit's located in the town need filling first. The Environment Agency stated; that the site overlies till (mixture clays, silts, sands and gravels) which in turn overlies the Permo-Triassic sandstone. The depth to water table is variable. The majority of the sites appear to be greenfield. The public at Shrewsbury Town Council events raised the point of the possible accumulative impact of surrounding developments combined with this site on the local area.

Question 20: Do you agree that site SHREW106/ELR007(2 hectares), being land east of Battlefield Road, be allocated for employment land subject to satisfactory access off Battlefield Road?

Of the 106 respondents who answered this question a majority (78%) agreed with the proposed site and 22% disagreed, with the remainder (4) not indicating their overall view. Comments from respondents against the allocation of this site for employment use related to

the lack of need to identify more employment sites as empty units should be filled first; that the use of brownfield land should be used in preference to greenfield; and, that the north of the town has enough employment development and so new employment development should be focused in other areas of the town. There were also some concerns over the impact on traffic and pedestrian safety in the area.

English Heritage highlighted that the site is close to the Registered Battlefield and consideration will need to be given to any potential implications for its setting. The archaeological potential of these sites may also need to be considered. The National Grid stated that there should not be development directly underneath power lines to access to transmission system and pylons will need mitigation measures.

Question 21: Do you agree with the proposed Primary Shopping Area and the primary and secondary shopping frontages for Shrewsbury Town Centre?

Of the 118 respondents who answered this question 80% agreed with the proposed site and 20% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (8).

A number of respondents highlighted that vacant Town Centre units need filling and regenerating, with particular focus needed on the Riverside shopping mall. Respondents also stated that retail development should be focused in the town centre rather than in out of town centres, and that independent shops need protecting from chain store development. Other issues raised by respondents were primarily focused around parking and congestion, namely: that parking provision and charges needs addressing to attract more visitors; and that congestion issues around the town centre need to be tackled.

Those against the proposal raised a number of points, namely; that the proposed shopping centre will not resolve the town centre issues, as will not attract new customer to the town; and that the Town Centre shouldn't be altered. This proposal is supported by Ford Parish Council, Miles Kenny and Bayston Hill Parish Council.

Question 22: Do you agree with the proposed allocation of the land proposed for the New Riverside Shopping Centre for new retail development?

Of the 115 respondents who answered this question a large majority (78%) agreed with the proposed site and 22% disagreed, with the remainder (1) not indicating their overall view. A number of respondents felt that new retail development on the site would make a positive contribution to the town centre's vitality; was preferable to developing out of centre; and, that the Riverside shopping centre needed to be redeveloped. A number of respondents against identifying this site raised concerns that empty shops need to be filled before developing new units; that the development will have an impact on the character of the town; and that the development should be smaller to have less effect on existing independent retailers. The site now has planning permission.

Question 23: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Shrewsbury?

Of the 112 respondents who answered this question 43% agreed with the proposed development boundary and 67% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view (2). Respondents highlighted that they support Bayston Hill being kept as a separate settlement from Shrewsbury, with development being prevented from taking place between both settlements. A number of respondents also highlighted that they support the redrawing of Shrewsbury's development boundary to include certain preferred and non-preferred sites.

Those against the proposal development boundary raised a series of points. A number of respondents highlighted that they are against the proposed redrawing of Shrewsbury development boundary to include certain preferred sites. Other points raised by respondents were: that open countryside and green buffers and round the town should be protected; that

brownfield land should be utilised before greenfield is allocated for development; and that the amount of development proposed will damage the character of the town. Councillor Miles Kenny and Bayston Hill Parish Council disagreed with the proposal alterations to Shrewsbury's development boundary.

Alternative Sites in the Place Plan area you think we should consider instead.

A number of respondents highlighted that they sought to promote non-preferred sites for allocation, these sites are as follows: SHREW086, SHREW031, SHREW 028, SHREW 018, SHREW173, SHREW189/ 009, SHREW 090, SHREW126, SHREW010, SHREW142, Land off Reabrook (Kennedy Road) should be used for housing, and land East of Nobold Lane SHREW088. Other sites promoted by respondents are: Shelton Hospital (SHREW209). Respondents also highlighted a number of sites that shouldn't be allocated for development, these sites are as follows: SHREW210/09, SHREW 030/R, SHREW094, SHREW019, SHREW023, SHREW027, and SHREW162R.

BASCHURCH

Question 24: Do you agree that Baschurch should be a Community Hub?

Out of the 58 respondents, a substantial majority (83%) support the designation of Baschurch as a Community Hub as it already acts as a hub for the surrounding settlement who shared Baschurch's facilities. Development within rural areas will also prevent decline and sustain rural communities. However some respondents felt that Baschurch was not an appropriate location for further development as it has already had sufficient housing and there is virtually no local employment in the area. Also concern was raised about the capacity of the existing sewerage and road infrastructure and the impact development would have on the rural character of the area.

Question 25: Do you think that the target of a further 150-200 houses to be built in Baschurch by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 60 respondents, the majority (63%) support the housing target for Baschurch, with a few respondents stating that more housing could be allocated due to the services and facilities within the village. However some respondents suggest that the existing road and sewerage infrastructure is inadequate to accommodate further housing. There is also concern that the existing schools, doctor's surgery and other services do not have capacity to support further housing. One respondent was concerned that the level of housing for Baschurch is disproportionate compared to other villages surrounding Shrewsbury. A few respondents also comment that the railway station should be re-opened before further development occurs.

Question 26: Do you agree that site BAS005, being land behind Wheatlands Estate (1.26Ha), should be allocated for 40 houses?

Out of the 53 respondents, a large majority (79%) support the inclusion of this site largely due to its location within the existing development boundary and close proximity to the services and facilities. Other than the general issues in connection to development within Baschurch as a whole, the issue of deliverability was raised by one respondent, as the site has been allocated for a number of years but not been built or progressed.

Question 27: Do you agree that site BAS035, being land at Station Road (2.68Ha), should be allocated for 40 houses (subject to the provision of land for a school 'drop off' zone for coaches and other school traffic and satisfactory highway access)?

Out of the 57 respondents, the majority (68%) support the inclusion of this site, as its location is in close proximity to the services and facilities and will provide a drop off point for the school, alleviating the existing problem at the Eyton junction. However some respondents argue that there is already existing congestion and road safety issue on station road, with cars parking on the side of the road and therefore increasing traffic will cause a greater problem. Concern was also raised that the site is being considered due to the proposed drop off point, which is not a practical location for the school. It was also considered that this development was 'backland' development and that adequate visibility splays would not be available.

Question 28: Do you agree that site BAS025, being land to the rear of Medley Farm (1.22Ha), should be allocated for 25 houses?

Out of the 56 respondents, the majority (68%) support the allocation of the site, subject to a suitable access option. However some respondents raised concern about gaining a suitable access to the site, as Dyas lane is narrow with poor visibility. Some respondents also stated that the development was too dense and would extend beyond the natural boundary of the village. English Heritage raised the point that the site is located next to a conservation area, therefore high quality design will be required to sustain and enhance its significance. It was also considered that alternative sites, currently not considered as preferred options, were more suitable.

Question 29: Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Baschurch?

Out of the 56 respondents, a large majority (70%) support the proposed development boundary as the boundary is sufficient to meet housing need and will not dramatically alter the character of the village. However a number of objections were also received, the general issues related to the insufficient infrastructure to accommodate this scale of development, concern that it will turn Baschurch into a town and the presumption that development should be concentrated in the north east and east of the village- it was suggested that this area has no less landscape sensitivity than other areas. More specifically some respondents suggested the exclusion or inclusion of alternative sites (alternative sites details below).

Alternative Sites in Baschurch

1. Site BAS022 should be given full and further consideration. The site forms a natural extension to the village and is well related to existing development and facilities. Access is not a constraint and two viable options are available. The site is suitable to up to 50 dwellings.
2. Baschurch: Relocation of tennis club / men's club to green field site on other side of Church Road could free up land (partly unused) between Church Road & Westfield's Close for housing.
3. Land to the south of Baschurch off Prescott Island should be considered for housing as it has excellent facilities, easy access and the land owner is willing for it to be included.
4. In Baschurch Site BAS 034 has been discounted as it is too large however there has never been an assumption that all of it would be used, an allocation there instead of BAS025 would give the village the first step in what it really wants - a station stop. Public opinion is behind the stop, and if this chance goes the owner of the building will sell on the open market and the opportunity will be lost forever

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

5. Land at Prescott Corner, Baschurch- the site has an existing suitable access, is located opposite the medical centre and is convenient for public transport services to both Shrewsbury and Oswestry. The site is also well screen.
6. BAS019, 034, 035- *The Parish Council* would like consideration to be given for BAS034 and BAS019 to facilitate a loop road via BAS035 to allow easier access to the Corbet School but also feel that it is vital that some of this land is used to provide work units.
7. Plot BAS 017 needs to be considered for 35 houses as it includes provision for a new doctors surgery
8. Considered BAS017 for mixed use development, to include site for relocated Doctor's Surgery, residential and open space. The site has historic permission for development (although not extant) which shows that the site is suitable for housing development. The site has no access, flooding or ecological constraints and is located within easy access to facilities and services. The development will provide land for a new surgery, which will provide the required accommodation and car parking space required. Baschurch has no more capacity for further windfall development and therefore need to allocate a site for the remaining housing target.
9. BAS017- the Parish Council support the principle of development of the site on condition that the allocation for parking spaces at the surgery is increased and an access created from Milford Road. The integrity of the Coffin Path be maintained and should the housing site be developed prior to the surgery the routine maintenance at that part of the site should remain the responsibility of the developer/land owner.
10. Support inclusion of BAS017
11. Support inclusion of BAS017- need for a new medical surgery

Other Issues- Potential Allocation of BAS017

During the consultation process, new information was received regarding site BAS017 including details of land for a new Medical Practice and associated parking. Shropshire Council decided that the site should be part of a public consultation as a preferred option and Baschurch Parish Council agreed provided that the allocation of car parking is increased and an access created from Milford Road, conditions which the developer has agreed to. 4 additional comments were received in favour of the inclusion of the site, stated that there was a need for a new surgery. However a number of respondents (6) do not support the potential inclusion. The key issues raised include;

1. Loss of visual and aural amenity for existing neighbouring properties
2. Does not accord with 2008 plan, which shows that the community want small development of 5 or fewer houses, not 30
3. Loss of privacy and overlooking for neighbouring properties.
4. No real community benefit- the existing surgery is sufficient and there are no car parking issues.
5. Not in preferred location for development in the village, Parish Plan identified the north east and east of the village as this areas landscape sensitivity if less.
6. Does not have good access to facilities and services.
7. Site has high risk of groundwater flooding
8. Concern that the site is only being considered due to the potential community gain of a new surgery. However this is unlikely to be built as the Doctor's cannot afford it. So what will happen to the piece of land "set aside"?
9. Lack of sewerage capacity

BAYSTON HILL

Question 30: Do you agree that Bayston Hill should be a Community Hub?

Out of the 56 respondents, a substantial majority (48 out of 56, (86%)) support the designation of Bayston Hill as a Community Hub. A few respondents comment that it was important that growth is allowed and managed across the whole county, including the rural areas, in order to sustain communities and prevent areas of decline. One respondent did raise concern over the capacity of the A49.

Question 31: Do you think that a target of a further 50-60 houses to be built in Bayston Hill by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 58 respondents, a substantial majority (51 out of 58 (88%)) support the housing target for Bayston Hill as it is a large settlement with suitable services and facilities. Some respondents even suggested that a higher target would be appropriate. Concern was raised again about the access from and to the A49, and need for infrastructure improvement. It was also stated that the results of the Parish Plan showed support for the maintenance of the countryside space to ensure the Bayston Hill remains separate from Shrewsbury, and therefore housing should not be allowed on sites that would undermine this.

Question 32: Do you agree with the development boundary for Bayston Hill?

Out of the 58 respondents, a large majority (45 out of 58 (78%)) support the development boundary for Bayston Hill. However a number of respondents comment that the boundary should be extended to allow for additional growth, and several alternative sites were suggested, including; Land off Pulley Lane, (BAY011- support by 4 respondents); Land off Hereford Road (BAY009) and Land off Burgs Lane (BAY008).

Alternative Sites in Bayston Hill

1. Land off Pulley Lane (BAY011)- 4 respondents support this allocation.
2. Land off Hereford Road (BAY009)
3. Land off Burgs Lane (BAY008).

BOMERE HEATH

Question 33: Do you agree that Bomere Heath (with Leaton & Dunns Heath) should be a Community Hub?

Out of the 50 respondents, a substantial majority (40 out of 50 (80%)) support the designation as it will provide housing to meet the demand and prevent decline in rural communities. However a few respondents felt it would create sprawling or ribbon development.

Question 34: Do you think that the target of a further 50 houses to be built in Bomere Heath (with Leaton & Dunns Heath) by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 53 respondents, a large majority (41 out of 53 (77%)) support the housing target as it has a good range of services and facilities. A few respondents even suggest a higher target would be appropriate. However some respondents comment that Bomere Heath was already at capacity, and issues with traffic congestion and parking already existing, especially around the shop and school. Bomere Heath and District Parish Council have altered their position on the housing target, suggesting that 10-25 houses across all of their cluster areas would be appropriate, with a maximum of 6 dwellings per cluster.

Question 35: Do you agree that site BOM004/R, being land off Shrewsbury Road, Bomere Heath (2Ha), should be allocated for 30 houses?

Out of the 50 respondents, a very substantial majority (46 out of 50 (94%)) support the allocation of BOM004/R, as it is the most suitable location in Bomere Heath, in close proximity to the services and facilities. A few respondents did suggest that improvement to public open space for recreation and outdoor community areas should be incorporated with any application on this site.

Question 36: Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Bomere Heath?

Out of the 51 respondents, a majority (35 out of 51 (69%)) agree that there should not be a development boundary for Bomere Heath. However some respondents suggest that a development boundary would be appropriate for Bomere Heath, as it will clarify where the village and open countryside begins and end and suggest the potential areas for windfall development. This was supported by the Parish Council which stated that Bomere Heath should have a development boundary, which could include the area formerly used by the cricket club. It was also suggested that land to the north and east of the village has the capacity for further development.

Alternative sites in Bomere Heath

1. Land South of Preston Gubbals Road (BOM002)
2. Land North of Preston Gubbals Road (BOM003)
3. Land North of Bomere Heath (BOM001)
4. Land at Green Lane, Bomere Heath (BOM022a and BOM022b)

Other Issues

1. Albrighton and Preston Gubbals- Community Cluster?

During the consultation process Bomere Heath and District Parish Council informed Shropshire Council that they wish to designate an additional Community Cluster comprising Albrighton and Preston Gubbals. This additional cluster was also support by one member of the public.

2. Bomere Heath Maintaining the Footpath Network

Any development taking place in Bomere Heath should bear in mind any impact it will have upon the footpath network, and should seek preserving the attractiveness of the

NESSCLIFFE

Question 37: Do you agree that Nesscliffe should be a Community Hub?

The majority of respondents (45 out of 55 (82%)) supported the designation of Nesscliffe as a Community Hub, with some respondents stating that it was important to allowing growth in rural communities to prevent decline and sustain the existing communities. One respondent stated that the existing road network is not capable of accommodating additional growth.

Question 38: Do you think that the target of a further 50 houses to be built in Nesscliffe by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority of respondents (43 out of 59 (73%)) supported the overall housing target for Nesscliffe, with one respondent stating that it would even accommodate up to 80 dwellings. However a number of people objected to the target, stating that it was too high and would create adverse traffic implications on the local road network. The Parish Council supported this position and stated that the overall target should be reduced to 30 houses over the Plan Period.

Question 39: Do you agree that sites NESS004 and NESS012 (part), being land West of Holyhead Road (0.5-1Ha) should be allocated for 10-15 new houses?

The majority of respondents (38 out of 56 (68%)) supported the allocation of the sites as a preferred option, with one respondents stating that the allocation should be increase to provide 65 dwellings. However a number of respondents objected to the inclusion of the sites stating that development would have a negative impact on the landscape and the local road network. Concern was also raised that the development of this scale would be too dense, with the Parish Council adding that new development should be limited to 10 dwellings.

Question 40: Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Nesscliffe?

The majority of respondents (37 out of 55 (67%)) agreed that there shouldn't be a development boundary identified for Nesscliffe. However a few respondents stated that a development boundary would be appropriate and suggestion that the old development boundary should to restored.

Other Issues- Great Ness Cluster

During the consultation Great Ness and Little Ness Parish Council informed Shropshire Council that that they wished to identified Great Ness, Little Ness Wilcot, Hopton/Valeswood, Kinton and Felton Butler, as a community cluster in their own right to allow only infill development in these settlements. A number of comments in objection to this decision where received during consultation;

1. Object to the designation of a Great Ness Cluster. It is against the result of the survey which was conducted, where the majority of the residents stated a wish to remain as countryside
2. The Great Ness residents are against developments in our area and this was certainly made clear at the meeting. A survey of the resident's wishes had been made and it was overwhelmingly against development in what is conservation area. There are virtually no employment available within the parish and all workers will have to commute
3. I STRONGLY against our Parish Council's decision to make Great Ness a cluster and allow infill building. When the new planning scheme was first announced it was agreed that we should remain countryside, I don't understand why this decision is being changed in spite of the wishes of the majority of Great Ness residents. I believe that some small hamlets should be left as precisely that, to build everywhere and anywhere will destroy the whole essence of England.
4. A survey was conducted and the results which came back were; 20households- Countryside; 2 households- Cluster, one of those being the developer who wants to build in Great Ness; 2 abstentions and 4 surveys were not able to collect. Great Ness is a Conservation area, it is not on mains drainage, and our water pressure is poor. There are currently three houses in the village for sale, which have had little interest from buyers, so we do not need to have any more houses built in 'infill', when it would appear that there is no interest from people wishing to come and live in the ones that are currently for sale. We do not have any services to offer which would contribute to a

sustainable community, and the nearest bus stop is a half a mile away. In the housing needs survey no one in Great Ness voted for there to be any more housing in Great Ness, Affordable or Open market.

5. Parish Council RESOLVED that the settlements of Great Ness and Little Ness parish namely Wilcot, Hopton/Valeswood, Kinton, Felton Butler, Great Ness and Little Ness be considered a community cluster in their own right to allow only infill development in these settlements
6. On numerous occasions the Parish has been asked for its views on housing and each time the residents of Great Ness have stated that they wish to remain as countryside with no new development. The residents worked hard to gain conservation area status because they wanted to protect what they feel is an important and unique area of the Shropshire countryside. A designation of countryside may it is felt help in this protection.
7. I understand that at a recent meeting our Parish Council decided that the way forward for Great Ness was as a cluster development. I believe this was decided in the face of a local survey. I also believe that this survey was not a partial survey but took the views of the vast majority of residents and that the survey was overwhelmingly in favour of in direct Great Ness remaining to be designated as Countryside.
8. Residents of Great Ness have carried out a survey of all 27 households in the village and this has clearly indicated 20 for to 2 against with 4 non returns that the residents wish to remain as Countryside. Residents of Wilcot attended on 3rd July and clearly indicated their desire to remain open countryside.
9. I write to express to you my strong objections to the overruling of Great Ness residents' expressed wishes by the Parish Council who, regardless of their electorate, have chosen instead to opt for Great Ness to become a 'cluster' rather than 'countryside'. They have absolutely no mandate for this decision and a cynic might suspect that some councillors have personal if not pecuniary reasons for preferring the option which would allow further development within this hamlet.

BICTON HEATH, FOUR CROSSES AND MONTFORD BRIDGE

Question 41: Do you agree that Bicton village, Four Crosses area (part) and Montford Bridge (Montford Parish) should be a Community Cluster?

Out of the 53 respondents, a substantial majority (46 out of 53 (87%)) support the designation of the settlements as a Community Cluster, as the area is well served by services and facilities and the settlement already act as a Cluster. IT was also stated that development was required in rural areas to prevent further decline and sustain communities. However one respondent did comment that development in these areas would destroy their rural nature.

Question 42: Do you agree that the target of a further 15 new houses to be built in Bicton Village and part of the Four Crosses area (Shepherds Lane) by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 51 respondents, a substantial majority (48 out of 51 (82%)) support the housing target of a further 15 houses. However some respondents (4 out of 51) stated that Bicton should have a higher target as it has the capacity and services to accommodate more housing. Concern was raised that sufficient growth was required to ensure the on-going viability of services and facilities. It was also suggested that the housing target needs to be flexible in order to meet the future housing need over the plan period.

Question 43: Do you agree that the target of a further 10 new houses to be built in Montford Bridge (Montford Parish) by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 52 respondents, a substantial majority (44 out of 52 (85%)) support the housing target for Montford Bridge. One comment was received which suggest that self-build and individual development should be allowed.

Question 44: Do you agree that land should be allocated for a small group of 5-8 houses on site MNB2 (part) being land south-west of the Holyhead Road?

Out of the 50 respondents, a substantial majority (40 out of 50 (80%)) support the allocation of this site, as it was positively assessed through stage 1 and 2a and is relatively unconstrained. However Montford Parish Council do not support the allocation of the site, stating that they wish the housing target to be met through windfall site only and that each windfall sites should have a maximum of three to five new private houses and be in locations which are supported by Montford Parish Council at the time.

Question 45: Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Montford Bridge?

Out of the 47 respondents, a large majority (36 out of 47 (77%)) agree that Montford Bridge should not have a development boundary. However a few respondents feel that a development boundary around Montford Bridge would be appropriate as it will control the location of development and clarify where the village and open countryside begin and end. One respondent raised the issue that the proposed boundaries were already allocated as some farmers had already sold land for development.

Question 46: Do you agree with the development boundary for Bicton village?

Out of the 49 respondents, a substantial majority (41 out of 48 (84%)) support the development boundary for Bicton village. However a few respondents stated that the boundary was too tightly drawn and that there was insufficient land to meet the housing target. Suggestions to extend the boundary to include land near to Bicton School, the centre of the village and north of Holyhead Road were noted. One respondent raised the issue that the proposed boundaries were already allocated as some farmers had already sold land for development.

Question 47: Do you agree with the development boundary for the Four Crosses area (part – Shepherds Lane)?

Out of the 48 respondents, a substantial majority (39 out of 48 (81%)) support the development boundary for Four Crosses area. One respondent did suggest that the boundary act Shepherds Lane could be extended to the east in order to provide a more logical rounding off to the settlement and enable more flexibility for infill housing. One respondent raised the issue that the proposed boundaries were already allocated as some farmers had already sold land for development.

Alternative Sites in Bicton-Montford Cluster

1. Land adjoining Bicton School (BIC021sd) - the site is approx. 2.07 acres and is suitable and available for development. The site has no access, flooding or landscape constraints and is located next to existing development.
2. Land Adjoining Holyhead Road, Bicton (BIC008) - the site is approx. 1.97 acres and is available for development. The site has no access, flooding or landscape constraints and could accommodate 10-15 dwellings.

Other Points

1. Environment Agency

(Montford Parish) All located on Permo Triassic Sandstone – the majority within SPZ3 (except Bicton)

DORRINGTON, STAPLETON AND CONDOVER

Question 48: Do you agree that the settlements of Dorrington, Stapleton and Condover should be a Community Cluster?

Out of the 60 respondent, a substantial majority (459 out of 60 (82%)) support the designation of a Community Cluster as the settlements share a functional relationship due to their close proximity and shared services and facilities. The plan growth will prevent decline and sustain the communities for the future. One respondent did comment that Condover and Dorrington could equally be designation as separate Community Hubs as they both have the appropriate facilities and services. Another respondent stated that Stapleton should not be included in the cluster as it was a much smaller settlement with different needs.

Question 49: Do you think that the target of a further 55-60 houses to be built in Condover (20-25), Dorrington (about 30) and Stapleton (about 5) by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 61 respondents, a large majority (45 out of 61 (74%)) support the overall and individual housing targets for the cluster. A few respondents stated that Condover, Dorrington and Stapleton are all capable of accommodating more development, as the current levels are not sustainable. However, a few respondents stated that the target for Dorrington and Stapleton was not too high. It was considered that Stapleton has a lack of amenities and infrastructure capacity and therefore no development should occur. Concern was also raised that any further development in Dorrington should be phased over the plan and would need to provide a safe pedestrian crossing, speed reminder measures and safe access off the A49.

Question 50: Do you agree that site CON006, being land opposite the school (0.3Ha), should be allocated for about 5-10 houses?

Out of the 52 respondents, a substantial majority (42 out of 52 (81%)) support the inclusion of this site; one respondent stated that the development should include 2 affordable properties. However another respondent stated that development of this site would result in undesired ribbon development. Another respondent highlighted the existing car parking problems at the school and suggested that this land could be used as a drop off/ collection point for pupils.

Question 51: Do you agree that site CON005, being land east of Shrewsbury road (0.2Ha), should be allocated for about 5-10 houses?

Out of the 52 respondents, a substantial majority (42 out of 52 (81%)) support the inclusion of this site; one respondent stated that the development should include 2 affordable properties. A few respondents stated that development of this site would result in undesired ribbon development and consideration of an extension of CON006 would be preferable. A

respondent also raised concern about the capacity of the school and the current car parking issues.

Question 52: Do you agree with the development boundary for Condover?

Out of the 51 respondents, a substantial majority (41 out of 51 (80%)) support the development boundary for Condover, a respondent stated that they support the extension of the boundary to include Home Farm. A few respondents stated that the boundary should be extended further to include alternative sites (alternative sites detailed below).

Question 53: Do you agree that site DOR004, being land off Forge Way (0.6Ha), should be allocated for about 15 houses?

Out of the 61 respondent, a substantial majority (49 out of 61 (80%)) support the inclusion of this site as it provides a good mix of houses, including starter homes and bungalows for the elderly. It also provides a safe pedestrian crossing through the village. However some respondents object to the site due to the proposed access onto the A449, which is already dangerous and difficult to use. There was also concern that the site was not suitable for 30 houses and would be too dense a development. Another issue raised was the impact to the heritage assets in the area, especially the Church.

Question 54: Do you agree with the development boundary for Dorrington?

Out of the 58 respondents, a substantial majority (48 out of 58 (83%)) support the proposed development boundary for Dorrington. Some respondent did state that the identified open space areas should be acknowledge on the development boundary map, in order to protect these areas. Some respondents did object any of the proposed changes to the development boundary, stated that Dorrington has seen substantial growth in recent year, and any further growth should be retained in the existing boundary. Specifically concern was raised about the inclusion of land known a Lower Folds (Eastern Boundary), as the land is prone to flooding and not suitable for any form of development. Some respondents also suggested alternative sites that should be included in the boundary (details of alternative sites given below).

Question 55: Do you agree with the development boundary for Stapleton?

Out of the 52 respondents, a substantial majority (45 out of 51 (88%)) support the development boundary for Stapleton. One respondent stated that the boundary should be extended to the north east adjacent to Manor Court as this would be a logical location for development. Another respondent stated that whilst they support the proposed boundary, local residents should have input now in identify appropriate location for minimal development as this would be more consistent with the principles of localism and likely to produce a better outcome.

Alternative Sites in Dorrington, Stapleton and Condover

1. Land to the south of the Old Vicarage Dorrington (DOR017)- 13 respondents, including the Parish Council support the inclusion of this site, for the following reasons;
 - a. The site would provide a mix of market and affordable housing, including the potential for housing for the elderly. It is well related to the village and is close to community facilities. The site has no known access; infrastructure; residential amenity; landscape; heritage or flooding constraints. It will also provide a safe cycle and pedestrian route, which is a significant benefit, enabling increased and

- safer connectivity between the west and east sides of the village. Therefore this site should be allocated for 16 houses.
- b. This site exits onto Church Road, which is clearly the better proposition with the Church Road/A49 junction offering a much improved safety aspect, compared to the Forge Way site (DOR004).
 - c. Would meet Government requirements and enhance village facilities.
 - d. The proposed entrance being on Church Road is firstly far enough away from the school to not cause any additional traffic issues. I also feel that accessing the A49 from Church Road is safer than accessing from Forge Way. The A49 as you are aware is a very busy main road and having driven out of both junctions the visibility is considerably better from Church Road. The proposed site behind the Old Vicarage is centrally located and will not block any existing views or affect the privacy of any existing residents, the other proposed sites cannot guarantee this. Having already had my view detrimentally affected by development I would not want this to happen to other residents. 3) The proposed development could provide the villagers especially the children with a safer and improved pedestrian and cycle route through the village. 4) The development at the Old Vicarage would contain the development neatly and in a logical way.
 - e. It would be a massive boost to the community and for the school and does not affect anybody apart from the Landowners whom welcome this development.
 - f. Well situated within the village and appears to be the most logical place for future housing development.
 - g. A good mix of properties for not only young people, but also families and older couples and would be centrally located in the village giving easy access to all amenities. It also means that the village would be developed within its current boundaries and not extended into the greenfield land to the north of the village off the busy A49, which is less suitable as, being on the outskirts, would definitely increase traffic to the school, shop, church and doctor's surgery as well as turning Dorrington into more of a ribbon village. This development will meet the housing need and provide an improved safer pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare through the centre of the village to the amenities.
 - h. Appears to be an ideal and very practical solution to the requirement for more mixed housing, the location being conducive to social integration within the village community and very close to the existing village amenities
2. Land in Condover (CON003), lying immediately to the rear of the school, as identified on the attached plan should be allocated for residential development.
 3. Land at Home Farm, Condover- The site is capable of accommodation the development required in Condover and would partly involve the use of a brownfield site. Development would not result in loss of productive agricultural land. The site has no known constraints in terms of landscape, infrastructure and access. (New Site)
 4. Land to the South of Falkland Road- can provide the identified housing need for Dorrington and would complete and consolidate the built form while respecting the village layout. There are no known constraints to the use of the site. The site is available immediately and residential development including affordable housing is deliverable.
 5. Land to rear of Sunny Cottage (DOR007) should be allocated instead of DOR004. DOR007 fits national policy better and can accommodate the 30 dwellings and required recreation land. The site is within the development boundary, is surrounded by existing development and has a suitable access.
 6. Re-consider the allocation of CON001- It is acknowledged that the site is separate from the main part of the village unless CON003 is development. Never the less the site is adjacent to community facilities. There is the opportunity to offer extension to community facilities: - Extension to school grounds with allocation of CON003; Extension to community sports fields as part of CON001; Provision of better sport; recreation and community facilities with extension to the development boundary by including CON001

and CON003 with appropriate cross funding and Provision for community led development; self-build plots; or other innovative mixed use developments.

Other Issues-

1. Allocation of Land to the rear of The Old Vicarage (DOR017)-

During the consultation process, Condover Parish Council informed Shropshire Council that they wished to allocate DOR017 as an additional preferred site, for 15 dwellings. This potential allocation was supported by a further 12 representation (details given above). However 3 respondents object to the potential inclusion of the site for the following reasons

1. 1) Large development altering the delicate balance of the village 2. Potential damage to the rural character and vista of St Edwards Church 3. Two link roads to adjacent sites that have not been identified for development indicate the scale of this proposal 4. Access onto Church Road is near the School and the Church, is narrow at that point and is already a "rabbit run" at times. 5. Access onto the A49 major trunk road is already difficult and the increased traffic flow would further hinder the flow of traffic and put people in danger. 6. Extra traffic generally in the area of the school and near the shop will be dangerous, particularly for the elderly and young children. 7. A massive development like this will overwhelm the physical infrastructure of the village 8. The proposal will intensify land usage and the views and privacy of the Forge residents, St Edwards Church and the grave yard will be affected. AS will The Old Vicarage!!
2. I do not agree with this site being included in the development boundary. The extra traffic would overburden an already busy junction. There is no pavement for part of this road and it goes straight past the school which is busy anyway. It would not be safe for significantly more vehicles to use this area.
3. I am concerned that the vicarage site that has recently been put forward is not identified here for consultation. If the developer is able to ensure traffic comes out of forge way, I would agree with it. If the development exits on to church road I would object. Church road is narrow, limited foot ways, next to the local school which can get congested. 15 dwellings which have been suggested would bring substantial extra vehicles. I am cautious about this site. Church road safety was an area of concern identified through the parish plan questionnaire. A safe pedestrian crossing on the A49 is vital if this development is agreed. CIL contributions should be directed towards youth activities/shelter, play area maintenance, village hall support and contributions to other village groups.

GRAFTON, FOTZ, MYTTON AND FORTON HEATH

Question 56: Do you agree that the settlements of Grafton, Fitz, Mytton and Forton Heath should be a Community Cluster?

Out of the 47 respondents, a substantial majority (42 out of 47 (89%)) support the designation as a Cluster. Some respondents stated that was important to have growth in the rural areas to prevent decline and sustain communities. However some respondents objected to the designation for the following reasons; none of the settlements have a complete set of facilities, vehicle journeys would increase in order to reach facilities and the development would blight the traditional rural communities.

Question 57: Do you think that the target of a further 10-25 houses to be built in the Community Cluster?

Out of the 47 respondents, a substantial majority (39 out of 47 (83%)) support the houses target across the cluster. One respondent stated that support was subject to an identified need, substantial proportion of local people and affordable homes and sympathetic rural design. A concern was also raised about the increase vehicle movements because of the lack of facilities and the further impact to an already congested rural environment.

Question 68: Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for these settlements?

Out of the 47 respondents, a substantial majority (39 out of 47 (83%)) agree that no development boundary should be identified.

Alternative Sites in Grafton, Fitz, Mytton and Forton Heath

1. Consider allocating Land at Mytton Mill, Forton Heath for 16 dwellings (in additional to the 9 already granted). an allocation would ensure that new development would be focussed on one of the larger of the four settlements included in the Cluster, would assist in securing a viable future for Mytton Mill itself and would represent a sound and sustainable approach to development of the area through containment of development and conversion of an existing property. Containment of development at Mytton Mill as proposed would also assist in preventing sporadic encroachment into the open countryside, in circumstances where none of the four villages have identified settlement boundaries, making it difficult to resist new development on the edges of the settlements. Allocating Mytton Mill would also assist in preventing the four settlements within the Community Cluster from coalescing.

HANWOOD AND HANWOOD BANK

Question 59: Do you agree that the settlements of Hanwood and Hanwood Bank should be a Community Cluster?

Out of the 47 respondents, a substantial majority (42 out of 47 (89%)) support the designation as a Community Cluster. One of the reasons for the support is the acknowledgment that rural communities need growth in order to prevent decline and sustain communities. A respondent did comments that development needed to be concentrated in the centre of the village, to prevent further ribbon development.

Question 60: Do you think that the target of a further 10-50 houses to be built in Hanwood and Hanwood Bank by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 49 respondents, a substantial majority (41 out of 49 (84%)) supported the target for housing. A respondent commented that the target could be higher, due to the easy access to the A5 and Shrewsbury. It was also stated again that housing should be located in the centre of the village. A few respondents did state that the figure was too high, with a maximum of 10 and 30 being suggested. Consideration should also be given to allow self-build and individual developments.

Question 61: Do you agree that site HAN011/R, being land west of the school (1Ha) should be allocated for approximately 30 houses?

Out of the 51 respondents, a large majority (39 out of 51 (76%)) support the inclusion of the site as it is a logical site for extending the village, it will support the local school and services and potential provide traffic calming and pedestrian crossing near to the school. The main concern was that the development of this site would eventually lead to the coalescence of the settlements of Hanwood and Cruckmeole, creating even more of a linear village. Some respondents suggested that development should be focussed in the centre of the village, widening the village rather than continuing to lengthen it.

Question 62: Do you agree with the development boundary for Hanwood and Hanwood Bank?

Out of the 48 respondents, a substantial majority (39 out of 48 (81%)) agree with the development boundary. A few respondents did state that land near the old mines, brickyard, clay pit and quarry should be allocated for development, as they would widening the village rather than lengthening it and potential merging the settlements of Hanwood and Cruckmeole.

Alternative Sites in Hanwood and Hanwood Bank

1. Pontesbury Parish Council would also support development of Land to the south of the A488 to include part of land reference HAN013 and farmland between Pound Lane and the Parish boundary (not included in SAMDev). A line extending from 50m south of the railway line on Pound Lane and running roughly parallel to the railway line as far as the rear of properties on Orchard Lane in Hanwood Parish as the furthest southern limit

Other Points

1. Environment Agency

Landfill located approximately 150m to the east of the site. Possible shallow groundwater.

LONGDEN, HOOK-A-GATE, ANNCROST, LONGDEN COMMON, LOWER COMMON/ EXFORDS GREEN

Question 63: Do you agree that the settlements of Longden, Hook-a-Gate, Annscroft, Longden Common, Lower Common/Exfords Green should be a Community Cluster?

Out of the 57 respondents, a substantial majority (50 out of 57 (88%)) support the designation of a Community Cluster. Some respondent stated that it was important that growth is allowed in the rural areas to prevent decline and sustain communities. The Parish Council stated their wish for development to be focus in Longden as it is the largest settlement and contains the majority of services and facilities. This statement was also support by a number of respondents.

Question 64: Do you think that the target of a further 10-50 houses to be built in this Community Cluster by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 58 respondents, a substantial majority (49 out of 58 (84%)) support the housing target for the Cluster. Some respondents stated that the development should be small scale or individual, infill or conversions, in line with the aspirations of the Parish Council and local residents. However some respondents stated that a more precise figure needed to be decided as the range was to large, with some respondents suggestion target of 25, whilst others where suggesting nearer 50. Concern was raised that a target of 50 would not be achievable through infill and conversion alone and allocation of Greenfield extension sites would need to occur.

Question 65: Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Longden, Hook-a-Gate, Annscroft, Longden Common, Lower Common/Exfords Green?

Out of the 54 respondents, a substantial majority (46 out of 54 (85%)) agree that no development boundary should be identified for any of the settlements. A respondent stated the emphasis should not be on whether a proposed development in positioned on the correct side of an arbitrary line but should rather take account of all issues of sustainability. However a respondent stated that a development boundary for Longden would prevent sprawl outside of the village.

Alternative Sites in Longden, Hook-a-Gate, Annscroft, Longden Common, Lower Common/Exfords Green

1. Land to the northern side of Longden (LON020sd)- The site is approx. 1.4 acres and is within walking distance to the village facilities. It is considered the best and most sustainable housing opportunity available. The site has no access, flooding or landscape constraints and is available immediately. It is suitable for up to 15 dwellings, phased over time to meet the needs
2. Land at the southern edge of the village- the site is approx. 1.1 acres and is available for development immediately. The site has no access, flooding or landscape constraints and could accommodate up to 10 dwellings.
3. Land to the west of the Rectory, Longden. This site, which is entirely owned by the Diocese, represents a suitable location for a small scale housing development and can be delivered in the early years of the plan period.

MERRINGTON, OLDWOODS AND WALFORD HEATH

Question 66: Do you agree that the settlements of Merrington, Oldwoods and Walford Heath should be a Community Cluster?

Out of the 47 respondents, a substantial majority (39 out of 47 (83%)) support the designation as a Community Cluster.

Question 67: Do you think that the target of a further 10-25 houses to be built in this Community Cluster by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 48 respondents, a large majority (37 out of 48 (77%)) support the housing target. Some respondents suggested the Walford Heath and Old Woods should be the focus for development as they are more suitable for development than Merrington, which has a more scattered rural character and appearance. However other respondents stated that no development should take place as there is a lack of facilities and would spoil the beautiful rural character of the area. One respondent also stated that Old Woods is not appropriate for further development due to poor road services and risk of flooding.

Question 68: Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for these settlements?

Out of the 46 respondents, a substantial majority (39 out of 46 (85%)) agree that no development boundary should be identified. A respondent did suggest that Walford Heath should have a boundary to include land at Walford Heath Nurseries.

Alternative Sites in Merrington, Oldwoods and Walford Heath

1. Land at Walford Heath Nurseries (WALFH001)- the site is approx. 1.7 acres and is deliverable and available. There are no known flooding or landscape constraints.
2. Land Adj Broad View, Old woods (OLD001sd)- development of this site would consolidate existing built development, rather than extending the village into open countryside. The site could accommodate 6 dwellings and could be design in respect to the existing built form. There are no constraints to development of the site.

Other Points

2. Environment Agency

Mixed superficial deposits overlying the Permo-Triassic sandstone. The area to the SE of Merrington lies within a SPZ. There are a number of private supplies in the area. extensive drift deposits with a number of private supplies in the area.

UFFINGTON

Question 69: Do you think that the target of about 5 houses to be built in Uffington by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 47 respondents, a large majority (37 out of 47 (79%)) support the housing target for Uffington. Uffington Parish Council commented that 4 for the 5 houses should be allocated on the preferred site (UFF06/10) and the remaining one house should be infill development. However some respondents felt that a target of 5 houses was not appropriate and that more housing was required to meet local need and to address the imbalance of

housing stock in the locality. One respondent suggested that a target of 10-15 houses could be accommodated.

Question 70: Do you agree that site UFF06/10, being land between Manor Farm and Top Cottages, should be allocated for up to 5 houses?

Out of the 46 respondents, a substantial majority (39 out of 46 (85%)) support the inclusion of the site for up to 5 houses. The Parish Council confirmed its support for the site, but stated that it should only be allocated for 4 houses. A respondent did raise concern that the land owner is unwilling to release the land, questioning the deliverability of the site.

Question 71: Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for Uffington?

Out of the 45 respondents, a large majority (33 out of 45 (73%)) agree that no development boundary should be identified. One respondent did argue that a development boundary should be drawn and that the route of the old canal should be protected from development that would prevent the future restoration of the canal.

Alternative Sites in Uffington

1. Land south of Uffington (UFF004) - The site immediately borders the existing housing to the north with a farmstead to south. Should housing be permitted on this land it would provide a natural extension to the linear form of the village. Development would be best situated on the road frontage only to match the mentioned existing linear form, however, if required the whole site is available. Housing already exists on the opposite side of the road and any development would provide infill between the existing built form of the village – the farmstead providing a natural boundary to the south. Safe access can be easily achieved, services are readily available and the site is deliverable immediately.
2. Reconsider site UFF002/09- Do not agree with the Councils conclusion that the site is “not well related to existing built up area; to south of main settlement”. The site lies some 0.2 miles from the main focal point of the village; The Corbet Arms and 0.3miles south of the Village Hall. Considering both its adjoining footpath and residential properties (Top Cottages), we do not feel this site can be considered to be not well related, specifically as it is located only some 0.1miles south of that site proposed for allocation. This site should be considered as an opportunity to create a logical extension to village.
3. Land to the rear of Vine Cottage- Development of the site would form infill development in the centre of Uffington. The site has its own access and no known flooding constraints.

Other Issues

3. Uffington Maintaining the Footpath Network

Any development taking place in Uffington should bear in mind any impact it will have upon the footpath network, and should seek preserving the attractiveness of the network.

WESTON LULLINGFIELDS, WESTON WHARF AND WESTON COMMON

Question 72: Do you agree that the settlements of Weston Lullingfields, Weston Wharf and Weston Common should be a Community Cluster?

Out of the 44 respondents, a substantial majority (36 out of 44 (82%)) support the designation as a Community Cluster. Some respondents stated that it was important that growth was allowed in rural areas to prevent decline and sustain communities.

Question 73: Do you think that the target of a further 15-25 houses to be built in this Community Cluster by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 43 respondents, a large majority (34 out of 43 (79%)) support the housing target. As growth is required to sustain communities, one respondent even stated that more houses were required. However a few respondents stated that no more development should occur as it was already over developed and would spoil the open countryside.

Question 74: Do you agree that no development boundary should be identified for these settlements?

Out of the 42 respondents, a substantial majority (35 out of 42 (83%)) agree that no development boundary should be identified. However one respondent raised concern that without a development boundary or identification of areas that development will be permissible could result in the Cluster being regarded as 'countryside' that would restrict any development.

Question 75: Do you agree that an extension to the existing operational site at Gonsal Farm should be the preferred option for mineral extraction?

The majority of respondents (67% of 54 respondents) support identification of the quarry as a preferred option. The key issues identified against the site include the size and proximity of the northern extension to the villages of Conover and Ryton; traffic generation on rural roads; noise; dust; impacts on wildlife and the tourism economy; and the potential after-use of the site for waste management. There is concern that public access to the restored quarry will be restricted. However, there is recognition that further development could deliver a new road link which could alleviate existing local traffic management issues generated by traffic from a range of uses, including the existing quarry.

Other Points

4. Environment Agency

Overlie extensive drift deposits with a number of private supplies in the area.

COUNTRYSIDE AREAS IN PLACE PLAN AREA

Comments raised by respondents of Alderbury with Cardeston Parish, including Halfway House and Wattlesborough Heath.

Of the 5 respondents, 40% stated a desire to be reconsidered as Community Cluster. Given reasons for this include insufficient public consultation and consideration, with the final vote being cast by the Chairman after a tied vote, with no consideration given to a further public meeting. A respondent commented that it is felt that designation as countryside will mean that the settlements cannot adequately respond to SAMDev. Alderbury with Cardeston Parish Council voted to continue to be designated Open Countryside, until further notice or formal review.

Alternative Sites:

1. T.O. Tomlins Ltd Yard, Station Road, Halfway House, Shrewsbury, SY5 9DB, for 0.92 ha residential, and 1.33 ha leisure development. Reasons for development included its brownfield state, taking into consideration existing features, such as landscape quality and wildlife habitat; and its defensible boundaries to north, and east, where required.
2. Abbey Lane, Alderbury, proposed for housing, with an application currently on hold due to the areas designation as countryside.

Comments raised by respondents on Ford.

One respondent provided comments on Ford. The respondent highlighted that Ford should have put itself forward as a community hub or cluster, allowing a small amount of development over the plan period to enable prosperity and support the community.

Wem Place Plan Area

Wem

Question 1: Do you think that the target of a further 330 houses to be built in Wem by 2026 is appropriate?

Some respondents comment that the reduction in numbers is disappointing and that additional housing, perhaps at a smaller scale than that envisaged, would help to attract and retain families, address local needs for affordable housing and enhance the vitality and viability of the town. However, of 52 responses, the majority view (65%) is that local infrastructure such as roads, schools, doctors, dentists, and the sewerage system are already at capacity and the introduction of new residents to the area will create an even greater burden. This view is corroborated by responses to the Town Council's own questionnaire on the same question. Some respondents argue that local infrastructure and employment opportunities must be improved before additional housing is planned since there is limited local employment opportunity and many people shop where they work. Development around Wem is constrained by the fact that much of the surrounding land is reclaimed marsh with a very high water table. Wem Town Council has asked for further discussion with a view to substantially reducing the proposed scale of housing growth.

Question 2: Do you think that the target of 4 hectares of employment land to be provided in Wem by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority of respondents (70% of 50 responses) support additional employment provision and promotion of the town's potential as an employment location in order to protect the economic future of the town, to encourage more local employment opportunity and to address existing high levels of out-commuting for work. This view is corroborated by responses to the Town Council's own questionnaire on the same question. However, many respondents also note that there remain empty units on existing employment land and suggest that existing provision should be improved or extended before developing a new location. Some respondents express concern about the traffic implications of a second employment area south of the town.

Question 3: Do you agree that site WEM003a, being land off Pym's Road (11.2Ha), should be allocated for 300 houses?

The majority of respondents (70% of 54 responses) do not support this site because of the impact of its development on existing infrastructure constraints, particularly the highway network and traffic congestion and because concerns about adverse impacts on the amenity of existing residents and the presence of drainage constraints on site. This view is corroborated by responses to the Town Council's own questionnaire on the same question. However, in many cases, the outcome for this site reflects wider concern about the scale of proposed development and the proposal to concentrate most development on a single site. A number of respondents recognise that this is the 'less busy side of the town' and that the site represents the best of the available options. This location is acknowledged as being close to the local schools and easy within walking distance of town centre amenities and that this will encourage greener transport modes and reduce short car trips.

Question 4: Do you agree that site WEM012 (1.25Ha), being land at Tilley, should be allocated for 30 houses?

A small majority of respondents (56% of 50 responses) do not support this site because of its proximity to the floodplain of the River Roden and the likelihood that its development would exacerbate existing drainage, flooding and sewerage issues. This view is corroborated by responses to the Town Council's own questionnaire on the same question. Access to the site through the existing estate road would exacerbate existing congestion problems which derive

the narrowness of the road and its alignment. There are also concerns about the need to maintain separation from the village of Tilley to the south.

Alternative Sites in Wem

1. A better area for development would be the triangle of land, between the B5476 and B5063, on the south side of Wem before the railway bridge. At least here the volume of traffic needing to cross Wem would be greatly reduced, as any people moving into new housing in Wem will not be employed there. I am unsure if this area has already been considered.
2. Propose the land between Soulton Road, the edge of the town, the railway and Wem Industrial Estate as alternative for 300 houses as one of the joint owners
3. Any future sites put forward for consideration should be suitable for development and not prone to flooding. Preference for development to the north of the town so consideration should be given to sites not previously promoted by their landowners.

Question 5: Do you agree that site ELR031a (5.3Ha) should be allocated for up to 4 hectares of employment land?

A substantial majority (75% of 44 responses) support identification of this site. This view is corroborated by responses to the Town Council's own questionnaire on the same question, The location of the site is considered to have less of an impact on cross town traffic. High quality, high tech business or office units are preferred to industrial uses which are already catered for at Soulton Road. However, some concern is expressed about traffic impacts in general and the limitations of the low railway bridge in particular. There may be a need to upgrade the Shrewsbury Road/Shawbury Road junction. Some respondents are concerned that the development of a greenfield site is being proposed when there is still development land in or adjacent to the existing industrial estate.

Question 6: Do you agree with the proposed Primary Shopping Area for Wem?

A substantial majority (81% of 42 responses) agree with the identified primary shopping area. However, a number of respondents suggest extending the area west of the High Street up to the junction with Castle Court or a little further east down Aston Street. It is noted that the current area does not include the proposed doubling of the Co-op store which is due to be extended and only includes the east boundary of the new town square. Others are concerned that any changes should focus on the improvement and development of existing businesses rather than changing the character of the town through the introduction of large national retail outlets or supermarkets which would unbalance Wem's fragile but slowly improving economy.

Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Wem?

A small majority (57% of 42 responses) do not agree with the new development boundary, principally because of the proposed inclusion within the boundary of the new sites which were identified as Preferred Options. There is a view that the development boundary should remain unchanged until infrastructure capacity is improved. Views differ regarding potential alternative directions for growth with some respondents acknowledging that the existing boundary is drawn very tightly around Wem and suggesting that sites to the north east of the town. Others agree with the current strategy not to allocate site for development east of the railway line because of existing traffic issues. An alternative suggestion is to focus development within the triangle of land between the B5476 and B5063.

Question 8: Do you agree that Shawbury should be a Community Hub?

The vast majority of respondents (91% of 34 responses) support identification of Shawbury as a hub to maintain its current role, to help sustain existing facilities and services and to provide affordable housing.

Question 9: Do you agree that the target of 50 houses to be built in Shawbury by 2026 is appropriate?

The vast majority of respondents (77% of 34 responses) support a target of a further 50 houses

Question 10: Do you agree that 15 hectares of employment land should be created in Shawbury over the next 14 years to accommodate a successful existing local business in need of significant expansion?

Shawbury PC was unanimous in opposing the identification of 15Ha of employment land due to a lack of convincing evidence of efforts to locate alternative sites in the locality or that the company will develop as suggested. However, a majority of respondents (71% of 24 responses) did support the provision of additional employment land, although some felt that the scale of the proposed allocation was excessive.

Question 11: Do you agree that site SHAW004, being land to the rear of Brickyard Farm, Poynton Road, should be allocated for 50 houses?

The majority of respondents (72% of 32 responses), including the Parish Council, supported the identification of this site, as the best location for housing and because of the significant community benefits which would be provided. Some concerns were raised about the potential for adverse impacts from aircraft taking off and landing at RAF Shawbury, the need for careful design of surface water drainage and the potential for contamination issues associated with adjacent land uses.

Question 12: Do you agree that land adjacent to Shawbury Industrial Estate (15 hectares), should be allocated as employment land?

Whilst Shawbury PC was unanimous in opposing the identification of this site, the majority of respondents (73% of 22 responses) supported its allocation. Some concern was raised regarding the size and location of the site and water management issues should development proceed.

Question 13: Do you agree with the proposed new development boundary for Shawbury?

The majority of respondents (87% of 31 responses) supported the proposed development boundary.

Question 14: Do you agree that the settlements of Whixall, Hollinwood, Welsh End, Platt Lane, Stanley Green, Dobson's Bridge, Browns Brook and Moss Cottages should be a Community Cluster?

The majority of respondents (61% of 31 responses) support identification of these settlements in the parish of Whixall as a cluster. Although local consultation revealed a positive view of the proposed 'cluster' overall, the parish council has indicated that it would like to return to being classed as 'open countryside' to give them more time to consider in more detail how to manage future development in the parish. The Canal & River Trust are concerned about the potential impact of infill development at Dobsons Bridge on the integrity of the canal corridor. Other respondents are concerned about water management issues including non mains drainage and surface water management.

Question 15: Do you think that the level of development over the period to 2026 for these settlements, i.e. up to 2 new dwellings per year across the cluster as infill development and building conversions, is appropriate?

Although the majority of respondents (64% of 25 responses) consider that the suggested level of development is appropriate, the parish council has indicated that it would like to return to being classed as 'open countryside' to give them more time to consider in more detail how to manage future development in the parish. Some respondents consider that the proposed level is too high due to the limitations of existing local infrastructure, in particular drainage and traffic issues. There is also support for a higher level of development to come forward as windfall, outside established development boundaries on its merits.

Question 16: Do you agree with the development boundary for Hollinwood?

The majority of respondents (76% of 21 responses) consider that the existing development boundary should be retained, although there is some support for it to be extended or removed.

Question 17: Do you agree with the development boundary for Platt Lane?

The majority of respondents (77% of 22 responses) consider that the existing development boundary should be retained, although there is some support for it to be extended or removed.

Question 18: Do you agree with the development boundary for Stanley Green?

The majority of respondents (76% of 21 responses) consider that the existing development boundary should be retained, although there is some support for it to be extended or removed.

Question 19: Do you agree with the development boundary for Whixall?

The majority of respondents (70% of 20 responses) consider that the existing development boundary should be retained, although there is some support for it to be extended or removed.

Alternative Sites and Hubs and Clusters?

1. Do not support development at the Hill, Grinshill: inappropriate scale, inadequate highway access. Need to support local infrastructure through additional development is not proven, impact on visitors to Corbet Wood, majority of local residents in parish survey do not support additional development in the parish;
2. Harmer Hill should be identified as either a Hub or as a cluster with Myddle;
3. Suggests Coton as part of a cluster;
4. Promoting inclusion of Harmer Hill and site HH001;
5. Wem Rural Parish Council has resolved to stay as 'Countryside';
6. Grinshill wishes to stay a "Stand alone/countryside" community with no development. This is on the understanding that development would be permitted for Affordable Homes on Single Plot Exception sites subject to the criteria being met. It follows, therefore that the proposal for development from residents on The Hill will not be given the support from Grinshill Parish Council.
7. Weston under Redcastle Parish Council wishes to remain a stand-alone community with no identified cluster. The only building would be infill or maybe an affordable home, although no large scale building outside the development boundary.
8. At their recent meeting on the 3 July, Wem Rural Parish Council voted to continue to class the whole parish as 'countryside'. I believe this to be a hugely lost opportunity to maintain a vibrant and healthy local community, and so I now make the same submission to Shropshire Council's SAMDev consultation. The area at Highfields, to the north of Wem should be identified as a cluster. Promotes land for self-build development which would release an existing property elsewhere in the area.
9. Northwood should be designated as an area suitable for general development. The PC has not put Northwood forward as a Hub or a Cluster and development would be restricted to agricultural workers dwellings or affordable housing (no CIL monies).

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

Northwood could easily accommodate market housing and a proportion of affordable homes. This would allow for gradual sustained growth, in a village which has good road links to local towns and schools. CIL funds could support investment in village facilities. Suggest LHS and RHS as you enter Northwood from Wem - opportunity for a safer road alignment.

10. Hadnall ideal for extra housing: on a main road and is declining village due to the PC not being forward thinking. School needs more children and may close if it does not grow. The Post office has already been closed and the local pub has closed down on occasion due to lack of patronage. The village hall is threatened with closure as the committee is struggling to recruit new members - impact on the playschool. Existing development boundary cuts through parts of property not edges. Potential to develop into a thriving centre but needs new young blood to take it forward and housing which will attract newcomers with fresh ideas to enable the village to become a thriving community.
11. Myddle & Broughton should remain countryside;
12. The MOD is disappointed that there are no references to RAF Shawbury within these documents given their importance within the local economy.
13. Sansaw Estate: Neither Hadnall nor Clive has been identified as a Community Hub or Cluster at the discretion of the Parish Council(s) concerned. There should be an explanation of why settlements that might be regarded as currently sustainable are not being allocated further development.
14. Promoting site in Brown Heath near Loppington, registered in SHLAA as BRW001;
15. Promoting site in Grinshill, registered in SHLA as GRN002;
16. Promoting site HH002;
17. promotes a site for market development, registered with SHLAA as COT001;
18. Promoting site HAD004.

Whitchurch Place Plan Area

Whitchurch

Question 1: Do you think that the target of a further 730 houses to be built in Whitchurch by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 56 respondents, 31 (55%) support the housing target for Whitchurch, as it will lead to sustainable levels of growth, supporting the existing employment, services and facilities. Some respondents stated that they would support the target providing that; employment sites were developed first and that development was designed to enhance the local environment not have a detrimental impact on road network, particularly Wrexham road and includes higher levels of affordable housing. A number of respondents also stated that the target was too low and more housing was required to ensure the viability of Whitchurch. On the other hand, 23 respondents (41%) objected to the target, mainly due to the lack of employment opportunities, which would lead to higher levels of commuting. It was accepted that the plan proposed more employment sites, however there was concern that there is already existing empty units, so this would not solve the employment issue. Other reasons for objecting to the target included; the negative impact to the local character of the area; the lack of services and facilities, which would not be able to cope with the increase in demand; the loss of open space and use of greenfield sites; negative impact on the road network and the concern that there is no need for this amount of housing, as there are already empty properties. Some respondents did argue that whilst the target was too high, a lower figure would be more acceptable.

Question 2: Do you think that the target of a further 15 hectares of employment land to be provided in Whitchurch by 2026 is appropriate?

Out of the 51 respondents, a large majority (40 out of 51 (78%)) support the employment target for Whitchurch, as employment is critical for the prosperity of the town. Some respondents added that they would support the target providing that sites were only brought forward if and when required, with the empty units being filled before new development occurred. They also stated that they should be developed before the additional housing sites and brownfield sites should be prioritised. However some respondents objected to the target as there is currently no demand for employment sites, as there are a number of empty units already within the town. It was stated that allocating sites for employment does not automatically mean that additional employment will move into the town.

Question 3: Do you agree that site WHIT009 (28.5ha), being land west of Tilstock Road, should be allocated for about 307 houses?

Out of the 50 respondents, a large majority (38 out of 50 (76%)) support the inclusion of the site, as it is in a sustainable location and has significant community benefits, particularly the provision of sports pitches. This site is also supported by the Parish Council, who have stated that site WHIT008 should be removed and the extra 60 dwelling allocation be added to this site. Other respondents stated that they would support the development providing that the development includes road infrastructure improvements, particularly new cycle and pedestrian links and is sensitively landscaped to prevent it being overbearing when viewed from the A41. Shropshire Wildlife Trust also stated that the site has ecological value, with presence of water voles and species rich wet meadow, as such development will need to take this into account. The reasons given for objecting to the sites allocation related to the negative, urbanising impact to the character of the town and that the site is located within a sand and gravel extraction safeguarded area.

Question 4: Do you agree that site WHIT046 (3.6ha), being land at Mount Farm, should be allocated for about 100 houses?

Out of the 47 respondents, the majority (31 out of 47 (66%)) support the inclusion of this site, as it is in a suitable location, provides ecological enhancements and will have an impact on the approach to the town. It was also stated that new development on the site should include a new access and cycle route. However, 16 respondents (34%) objected to the inclusion of the site, stating that development would be too prominent or overbearing in the townscape and that the access off Haroldgate is not suitable to accommodate the level of traffic. Other issues raised included; impact on residential amenity; loss of agricultural land; the isolation of the site from employment and other services and the presence of TPO on site.

Question 5: Do you agree that site WHIT037 (2.1Ha), being land south of Wrexham Road, should be allocated for about 60 houses?

Out of the 97 respondents, a substantial majority (81 out of 97 (84%)) object to the inclusion of the site. The main reason for objects to the site relates to the existing highways issues along Wrexham Road, concern was raised that the road is already very busy, dangerous and has blind spots due to on road car parking. As such it was it is considered to be unacceptable to further increase traffic flow, which would lead to a worsening of the existing traffic issues. Other issues highlighted include; negative impact on the local character, environment and wildlife, which could include water voles; the loss of agricultural land and that development has already been concentrated too much on this side of the town. The issue that all brownfield sites should be prioritised and development before greenfield sites, was also raised again. A few respondents also stated that the site was too remote from the town centre, development would result in the loss of local amenity land and there would be unacceptable levels of noise from the bypass. The Parish Council also object to the site on the grounds of traffic generation. The site promoter has confirmed that a number of survey and reports have been conducted which show that there are no constraints which would prohibit development and a road improvement scheme would be included with the development.

Question 6: Do you agree that site WHIT021 (3.65Ha), being land at Alport Road, should be allocated for about 60 houses?

Out of the 49 respondents, a large majority (35 out of 49 (71%)) support the inclusion of the site, including the Parish Council. Some respondents suggest that development should provide road improvement and open space provision. It was also suggestion by a few respondents that the site should be extended, with one respondents stating that the development should be linked with the whole of the WHIT021 site, as it is deliverable and would make most efficient use of the land. However, 12 out of the 49 respondents (24%) objected to the site, due largely to the impact to Alport Road/Claypit St, as it is already busy and narrow in parts. Concern was raised as to whether it would be able to cope with the level of additional traffic flow.

Question 7: Do you agree that site WHIT008 (2.46Ha), being land south of Liverpool Road, should be allocated for about 60 houses?

Out of the 47 respondents, 24 (51%) support the inclusion of the site, as it is located near services and facilities and acts as a natural extension to the existing development. Concern was raised that the area is of medium to high landscape sensitivity and therefore landscape mitigation should be provided with the development. Likewise, it was stated that open space provision should also be provided. However, 22 (47%) respondents objected to the inclusion of this site, largely due to the existing highways issues along both Liverpool Road and Wrexham Road. Concern was raised that the road is already very busy, dangerous and has blind spots due to on road car parking, therefore making it unacceptable to worsen the existing problems with additional traffic flow. The Parish Council also objected to the site on the grounds of traffic generation and over-development of the area.

Question 8: Do you agree that site WHIT33 (0.57Ha), being land North of Mill Park, should be allocated for about 15 houses?

Out of the 43 respondents, a substantial majority (35 out of 43 (81%)) support the inclusion of this site as it has good access and would round off the current development. A few respondents stated that they would support the development of the site if and when the housing is need. One respondent commented that there is some nature conservation sensitivity given its location adjoining a minor watercourse.

Question 9: Do you agree that site ELR33 (9Ha), being land north of Waymills, should be allocated for employment land?

Out of the 46 respondents, a large majority (36 out of 46 (78%)) support the inclusion of this site for employment uses, as employment sites are needed in the town and this site is well located near to other employment uses and has good road access. Some respondents stated that this development should only go ahead when the existing empty units are in use and there is an additional demand. A minority of respondents (13%) objected to the inclusion of the site, stating that there is no need for additional units and development of the site would affect the character and appearance of the town and result in encroachment of open countryside.

Question 10: Do you agree that site ELR35, being land at Heath Road (6Ha), should be allocated for employment land?

Out of the 45 respondents, a large majority (33 out of 45 (73%)) support the allocation of this site for employment use, as it is in a suitable location that can provide a gateway business park. It will also provide needed employment land. Some respondents did stated that this development should only go ahead when the existing empty units are in use and there is an additional demand However a minority (9 out of 45 (20%)) objected to the inclusion of the site for the following reasons; no need for employment land; there is no suitable access and the site will cause a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area and residential amenity. A few respondents also stated that any additional employment land should be located in the Waymills area, which already has existing employment uses.

**Question 11: Do you agree with the proposed Primary Shopping Area for Whitchurch?
SAMDev**

Out of the 41 respondents, a substantial majority (36 out of 41 (88%)) support the shopping areas for Whitchurch. A few respondents stated that the empty shops need to be filled before expanding the shopping area. Another respondent stated that there should be no allowance for out of town retail development as the town's vitality needs to be protected. It was also raised that not all the shops in the town were highlighted, for example could include the Iceland complex and forthcoming Sainsbury's. This would create a more comprehensive map.

Question 12: Do you agree with the proposed new boundary for Whitchurch?

Of the 46 respondents who answered this question 61% agreed with the proposed development boundary and 37% disagreed, with the remainder not indicating their overall view 2%.

A number of respondents highlighted that sites WHIT037 and WHIT008 are unsuitable for development, because of the resulting impact of development on the local road network with regards to increased traffic and reduced safety. Therefore these sites shouldn't be included within the development boundary. Respondents also highlighted a number of other sites which shouldn't be included within the development boundary: WHIT033, WHIT009 and ELR33. A number of respondents also highlighted that they support the redrawing of Whitchurch development boundary to include certain preferred and non-preferred sites: WHIT021, WHIT047, WHIT009, WHIT005, WHIT028, WHIT033/10 and WHIT025. Other points raised by respondents were: that the area around the canal and the green corridor leading into the town should be highlighted as Open Space; that the new Sainsbury supermarket on London Road should be shown within the development boundary; and that if the proposed development boundary changes are implemented then improvements will be needed to road infrastructure.

Prees, Higher Heath, Prees Green, Lower Heath, Fauls and Sandford

Question 13: Do you agree that the settlements of Prees, Higher Heath, Prees Green, Lower Heath, Fauls and Sandford should be a Community Cluster?

Out of the 36 respondents, a substantial majority (32 out of 36 (89%)) support the designation as a Community Cluster as the settlements already act as a cluster, sharing services and facilities. However some respondents objected to the designation for the following reasons; transport links are not sufficient; the development at Higher Heath will result in loss of employment land and Fauls & Sandford are too disparate and should be deleted from the cluster. One respondent also noted that Tilstock & Prees should be considered in this cluster due to their topography.

Question 14: Do you think that the target of about 100 houses for this Community Cluster is appropriate?

Out of the 36 respondents, a large majority (28 out of 36 (78%)) support the housing target for the Community Cluster. Some respondent did comment that in order to maintain the viability of the settlements a higher figure would be more appropriate. One respondent stated that the target should include more rural affordable housing. Another respondent commented that he supports the target with the inclusion of the Grocontinental site as it was a brownfield development, however if this development was not deliverable it should not be replaced with greenfield development.

Question 15: Do you agree that the land west of Shrewsbury Street, Prees (PRE002/011/012) should be allocated for about 32 houses?

Out of the 34 respondents, the majority (24 out of 34 (71%)) support the inclusion of this site. The main reason for support was that the development will provide community benefits to the area, in particular the replacement Doctor's Surgery. Other reasons for support included; the sustainable

location, which would act as a logical extension of the village within the existing natural boundary; the need for growth in order to sustain the existing facilities and services and the visual improvement to the local area. A few respondents stated that the site could accommodate a higher level of housing than that proposed. Some respondents stated that they would support the inclusion of the site providing that the development; provides accommodation for the elderly; is carefully and sensitively design in order to respect the conservation area and that it address the inadequate water pressure issues. However a number of respondents (9 out of 34 (26%)) objected to the inclusion of the site for the following reasons; result in a loss of open space and wildlife habitat; will add to existing congestion problems; there is no demand for housing, as there is already empty properties and housing not selling; site has flooding issues and the site forms an important buffer between residential and industrial uses.

Question 16: Do you agree that the land off Moreton Street, Prees (PRE008) should be allocated for about 32 houses?

Out of the 32 respondents, a large majority (25 out of 32 (78%)) support the allocation of this site. A few respondents stated that the restoration of the grade 2 property (Prees Hall) should take priority, however concern was raised about whether the restoration was possible. Another respondent also stated that they would support the inclusion of the site providing that; the sewage system is upgrade and surface water and water pressure issues are resolved before development is undertaken. However, one respondent stated that the site should not be included as it will inevitably lead to further development in the open countryside.

Question 17: Do you agree with the development boundary for Prees?

Out of the 32 respondents, a large majority (25 out of 32 (78%)) support the development boundary for Prees. The additional comments received related purely to the inclusion of alternative sites within the boundary including; Land off Station Road (PRE005); Land off Lighteach Road (PRE006); Land off Primrose Lane (PRE017) and Moreton Farm.

Question 18: Do you agree with the development boundary for Higher Heath?

Out of the 32 respondents, a substantial majority (27 out of 32 (84%)) support the development boundary for Higher Heath. The additional comments received related purely to the inclusion of alternative sites within the boundary including; land on the west side of the A41; Land at Berwick off Heathwood Road and Land at Chesmere Kennels, Mill Lane.

Tilstock, Ash Magna/Ash Parva, Prees Heath, Ightfield and Calverhall

Question 19: Do you agree that the settlements of Tilstock, Ash Magna/Ash Parva, Prees Heath, Ightfield and Calverhall should be a Community Cluster?

Out of the 38 respondents, a substantial majority (32 out of 38 (84%)) supported the designation as a Community Cluster. A few respondents stated that no development should take place in rural settlements as services and facilities cannot be sustained. One respondent specially stated that Ash Magna should not have more development as it has already has substantial growth in recent years. One respondent did also suggest that Tilstock should be designated as a Community Hub due to amount of services and facilities. Another respondent also commented that Tilstock and Prees Heath should not be part of the cluster, as they don't relate to the other settlements which are ribbon development along Ash Road.

Question 20: Do you think that the growth target of about 75 houses for this Community Cluster is appropriate?

Out of the 40 respondents, a large majority (28 out of 40 (70%)) support the growth target for the cluster. Out of the 13 respondents who gave additional comments, 4 stated that the target should be higher as the settlements can accommodate more growth, with 2 of these specifically referencing the need to increase the target for Prees Heath. However one respondent stated that the target should be lower, and a further 3 respondents stated that the settlements should not have any growth and it could not be sustained.

Question 21: Do you agree that the land at the Vicarage in Tilstock (TIL001) should be allocated for about 25 houses?

Out of the 41 respondents, 24 (59%) supported the sites allocation, with a few respondents stating that it was the most suitable location, creating a single site for future growth. Some respondents also stated that they would support the sites inclusion providing that; the access was gained from Wem Road, the development provided improved road infrastructure, the Vicarage was retained and that development allowed for future expansion of the cemetery. However 16 out of the 41 respondents (39%) objected to the sites inclusion. The proposed access opposite the school was the main reason for objecting to the site, with several respondents considered this to be unsuitable due to existing traffic problems and safety issue for the children. Other issues raised included; the loss of open countryside and good quality agricultural land; the size of the site, as it was considered too large and concern was raised that more housing would likely be built; the lack of facilities to accommodate new houses and the lack of demand of more housing in the village. It is also noted that 2 respondents stated that they favoured TIL002 over TIL001, as it was brownfield development, a more logical extension to the village and would cause less impact. Another respondent stated they favoured TIL008 over TIL001 as it allowed for employment opportunities.

Question 22: Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Tilstock?

Out of the 40 respondents, a large majority (30 out of 40 (75%)) support the development boundary for Tilstock. Out of the 9 respondents who made additional comments, 3 supported the inclusion of TIL002, 2 supported the inclusion of TIL008 and 1 supported the inclusion on TIL001. A further 2 respondents stated that TIL001 should be excluded from the boundary for the reasons stated above. One respondent also raised concerns that the development boundary covered too much green space.

Question 23: Do you agree with the development boundary for Ash Magna?

Out of the 33 respondents, a substantial majority (28 out of 33, (85%)) support the development boundary for Ash Magna. 3 out of the 5 respondents who did not support the boundary stated that it should be made larger or include a specific allocated site, as there were limited infill opportunities. One of these respondents was the Parish Council who suggested that site 008 should be included as a preferred option.

Question 24: Do you agree with the development boundary for Ightfield?

Out of the 31 respondents, a substantial majority (28 out of 31 (90%)) support the development boundary for Ightfield. Only one respondent made additional comments, stating that the boundary could be allowed to be slightly bigger.

Question 25: Do you agree with the development boundary for Calverhall?

Out of the 31 respondents, a substantial majority (26 out of 31 (84%)) support the development boundary for Calverhall. Only one respondent made additional comments, stating that the boundary could be allowed to be slightly bigger.

Q26. Alternative Sites

1. The Heathwood Nurseries site fronting the A41 and the Grocott site is ideal for residential development. It is already a brown field site and much of the infrastructure is in place on the

site, or will shortly be as the Grocott site is developed. The one small part of the A41 frontage not owned is already developed.

2. Land at Church Farm- the site is currently Brownfield and would be able to provide a sufficient quantity of good quality housing which meets the needs of all. Access to services and facilities is only realistically possible by car, however the Parish Council do not feel that this constraint should prevent development where it is needed by the community. The site is available and deliverable

3. There are opportunities to extend the development boundary at Prees off Station Road (PRE005), off Lighteach Road (PRE006) and off Primrose Lane (PRE017) to provide sustainable urban extensions.

4. Land East of Black Park Road, Whitchurch (WHIT047)- This site is located within a highly sustainable location meeting the key principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which considers that “housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development” (paragraph 49) and seeks to “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable” (paragraph 17). These policy requirements are applicable to this site due to its close proximity to key services and employment uses within Whitchurch as well as easy and convenient access via train to services and employment opportunities further afield. The NPPF seeks also to “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value” (paragraph 17). The site comprises land formerly used entirely as railway sidings which are now surplus to requirements and as such this site is defined as previously developed land and 'not' greenfield land as has been stated in the Council's Background Assessment (Whitchurch Housing Sites Assessment – ref. WHIT047). Whilst the site was formerly combined as part of the larger Alport Road housing allocation in the Local Plan (which was principally greenfield land) it is considered that this site can achieve a stand-alone residential development as it is feasible to achieve an acceptable access on to the existing highway network. The current SAMDev public consultation identifies a number of alternative residential sites within and around Whitchurch however the majority of the preferred residential sites identified in the SAMDev are located outside Whitchurch's development boundary and on greenfield land which are of high amenity value. These sites are WHIT008 (60 dwellings), WHIT009 (307 dwellings), WHIT033 (15 dwellings), WHIT037 (60 dwellings) and WHIT046 (100 dwellings) which when combined would provide 543 dwellings. The NPPF stresses that “allocations of land for development should

prefer land of lesser environmental value” (paragraph 17) and it is considered that the Land East of Black Park Road site is of significantly less environmental value than those sites identified for housing in other locations around Whitchurch. The SAMDev also identifies a further windfall allowance of 128 dwellings. During previous Local Development Framework consultations, BRB (Residuary) Ltd have been able to adequately demonstrate through a Transport Appraisal (July 2011) that this site can accommodate 40 new dwellings without compromising highway safety. It is therefore considered that sufficient evidence has been provided to clearly demonstrate that this site will have no adverse impact upon the current road network. With this taken into account, it is considered that this site could contribute to Whitchurch’s housing requirement and thus reduce the extent to which the existing settlement boundary needs to be altered. Whilst the Council’s background evidence identifies BRB (Residuary) site as being located within the wider draft Environmental Network, this planning policy designation will not preclude development in principle but would simply ensure that biodiversity issues are considered as part of any forthcoming planning proposal. Similarly, it is recognised that the presence of trees on site represents only a ‘minor constraint’ which can be overcome through a suitably designed housing layout. In addition to the above, the categorisation exercise that has been undertaken by the Council as part of the background evidence (contained within the Whitchurch Housing Sites Assessment – ref. WHIT047) entirely supports residential development on this site and raises no significant factors which would restrain a residential development proposal in principle. The background assessments confirm that the site has a level topography, maintains an adequate site access, is considered to exhibit a low level of landscape value, is physically well linked to educational establishments, the town centre and employment opportunities, and most importantly remains an available and viable site to accommodate the housing needs within Whitchurch. It is therefore recommended that the SAMDev maintains site WHIT047: ‘Land East of Black Park Road’ within the development boundary and allocates it as an identified housing site. Whilst we have objected to the other residential development sites within the SAMDev Whitchurch Questionnaire, this is on the basis that we believe that it is not necessary for these sites to accommodate the full housing quota that has been identified as WHIT047 can accommodate a proportion of the overall housing requirement within this site.

5. Land adjacent Berwick, Heathwood Road, Higher Heath is a large residential curtilage adjacent the existing residential settlement of Prees Higher Heath. Measuring 0.5ha (1.24 acres) this property is underdeveloped and would comfortably accommodate 10 - 15 dwellings. Access to key infrastructure is good with safe vehicular access onto Heathwood Road and mains sewers close by. Development of open market housing upon this site will make direct financial contribution to key local services and infrastructure via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Affordable housing contribution. Levied at £80 per sqm of build the CIL will make a contribution of approx. £10,000 per dwelling towards facilities and services in the Prees Higher Heath area. Additional supporting information relating to this site has been forwarded to Shropshire Council

6. It seems to me that the Northern side of town, heading out towards Chester and Tarporley, has been largely ignored. There seems to be plenty of scope, and plenty of space inside the bypass, for development here.

7. WHIT021 - residential development. See detailed comments in response to Q.12.

8. Land off Chester Road, Whitchurch (Whit 005)- The site off Chester Road is located within a highly sustainable location just outside the development boundary for Whitchurch, only 15 minutes from the Town Centre. The site is located to the north west of Whitchurch, and comprises of an open field, located to the rear of Chester Avenue, and is currently used for grazing. The site benefits from good access immediately off Chester Road. Whilst the site is

Greenfield, it is surrounded by residential properties to the east and south, and would therefore be a natural extension to the settlement boundary. Indeed the background evidence to Whitchurch Housing Sites Assessment, acknowledges that whilst the site is considered to offer a useful gap between the existing built-up area and the ribbon development further north along Chester Road, it is considered to be relatively enclosed and could accommodate housing as far as its western boundary. The site assessment further rates the site as a realistic development site, and accepts that in its own right the site has potential for some new residential development if required. In principle we support the Councils Strategy for Whitchurch, particularly the fact that the SAMDEV accepts the need to identify Greenfield sites on the edge of Whitchurch to meet the identified housing needs. We are therefore of the opinion that the above site offers a good opportunity to be developed for residential development. Indeed, the site is sustainable and deliverable. We therefore recommend, that the site be acknowledged as having a redevelopment potential for residential development. The site is an existing sustainable and deliverable site, located adjacent to the development boundary for Whitchurch. We look forward to receiving confirmation that our clients representations have been considered and should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

9. the land at the top of Talbot Street Whitchurch was allocated in the last plan for development of housing. Part of the plan was that a new road would be built adjacent to the railway line linking Talbot Street to Station Road. This seems to have now been lost within the plan. this site is close to both the Infants and Junior Schools the Railway Station so therefore would be suitable for new housing especially for young families. The road would reduce the amount of traffic coming down Talbot Street, which at certain times of the day is almost at a standstill.

10. Land at The Pines, (Chesmere Kennels) Mill Lane, Whitchurch, SY13 2HR should be allocated for housing development, including possible affordable housing and/or community facilities, such as a doctor's surgery. There are no such community facilities at present in Higher Heath. The proposed development of 150 houses on land owned by Grocontinental seems to have stalled for a number of years. Will this ever happen? Even if it does happen this would increase the need for community facilities. The land at The Pines comprises 4 acres and is contained within an established development of bungalows and houses. It is currently designated as being outside the development boundary (which it borders) and it is contended that this could change without detriment to surrounding land, properties and businesses. Infrastructure would be easy (there being sufficient highway access for a service road to a development and all utilities are located thereon).

11. Site WHIT028/09 / WHIT025 comprising land at Hill Valley Golf Course, Tarporley Road, Whitchurch should be considered as a housing allocation instead of, or in addition to, the housing sites identified during the SAMDev Preferred Options exercise. Certain of the proposed allocations are considered to be either unsuitable; to have more limited capacity than estimated; or constraints which would mean that delivery is unlikely to take place until later in the Plan Period. Accordingly, it is considered that additional land needs to be allocated which could deliver c.75 dwellings and has the potential to contribute to housing supply at an early opportunity in the Plan period. The site's suitability has been supported by a Transport Assessment – which illustrates how a new access could be made to Tarporley Road, with a relocation of the existing National Speed Limit further to the north on Tarporley Road. Access to Terrick Road, to the east of the site, would be limited to pedestrians/cyclists only. An Ecological Appraisal has concluded that there are no site issues which could affect the principle of the development of the site. The ecological resources which exist can be accommodated and incorporated in the development of the site by the adoption of relatively simple design principles – such as retaining ponds, trees and hedgerows, improving wildlife corridors and fostering habitat creation through new indigenous planting. A layout illustrating c.75 new

dwellingings will be submitted under separate cover and will be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Appraisal. The appraisal will illustrate the landscape context, identifying key viewpoints and likely visual receptors and will demonstrate how the layout of the proposed development will complement, respect and fit into the existing environment. It concludes that the site affords characteristics more associated with the urban fringe than the more rural outer-lying arable fields which elsewhere surround the urban area. Strengthening elements of the existing landscape framework and incorporating a materials palette to match existing built development will serve to soften views of the development in order to minimise visual intrusion. The site layout also incorporates an area for recreation/community space, suitable for use as allotments or a wildlife centre etc. This area, situated towards the east of the site, also serves to provide some separation from existing established development located off Alport Road. Foot/cycle access through this area will provide linkages through the site to the public footpath on the western boundary, and from there, directly south to the town centre and the new Sainsbury's Superstore development off London Road.

12. Land adjacent to the crossroads in Ash Magna should be included within the development boundary and allocated for housing and open space. A plan showing the proposed site is submitted with a separate email.

13. All possible brownfield sites in all areas should be redeveloped before building on green spaces.

14. I would propose that a development plan is developed for the Fulgoni Trust land next to the existing Whitchurch Canal arm that, combined with the plans for the building of the new canal basin, provides an attractive, sustainable plan for that area. Such a plan should, I suggest, only go ahead on the following basis; - enhancement of the canal arm as a whole - acceptable to local residents - financial arrangements to assist the Waterway Trust to finance associated works - improved amenity for the community - wide area of open spaces and wildlife spaces adjacent to the existing canal arm. -access provided for the trusts moorings on the west side of the arm that will be blocked when the canal is extended -arrangements to deal with the design of the access at the start of the canal arm. -promotion of the green corridor from the canal into the town and perhaps some improvements to that route

15. More housing for Whitchurch in the North West area off Chester Road, where access is good.

16. Support allocation of land north of Waymills (WHIT029 and WHIT027) The mixed use is in an excellent position close to services, facilities and other employment uses. A further extension to the Waymills site should be used instead of the land proposed off Heath Road (ELR33) a totally inappropriate place for such development.

17. Support allocation of land north of Waymills (WHIT029 and WHIT027) The mixed use is what is needed for the long term development of the town. The site is a sustainable location close to services, facilities and other employment uses. A further extension to the Waymills site or opposite Grocontinental would be a considerably better option both ergonomically and aesthetically for the town as a whole.

18. Land to the rear of 66 Wrexham Road should be allocation. The site is approx. 3.96 acres.

19. Land at Pear Tree Lane (WHIT007) should be allocated

20. Land north of Waymills (WHIT027 & WHIT029) should be allocated for mixed use of 8.5ha of employment land and 60 dwellings.

21. Land at Chemistry (WHIT030), there are no obvious hindrances to the delivery of this sustainable scheme which offers community benefits.

22. Land on Mile Bank Road (WHIT031) should be allocated as it is a brownfield site which is visually intrusive within its urban/rural fringe setting. It reflects poorly on Whitchurch as a settlement. The site is immediately available and does not suffer from any flood risk or ecological constraints and is served by all necessary utilities. In terms of the NPPF, the site is therefore a deliverable,

developable, and available housing option. The site is certainly within easy reach of Whitchurch and its associated services and clearly forms part of the town's urban fringe and hinterland.

23. Land north of the Beeches (WHIT032), should be allocated for up to 25 dwellings. The site has an existing access road.

24. Land at Fairy Glen (WHIT035)

25. Land off Chester Avenue (WHIT036) should be allocated for housing, the site is approx. 1.74 acres.

26. Land off Chester Road (WHIT039) should be allocated for housing, the site will act as infill development between The Beeches and Pear Tree Lane. The site could accommodate up to 25-30 houses.

27. Land at St. John's Park (WHIT041)

28. Land at Station Approach should be allocated for development. The site is a brownfield site and is appropriate for redevelopment.

29. Land at Corner Farm, Darliston should be considered for residential development. The site could be developed for 6 houses, which would help bolster numbers of school pupils, with employment available locally.

30. Land to the rear of Magna Dene, Ash should be considered.

31. Land at the former Cherry Tree Hotel. Prees Heath should be allocated. The site is approx. 0.29ha and is brownfield land, as such it accords with local and national policy. The site is currently an eyesore and its development would result in considerable betterment in terms of visual appearance. The site falls within the natural boundary and does not extend into surrounding countryside. It also benefits from an existing access to A41 and would provide community benefits.

32. Land at Invictus, Prees Heath could be allocated for 2 houses.

APPENDIX E: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICY DIRECTIONS 2012 – KEY ISSUES RAISED

1. Key issues from the Preferred Options consultation

MD1: Scale and Distribution of Development

1. *Settlement Specific Comments:* A number of responses were received from landowners/agents and residents, as well as Town and Parish Councils, regarding specific settlements – settlements to be identified as Community Hubs and Community Clusters, targets for additional housing, development boundaries and sites. The issues raised will be set out and considered when the schedule of settlements to be included in the Plan and the settlement policy sections are being prepared;
2. *Process of identification of Community Hubs and Community Cluster settlements:* Concern has been expressed by some landowners/agents regarding the process of identification, particularly the emphasis being placed on Parish and Town Council views and the scope for sustainable development to be prevented in settlements which had facilities and services and could be considered more sustainable communities/locations for development than some of those put forward. Linked to this, it was suggested that the policy should include a mechanism to allow sustainable sites to come forward in non-Hub / Cluster settlements. Support was expressed for the concept of Community Hubs and Clusters by some, including English Heritage and the Homes and Communities Agency (where locations sustainable and there was local community appetite);
3. *Scale and type of development / targets for additional housing:* A range of comments were received, including:
 - i. that the scale and type of development appropriate in each settlement should be described in the Plan;
 - ii. support for appropriate levels of growth in smaller settlements in order to create and safeguard sustainable rural communities;
 - iii. need for further discussions of foul and surface water management in the River Clun catchment (Natural England);
 - iv. support for recognition of importance of retaining local distinctiveness and character, and for regard to stock of historic farmsteads (English Heritage);
 - v. concern at lack of detail on appropriate densities of housing development;
 - vi. concern that biodiversity/ecological issues not referred to in the policy direction (Shropshire Wildlife Trust);
 - vii. targets should not be maxima preventing sustainable development coming forward;

- viii. targets for brownfield development and affordable housing, and how they were to be met, should be explained;
 - ix. the policy should include a mechanism to release further land so that affordable housing is provided if targets are not met;
 - x. the housing delivery resulting from the additional housing indicated should be compared against the targets for the County, Shrewsbury, the Market Towns/Key Centres, and other settlements and for the Spatial Zones; and
 - xi. allowance should be made for Neighbourhood Development Plans and Orders to deliver growth as well as allocations and windfalls.
4. *Development Boundaries*: A mix of views were expressed, including:
- i. that Market Towns and Key Centres/Community Hubs and Clusters should not have development boundaries/sites should be judged on their sustainability;
 - ii. support for the flexibility of no boundaries provided that there were sufficient allocations to deliver the minimum targets; and
 - iii. that a lack of boundaries would give rise to confusion as to where development would be permitted and mean that sites adjoining rather than within settlements would be considered less favourably.

MD2: Sustainable Design

1. *Watercourses*: The Environment Agency highlighted that it would like to see action taken in the SAMDev Plan with regards to development taking opportunities for improving and enhancing watercourses, through for example removing hard engineering structures and promoting the use of SuDs;
2. *Open space provision*: The local community raised the point that open and recreational spaces and the maintenance of those spaces should be a key consideration as part of the SAMDev Plan process;
3. *Climate change*: Local stakeholder groups identified climate change issues highlighted in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other national publications as key considerations in the SAMDev Plan process;
4. *Design quality*: A number of residents raised the point that it would like to see action taken in the SAMDev Plan with regards to policy requiring development to produce high quality design that is founded upon locally distinctive characteristics.

MD3: Managing Housing Development

1. *Quantity of housing land required:* Opinions varied between respondents on the level of provision needed for housing development in Shropshire. Some felt demand for housing development was over-estimated, and therefore less land is required, or that the quantity of housing should be determined by the local community. Others pointed to the number of sites where planning consent was never implemented as an argument in favour of more land being required. Attention was drawn to the promise made in paragraph 4.5 of the Core Strategy (inserted during the Core Strategy examination) that the SAMDev Plan will allocate sufficient land to deliver at least 27,500 homes. Overall there was concern that enough land is identified to meet Shropshire's housing requirements in all parts of the county.
2. *Regular Review:* A number of respondents supported having regular reviews to ensure sufficient availability of land for development, linked to updates of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the Five Year Housing Supply. In particular, the Homes and Communities Agency supported regular reviews as a flexible basis upon which to deliver housing and respond to changing economic circumstances. Others asked what would be the mechanisms for slowing down or speeding up the release of land, and encouraged regular reviews of the number of homes as well as the policy and sites for delivering them to reflect market circumstances.
3. *Phasing:* Phasing of sites raised concerns about introducing unnecessary and unjustifiable delays. It was suggested that deliverability should be the key consideration and that new sites should not be held back if existing sites in the supply pipeline were not being delivered. There should be no phasing of housing development in Market Towns and Key Centres/Community Hubs and Clusters to ensure flexibility;
4. *The Five Year Supply:* There were calls for clarity on whether the rolling 5 year supply of housing land will be based on a settlement, spatial zone, or urban/rural basis, and by what mechanism the release of land might be speeded up or slowed down. The SHLAA should be updated on a regular basis.
5. *Quality Design:* The need for high quality design was highlighted by several respondents, including English Heritage who were particularly concerned with how a site responds to and integrates with its setting. It was felt to be important that all housing developments meet the same quality standards.
6. *Key development guidelines:* Many respondents supported having key development guidelines for proposed sites, to provide greater certainty for the development industry and local communities and stakeholders on issues such as infrastructure provision. Others queried whether it is really necessary to provide guidelines for every site.
7. *Other aspects of sustainability:* One respondent commented that the support of the local community should also be a key consideration, in accordance with the NPPF.

8. *Site allocations*: Some thought that the SAMDev Plan did not necessarily have to allocate sites, and could perhaps simply suggest suitable sites, with detailed allocations and timescales for delivery determined by the local community, for example through a Neighbourhood Plan. Others expressed the view that the Council should make a greater attempt to allocate sites for development and reduce the reliance on windfalls and to provide greater certainty for developers during the plan period.
9. *Site numbers*: The number of dwellings on a site should be minimums not maximums, in recognition that design can greatly influence the number of dwellings capable of being accommodated within a site and that housing need should be met.
10. *Infill and density*: Small infill sites that have minimal disturbance to the environment should be identified and approved within the first five years. There should be adequate open space around a development, linked to the amount of open space already existing in the area, which may require lower densities.
11. *Shrewsbury sites*: Specific comments were received on the release of sites in Shrewsbury; these have been rolled forward for consideration in the settlement specific policies, to follow later in 2013.
12. *Evidence base*: A number of respondents called for an update of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) as a key underpinning evidence base.
13. *Delivery in villages*: A flexible approach to housing delivery should include making strategic decisions on which villages should be identified as Community Hub or Cluster Settlements, as part of ensuring sufficient housing delivery to meet rural needs.

MD4: Managing Employment Development

1. *Heritage considerations*: English Heritage would like to see key development guidelines including material heritage considerations for the development of employment generating uses;
2. *Impacts on water resources*: The Environment Agency point out that they would expect consideration of potential pollution activities in selecting the location of proposed allocated employment land to protect controlled waters under the Water Framework Directive;
3. *Sites reservoir*: The development industry express some concern that the perceived demand for employment land is prone to over-estimation and comment that the reservoir of sites should be identified in Policy MD3 with a planned trajectory to the delivery target;

4. *Sustainable development*: the employment allocations and their distribution should be justified in relation to the balance for housing development and the rural rebalance of development to deliver sustainable development and regeneration;
5. *Employment generation*: it is essential to allocate land for residential and employment development to accommodate the required scale of development but to facilitate employment generation a degree of flexibility is needed over the range of acceptable commercial uses.

MD5: Sites for Sand & Gravel Working

1. *Heritage impacts*: English Heritage are concerned to ensure the allocation of sites is fully informed regarding potential implications for the historic environment and heritage assets;
2. *Impacts on water resources*: The Environment Agency pointed out that a detailed environmental assessment would be required with any planning applications for sand and gravel workings, including an assessment of potential impacts on water features. A range of potential water resources and related issues were raised with respect to specific individual sites;
3. *Impacts on designated environmental assets*: Natural England considers that the policy should include a requirement around the safeguarding of designated sites and other biodiversity interests. Potential impacts on designated environmental assets from the development of specific individual sites were raised;
4. *Phased release and output restrictions*: The mineral industry has expressed support for the overall approach to site selection, but is concerned about the impact of the proposed phased release of sites, the potential for output restrictions and has some concerns about the quality of evidence about mineral resources.

MD6: Green Belt and Safeguarded Land

1. *Rural Viability/ Flexibility*: Local stakeholders and a number of developers raised the point that, whilst supporting safeguarding the Green Belt, they would like to see specific reference made with regards to supporting rural businesses and communities located within the Green Belt. Issues relating to this point raised by consultees are: the need for flexibility and support for agricultural and business diversification and development; further clarification regarding development types in light of need to promote sustainable rural communities; and supporting limited growth of some villages outside main centres to support their long term viability. English Heritage also raised the point about flexibility in the Green Belt, by emphasising the need for clarity on how policy deals with rural diversification, in particular sustainable use of historic farmsteads;

2. *Green Belt Boundaries*: Setting detailed Green Belt boundaries, as required by Policy CS5, has been identified by a number of developers as being essential. Green Belt boundary alterations were highlighted as needed where there are changes or anomalies since designation, and where land no longer serves its Green Belt purpose and would allow settlement rounding off. Additionally a developer raised the point that policy should consider if development needs can be best met by extensions to inset settlements, as well as including settlements which do not display open characteristics as new insets in the Green Belt. Local residents have emphasised the value of the land around the Mere in Ellesmere and suggest policy should consider designating it with a Green Belt boundary;
3. *Environmental Sustainability*: Natural England highlighted that it would like to see action taken in the SAMDev Plan with regards to Policy MD6 promoting increased Green Belt opportunities for recreation and interaction with nature. Ellesmere Town Council stated that Policy MD6 should reflect sustainable principles;
4. *Safeguarded Land*: A number of developers have highlighted, as a key consideration for Policy MD6, the need to identify safeguarded land for longer term development provision beyond the plan period, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). They also raised the point that failure to identify safeguarded land would result in Policy MD6 not meeting the requirements of NPPF, thus being found unsound. Local residents have emphasised the value of safeguarding the Green Belt over a long term period, and see this as a key requirement for Policy MD6;
5. *RAF Cosford*: The Defence Infrastructure Organisation MOD supports Policy MD6 recognition of the status of RAF Cosford as a major developed site in the Green Belt, but also highlights that the SAMDev Plan policies fail to identify other operational defence sites outside Green Belt and would like to see this addressed;
6. *Policy Wording*: Local residents highlighted that the ambiguity of some of the policy wording in Policy MD6 could result in reduced protection and undermining of the Green Belt.

MD7: Managing Development in the Countryside

1. *Greater support for farms and other rural businesses*: The National Farmers Union (NFU) stated that much greater emphasis should be placed on providing support for farm businesses to become more sustainable and therefore be more likely to be able to help achieve food security now and for the future. The evolution of farms will also be supporting environmental sustainability whilst helping to tackle climate change;

2. *Impact of development on agricultural land and water resources:* The NFU and others are concerned that development pressures will result in the loss of good quality agricultural land either directly or through inadequate water resources and drainage. The Environment Agency comment that the proliferation of properties that are non-mains should not be encouraged to protect the water environment. There is also some concern regarding the proximity of new development to existing farms and particularly livestock units which may result in neighbour issues;
3. *Large scale agricultural units:* Several comments have been received regarding large scale agricultural buildings. Responses from the community are seeking greater control whereas responses from the agricultural sector are seeking greater flexibility especially as they offer employment opportunities. The NFU would welcome the opportunity to be involved in the production of further guidance to ensure it is appropriate and future proof;
4. *Essential rural workers' dwellings:* Affordable housing size restrictions are considered to be inappropriate by the NFU and other responses. It is said that some dwellings will need to contain a farm office and utility areas whilst others will need to accommodate growing families. Reversion to affordable dwellings is not considered to be appropriate as this has a great impact on the viability of the farm business. Essential rural workers' dwellings will need to be located in close proximity to the place of work. A few responses received seek greater clarification of what constitutes an essential rural worker;
5. *Countryside, Community Hubs and Clusters:* Several responses feel that limiting development to Hubs and Clusters is overly restrictive especially in some villages that are capable of supporting new development. It was also stated that reliance on the view of the Parish Council to 'opt in' as a Hub or Cluster is not sufficient and more emphasis needs to be placed on local evidence. Concern was raised over the distinction between countryside and hubs/clusters where there is no development boundary;
6. *Conversions and replacement dwellings:* English Heritage commented that the removal of permitted development rights is welcomed especially where this will result in the protection of a heritage asset. Where the heritage asset is of major significance and a dwelling is required on site for an essential rural worker, it may be appropriate to allow new build rather than convert the building and risk damage to the asset. A few comments request greater detail be provided for conversions and replacement dwellings whilst not restricting extensions to conversions;

7. *General support for the policy*: Natural England welcomed the clear statement that the protection of the natural environment will be an important consideration. One respondent requested that protection be proportionate and that the role of mitigation measures in making development acceptable be recognised;
8. *Other*: The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership stated that the AONB is not being adequately differentiated and given sufficient weight within the policy. Similarly, the Ministry of Defence has stated that they would like greater recognition of all defence sites within Shropshire.

MD8: Infrastructure Provision

1. *Definition of infrastructure*: English Heritage recommends the inclusion of the historic environment and heritage assets as part of the general assessment criteria for new strategic infrastructure. The Woodland Trust would like to see a reference to green infrastructure. The minerals industry is disappointed that the policy does not currently address minerals infrastructure. Local stakeholders support reference to the need to plan for adequate transport, energy and broadband infrastructure and make some specific suggestions regarding the guidance applicable to wind turbines;
2. *Water resources*: The Environment Agency welcome the inclusion of policy guidance for waste water infrastructure, but note that water cycle strategy evidence base work needs to be updated. Some amendments to the criteria for specific types of infrastructure are suggested;
3. *Environmental capacity*: Natural England generally welcome the proposed approach, but recommend including an additional point to ensure that there is adequate environmental capacity;
4. *Capital & Assets Programme*: West Mercia Police suggest including reference to the LDF Implementation Plan, the CIL Regulation 123 list and infrastructure projects promoted by the Shropshire Capital & Assets Programme to provide demonstrable support for the Shropshire Capital and Asset Pathfinder Programme (CAP);

MD9: Safeguarding & Improving Employment Investment

1. *Retention of employment use*: A range of concerns are raised about the detailed policy tests which may be applied to the assessment of employment sites for safeguarding in the context of national and Core Strategy policies;
2. *Sites outside defined settlements*: policy should provide criteria for protection of strategic sites and employment areas outside settlements;

3. *Employment clusters*: policy should provide guidance on facilitating clusters of uses for key growth sectors for the local economy.

MD10: Town Centres

1. *Town centre uses/sequential testing*: A range of comments and concerns from local stakeholders regarding the need to support town centres as part of the policy approach and through sequential testing, and the need to recognise the role of the town centre in accommodating wider uses other than retail.
2. *Scope of policy*: Concern from stakeholders over lack of reference to the level of retail development acceptable in the Community Hubs and Clusters and the need to consider rural based retail proposals.

MD11: Tourism and Leisure

1. *General*: Local stakeholders generally supported many elements of the policy direction. The need for development to protect the qualities of the countryside was highlighted. The Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership requested more explicit reference to ensuring protection of the qualities Shropshire Hills AONB as a key draw for visits to Shropshire.
2. *Canals*: Explicit reference to identifying canals on the proposals map was widely supported by a range of consultees. A developer expressed concern over the lack of specific reference to the Montgomery Canal and suggested that the policy should be more explicit in promoting and enabling development linked to the canal to help support its regeneration in line with NPPF guidance on meeting infrastructure requirement needs. The Canal and River Trust identified that canal side development should be referenced more widely as part of an approach to canals as a multifunctional resource. They also highlight issues with identifying and quantifying the specific 'need' for marina development.
3. *Touring and static caravans, camping sites, chalets etc*: The Environment Agency suggested inclusion of reference to the 'managed retreat' of static caravan, chalet and log cabin sites away from areas of highest flood risk to areas of lowest flood risk.

MD12: Natural and Historic Environment

1. *General support*: Natural England particularly supported ecological networks and site based enhancement measures. Other respondents also supported the connection of habitats, new tree planting and the emphasis on the whole landscape. One respondent requested that protection be proportionate and that the role of mitigation measures in making development acceptable be recognised;

2. *Better protection for aspects of the natural environment:* The Environment Agency asked that the policy refer to the Water Framework Directive requirements to ensure no deterioration and achieve 'good status' in surface water, groundwater, and protected areas. Natural England requested that a point be added to cover the need for a Habitats Regulation Assessment for development in the River Clun catchment. Other respondents wanted a more strongly worded policy that went beyond minimum legal requirements or strengthening of the policy to protect a range of habitats and species as well as trees. Explicit protection was requested for ancient woodland and veteran trees; the lines of old railways and canals; special landscape character areas; agricultural land; local green spaces, particularly the green wedges into Shrewsbury; and tourist attractions. Respondents also asked for Tree Preservation Orders be monitored better and to be used more widely to protect mature trees;
3. *Better protection for the historic environment:* English Heritage requested a development management policy for the historic environment of equivalence to the one for the natural environment. The other respondents supported this view and were unanimous that that the policy direction as shown constituted a serious omission;
4. *Shropshire Hills AONB:* The AONB Partnership requested that the policy mention the special qualities of the AONB (as defined by the Management Plan) and include enhancement of these qualities, a restriction on development outside the AONB which would damage them and support for development which reinforces and promotes both the understanding and the enjoyment of them. The Partnership also wanted mention of the secondary AONB purposes which are 'to take account of social and economic wellbeing, promote sustainable development and meet the demand for recreation'. Other respondents supported the comments made by the Partnership but additionally asked for the same housing policy for AONBs as is currently in place for National parks as well as better protection for the AONB;
5. *Policy structure:* Natural England felt that the policy could be condensed to provide one bullet point on woodland trees and hedges and one on the safeguarding and enhancement of priority habitats. Other respondents wanted the word 'protecting' changed to 'conserving' and requested that the evidence base include particular documents;

MD13: Waste Management Facilities

1. *Heritage impacts:* English Heritage are concerned to ensure the allocation of sites is fully informed regarding potential implications for the historic environment and heritage assets;
2. *Environmental permitting:* The Environment Agency point out the need to ensure that waste management facilities are located in areas consistent with their groundwater policy) and landfill location policy. Planning applications should provide an appropriate level of detail to ensure the principle of development is acceptable with cross reference to environmental permitting

constraints. There may be potential to join up the consideration of emissions such as 'air quality' between the planning and permitting regimes for some types of development;

3. *Waste hierarchy*: The Environment Agency suggest that specific reference is made to the waste hierarchy from the revised EU Waste Framework Directive;
4. *Provision of recycling facilities*: Local stakeholders support the provision of local recycling infrastructure, combined heat and power and district heating as positive contributions to tackling climate change;

MD14: Landfill and Land Raising Sites

1. *Heritage impacts*: English Heritage are concerned to ensure the allocation of sites is fully informed regarding potential implications for the historic environment and heritage assets;
2. *Zero Waste*: The Environment Agency suggest referencing the objective of 'zero waste to landfill';
3. *Water resources*: The Environment Agency suggest that the policy should cross reference to the need to comply with relevant water management and protection policy requirements;

MD15: Mineral Safeguarding

1. *Heritage impacts*: English Heritage suggest reference to the Strategic Stone Study database in the context of safeguarding local sources of vernacular building materials;
2. *Coal resources*: The Coal Authority advises that reference to the Coal Mining Development Referral Area Plan as relevant evidence should be amended to refer to the Surface Coal Resource Plan. There is no additional need for the SAMDev Plan to address coal mining legacy issues and unstable land since these are already satisfactorily addressed;
3. *Scope of policy*: The mineral industry has suggested an alternative form of words to strengthen the policy on line with a national model policy drafted by the national industry body. Some concerns have been expressed about the operation of safeguarding buffer zones and the need for detailed illustration of the MSA boundaries;

MD16: Management of Mineral Development

1. *Building and Roofing Stone*: English Heritage suggest that the policy should recognise the small-scale nature and impact of building and roofing stone quarries and the need for a flexible approach to the duration of planning permissions and make reference to the evidence base provided by the Strategic Stone Study;

2. *Water Resources:* The Environment Agency considers that mineral working should be appropriately located and controlled in order to protect controlled waters. The policy should seek to control adverse impacts on 'water resources' as well as water quality and suggest further discussion to ensure relevant issues are identified and addressed at specific sites;
3. *Biodiversity issues:* Natural England welcome the recognition of the opportunities which the restoration and after-use of minerals sites can bring to green infrastructure, but note that several of the minerals allocations are near to designated biodiversity assets where careful consideration of the potential for adverse impacts will be required;
4. *Coal resources:* The Coal Authority broadly supports the policy direction and considers that it accords with paragraphs 143 and 163 of the NPPF and expands appropriately upon Core Strategy Policy CS20. Some minor improvements to the policy are suggested;
5. *Cumulative impacts and ancillary working:* The mineral industry offer some support for the draft policy direction, particularly in terms of the promotion of the comprehensive working of minerals sites and opportunities to generate local benefits from restoration and after-use schemes. However, amendments are also suggested to the proposed guidance on cumulative mineral working impacts and the control of ancillary development.

Gypsies & Travellers

Since the Policy Directions document was published, it is now considered more appropriate to prepare a separate DPD on Gypsies and Travellers' sites. This is due to the need for further technical work on the assessment of potential sites. Further consultations will take place on the development of the Council's policy in due course. A number of comments were received during this Preferred Options consultation which related to gypsies and travellers and these will be fed into the process:

1. *Heritage Impacts:* English Heritage has commented that consideration needs to be given to potential implications for historic environment and heritage.
2. *Flood Risk:* The Environment Agency point out that sites should not be located in areas at high risk of flooding, acknowledging the particular vulnerability of caravans. The flood risk sequential testing of potential sites must be undertaken in allocating sites to meet identified needs in accordance with Policy CS18.
3. *Contaminated Land:* The Environment Agency has also stated that sites should not be located on contaminated land unless it can be demonstrated that appropriate mitigation/remediation work can be achieved. In addition, the allocation of new sites should be informed by the Water Cycle Study and satisfactory water supply and drainage requirements should be in place for new sites with non-mains drainage avoided where possible.

4. *Policy Structure:* Comment was made that the Policy Direction does not give any restriction of the type of site that could be allocated. Detail should be provided on whether sites would be within development boundaries, brownfield or greenfield, whether towns are preferred over villages and whether sites with environmental designations should be avoided. The DPD should also state that the size of the site allocated should be proportionate to the settled community in which it is situated or adjacent.
5. *Other Issues:* Sites should be located in key strategic network corridors. There is acknowledgement that it is difficult to integrate the gypsy and settled communities. It is suggested that where allocated development land is not going to be used for many years, consideration should be given to allowing short term use for gypsies and travellers. The Homes and Communities Agency supports the policy direction and considers that it should complement the Council's programme capital programme for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller Sites.

Former Policy Direction MD4 – Key Areas of Change in Shrewsbury

1. *Historic environment:* English Heritage supported efforts to progress the Shrewsbury Northern Corridor Regeneration Framework Masterplan and to restore and redevelop the Flax Mill at Ditherington. The key principle of encouraging environmental enhancements should include consideration of the historic environment and heritage assets. More information should be included regarding the Shrewsbury Vision Regeneration Framework and its development implications;
2. *Water resources:* The Environment Agency would like to see recognition of potential land contamination issues to maximise the protection of the water environment in North Shrewsbury. It is recommended that the policy seeks to preserve and enhance the environmental value of the River Severn through Shrewsbury;
3. *Redevelopment opportunities:* The development industry was concerned about potential reliance on windfall sites in Shrewsbury. Brownfield development is susceptible to changing market conditions and proposals for redevelopment opportunities should therefore be based on realistic assessments of viability and delivery. Where redevelopment sites are not delivered then there will be pressure on delivery in other locations. A range of opinion was offered regarding the potential redevelopment of the Sentinel works specifically;

Former Policy Direction MD7 – Sustainable Urban Extensions

1. *General:* English Heritage, Natural England and the Shropshire Wildlife Trust supported the proposed policy direction/general principles/the approach of

preparation of overall masterplans for the three SUE's. Natural England sought early engagement regarding the green infrastructure strategies, while the Trust had concerns regarding potential impacts on green space (to be addressed through the masterplans showing green infrastructure to be included and how this provides buffers and links for the wider environment). The Environment Agency recommended joining the policy direction up the required surface water management plans, but noted the preparation of masterplans. Ellesmere Town Council and the Belle Vue Arts Festival stressed the importance of sustainability principles.

Shrewsbury South SUE

2. *Coal resource:* The Coal Authority sought reference in the Policy or its supporting text to the fact that the SUE falls within an area of surface coal resource, and consequently past coal mining activities, which has left a legacy (this issue has been picked up in the SUE Masterplan).
3. *Local Centre:* Whilst not objecting to the principle of the SUE or local level foodstore provision, Morbaine Ltd objected to the scale of the proposed retail floorspace for the SUE local centre (given the planning application under consideration at the time and subsequently granted consent for the relocation of the existing garden centre and the provision of a large foodstore and other smaller retail units). Morbaine Ltd considered that the policy should be clear that any local centre allocation should be based on the needs of the new residential and working population of the SUE and not the needs of the wider area, set out a maximum size threshold of 1,500 sq.m. for any new local centre, with a maximum size threshold of 500 sq.m. for any individual unit, with any larger scale proposals to be subject to the sequential and impact tests, and require any uses to come forward over a timeframe consistent with the SUE.

Consultants for Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd, in the same context of the then current planning application, objected that the size of the land proposed to be allocated as a local centre was in excess of that necessary to serve the needs of the SUE, recommending an allocation around half the size of that shown.

4. *Land north of Oteley Road, protection of Rea Brook Valley and other issues:* CPRE objected to the inclusion of land north of Oteley Road in the SUE, while agents for the owners of the majority of this land (Charles Frank Trust) expressed support for the SUE and the proposed broad arrangement of land uses. The Shropshire Wildlife Trust considered that development to the north of Oteley Road should be minimal, the landscape surrounding the Greek Orthodox Church and Sutton Farm protected, and development should not impinge on the Rea Brook Valley and LNR, which should be protected and enhanced as valuable green infrastructure.

The Belle Vue Arts Festival sought greater protection around the Rea Brook, the provision of community allotments, and links to the countryside.

Shrewsbury West SUE

5. *Supporting evidence/technical reports/Masterplan/sustainability appraisal:* Consultants acting for Morris Leisure raised principle issues relating to a lack

of supporting technical reports and justification for the SUE, contending that the site allocation was therefore premature. Particular concern related to the proposed Link Road, the associated environmental impacts on Morris Leisure's Oxon Touring Caravan Park during construction and thereafter, combined with the relocation of the Park and Ride facility, all adversely impacting on the caravan park, with no appreciable benefits to the business. A further issue raised related to the deliverability and viability of the Link Road, with the suggestion that this aspect of the scheme be removed or, if to be built, assurance given that it will be built to the same standard of design as the originally proposed North West Relief Road, including landscaping, noise attenuation and provision for sustainable transport. Concern was also expressed that the Council appeared to have discounted relocation of the caravan park and redevelopment of the (brownfield) site for residential development.

The consultants state that prior to the publication of a Masterplan and the next stage of preparation of the SAMDev Plan, the evidence base to support the proposed SUE should be completed to address the concerns on noise, disturbance and air pollution and published for public scrutiny. The consultants also considered that further details of what was proposed, including mitigation measures, (i.e. the Masterplan rather than the Land Use Plan consulted upon) were required to allow meaningful engagement. The lack of progress on the provision of the Masterplan was noted. Questions were also raised regarding the need for the Core Strategy and the emerging SAMDev Plan to be formally reviewed against the NPPF, and whether the sustainability appraisal carried out was appropriate to the current stage of plan making.

6. *Green infrastructure, Link Road and other issues:* Natural England put forward amended wording to include reference to green infrastructure rather than 'major landscape buffers and public open space' in order to maximise its multifunctionality. CPRE expressed concerns regarding the sensitivity of the landscape and the proposed Link Road (including in relation to the severance of existing lanes and the diversion of resources from the provision of other infrastructure). The Shropshire Wildlife Trust commented that development should have regard to Oxon Pool as a key element of the local green space, there should be further clarity on any possible wider impacts on the River Severn and the landscape to the north of the town, and that the site should not be reliant on other projects such as the controversial North West Relief Road.

HCF Residents Group submitted a number of questions, particularly regarding the inclusion of the Link Road, accesses to/from development off it, severance of the Calcott and Shepherds Lanes, the relocation of the Park and Ride site, and the provision of additional community facilities.

Oswestry Eastern Gateway SUE

7. *General:* Oswestry Town Council supported the allocation of the land for the SUE and the broad disposition of land uses, seeking an aspirational Masterplan with community elements to include allotments and generous open space provision, full integration with the Leisure Centre and College Campus, an adequate buffer zone for the bypass, a good mix of type and affordability of

dwellings, and a comprehensive approach to infrastructure provision from the outset. Oswestry & District Civic Society also supported the development of the SUE in principle, but suggested that the housing density could be increased. The Shropshire Wildlife Trust commented that provision should be included for green space within the site to extend the bypass buffer zone and provide additional ecological connectivity.

Other Sites

8. Two promoters submitted that other sites, in addition to the three SUE's referred to in the policy direction (which are those put forward in the Core Strategy), should also be identified as SUE's – land off Adderley Road, Market Drayton and land to the north-west of Oswestry.

APPENDIX F: DRAFT POLICIES 2013 CONSULTATION: KEY ISSUES RAISED

Draft Policy MD1: Scale and Distribution of Development

Of those who responded electronically 43% agreed with the draft policy, 43% disagreed and 14% didn't know. Whilst many agreed with the general principles of the policy and the broad distribution of development across the county's towns and rural areas, several responses suggested the need for additional evidence base to support the policy including through the preparation of an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Many who disagreed with the policy also promoted additional settlements to be included as Community Hubs or Clusters. Others questioned the policy's conformity with the NPPF in terms of identifying sufficient housing land supply. Others welcomed the ability of rural areas to 'opt in' for development after the adoption of the SAMDev, but that the plan needed to ensure that housing and employment opportunities should be balanced and prioritise brownfield land ahead of greenfield.

Draft Policy MD2: Sustainable Design

53% of 76 respondents supported the draft policy. A range of comments were received from statutory consultees, town and parish councils, local community/interest groups and local residents. There is agreement for how the policy seeks to protect landscape features and safeguard heritage, specifically mentioned by Natural England. It is noted by Shropshire Geological Society that good reference has been made to watercourses and the positive impact on local character this draft policy would allow for. Respondents including the Canal and Rivers Trust and Worcestershire County Council welcome a policy that focuses on the quality and detailed characteristics of development.

Concerns have been raised regarding the scale and location of future development and how the setting of a place could be negatively affected by development. Town Councils, community groups and planning consultants have raised concerns about how the character and style of future development will be implemented. There should be more of an emphasis on climate change resilience, suggested by Broseley Town Council. It has been suggested by Cerda Planning Limited that the policy is too restrictive and imposes specific architectural styles.

Draft Policy MD3: Managing Housing Development

Reference to "good enough to approve" should be amended to "exceed minimum requirements";

- Development on brownfield or infill sites before new greenfield sites, and reflect housing need rather than simply market forces;
- Some welcomed of increased dependence on local consultation on the type and mix of housing through the annual Place Plan process;
- The type of mix of housing on a site should also have regard to the applicant's views on what is appropriate for the site;
- Proposals for renewing permissions should be tightened to require evidence that the project will be realised, with an actual guarantee of delivery;

- Concern over the deliverability of the draft policy's criteria for renewing permissions as the Council could never guarantee development would come forward;
- Concern expressed that it is impractical to demonstrate that a development will not prejudice other sites coming forward;
- However, another comment suggested that renewals are made conditional on a satisfactory plan for maintenance of the site pending commencement of development delivery;
- It should be made clear in the settlement policies that the housing targets are not a cap, but a minimum;
- It was suggested that a key consideration within paragraph 4 of policy MD3 should be the sustainability of any proposed development;
- A number of respondents welcomed the flexibility inherent in paragraph 5 which would reduce the need for continual review of the Plan;
- Some felt the policy needed to be stronger on addressing any potential shortfall in housing in light of the NPPF and that alternative sites
- Overall, the policy was considered by many respondents to be too negative and inflexible when it comes to promoting increased housing delivery, which is a key aim of Central Government and the NPPF.
- A number of respondents suggested that rather than using partial plan reviews, it would be better to supply more allocations or through 'reserve sites';
- Some parish Councils were concerned the policy would lead to a long 'trickle' of development and ran contrary to Localism;
- There was a call for robust housing need figures and/or jointly sponsor surveys with developers and communities in deriving the settlements' housing requirements.
- It was suggested that there should be more flexibility to cross subsidise affordable housing exception sites appraised on a scheme by scheme basis.
- Some Parishes asked for clearer guidance on what is meant by affordable housing
- Attention was drawn to the need for affordable housing, starter homes, retirement housing facilities and the better use of empty properties to provide additional housing.

Draft Policy MD4: Managing Employment Development

Stakeholders generally supported the comprehensive approach to both protecting existing employment areas (Policy MD9) to maintain their economic use and to managing new allocations (Policy MD4) to continue to attract and support economic investment in the County. However, they wished to see a fully reasoned and quantified justification for the proposed scale of growth and the choice of new employment sites in Policy MD4. Stakeholders also felt that ideally, the Reservoir should be supported by Reserve sites which may be used to refresh the Reservoir against significant demand for new land.

Concerns affecting the support for Policy MD4, related principally to the degree of confidence in the planned aspirations for economic development compared with the investment demand experienced in Shropshire. Stakeholders foresaw a need for significant sector support especially for land based industries to deliver value added diversification and for small business formation and growth to respect their special

development needs which are not necessarily suited to development opportunities on industrial estates or business parks.

Stakeholders recognised that ensuring realistic prospects for attracting investment into the County are reliant on delivering a range and choice of developable and deliverable new employment sites in the portfolio of land and premises. The Reservoir must also identify accessed and serviced land which is readily available to the market, capable of delivery and is supported by evidence of these essential characteristics. Local stakeholders suggested that the choice of new employment sites should be driven by an approach based on Localism. The need to deliver new employment land was recognised as a key element of facilitating sustainable development by balancing the scale and distribution of new housing development. It was also recognised that the provision of employment land and the creation of new employment opportunities will help to ensure the continuing vitality, viability and prosperity of communities especially in more rural locations. Further concerns related to the need to also deliver investment in transport and community services and to respect local distinctiveness in the natural and historical environment.

Draft Policy MD5: Sites for Sand & Gravel Working

48% of 46 respondents support the draft policy. A range of detailed comments were received from statutory consultees, site promoters, neighbouring authorities and local interest groups. The measured approach adopted in the policy is supported by the Shropshire Geological Society. A number of respondents from industry are concerned about the proposed phasing mechanism and the potential to impose output and timescale restrictions. The Mineral Products Association is concerned that the policy is not currently supported by evidence from a Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) and that the current policy approach unnecessarily constrains mineral development in a way inconsistent with the requirements of the NPPF. Worcestershire County Council suggests that an explanation of the term "relevant sub-regional target" should be provided. English Heritage suggests that it may be helpful to reference current work on a Mineral Resource Assessment in Shropshire which aims to improve the management and understanding of the historic environment in mineral extraction areas.

Draft Policy MD6: Green Belt & Safeguarded Land

The majority of respondents (42%, 21 out of 51 respondents) supported the draft policy. A number of respondents expressed support for different aspects of the policy, including the reference to development in Community Hubs and Cluster and previously developed sites. However on the other hand, 16 out of 51 respondents (33%) did not support the draft policy. 7 of these respondents stated that no development should be permitted in the Green Belt and the policy should therefore restrict every form of development. Another issue raised was that the policy conflicted with the NPPF, namely paragraphs 87, 88 & 89. Firstly, point 1 of the draft policy makes no provision for the case of very special circumstance to be advanced to outweigh any harm to the Green Belt. Secondly, Point 4. excludes open market housing proposal being considered on a previously developed site, conflicting with paragraph 89 of the NPPF. Natural England also commented that the policy could consider any opportunities for links between the Green Belt and green infrastructure or ecological networks. Natural Trust also highlighted that the relationship between point 1 and point 3 of the draft policy is not clear, as it currently reads that infill

development in Community Hubs and Clusters could not be allowed as it would inevitably have some effect on openness.

Draft Policy MD7: Managing Development in the Countryside

Of the 62 responses 51% agreed with the policy approach, whilst 27% disagreed. The remainder did not indicate either agreement or disagreement. The main issues raised included a need to include appropriate safeguards for the countryside, including agricultural land, wildlife and other assets, but at the same time to provide some flexibility in the policy and provide for sustainable development which fosters the rural vitality and the economy with the functional role of the countryside being highlighted. Natural England supported the clarity of stance regarding importance of protection of natural environment. It was also noted that the role of mitigation measures in making development acceptable should be recognised in policy.

There was call for policy to directly identify the role for sustainable greenfield development to meet NPPF land supply requirements and to provide for market housing cross subsidy of affordable housing to meet rural housing need. Conversely it was also suggested that there should be no development outside village boundaries in order to protect the countryside. Furthermore it was said that policy should include provision to favour reuse of brownfield land including for market housing where no other beneficial use and enhancement achieved. Whilst the proposed restriction of holiday let accommodation to local need accommodation was supported it was suggested that as a whole that MD7 is overly restrictive and does not adequately provide for the housing need of rural communities. It was also suggested that there is insufficient support of conversions and that there are gaps in policy coverage relating to protection of agricultural land and certain types of development including renewable energy, live-work units, large agricultural buildings (particularly in AONB) mineral extraction & sand & gravel. English Heritage also highlight the need for to build in flexibility for reuse of historic farmsteads, including an element of new build where necessary for reasons of heritage and landscape interest, consideration, referencing West Midlands Historic Farmstead and Landscape Project. They also highlight need for clarification in respect of SPD providing additional guidance and recommend that the policy includes a clear and positive statement on the use of the emerging farmsteads guidance.

It is suggested that policy MD7 places inappropriate constraints on development, in particular the approach to new rural tourism, leisure and recreation is more restrictive than NPPF and not in line with government proposals to relax controls over change of use of agricultural buildings. Related to this it is suggested that locational criteria and viability assessment approach is inappropriate and application of occupancy conditions to existing dwellings out of date and unjustified. It was also felt that provisions for agricultural workers dwellings should be simplified. Specific comments indicated that a distinction should be drawn between general affordable and agricultural workers dwellings and that requirements for affordable contributions and restrictive conditions on existing farmhouses are too onerous. More generally concerns were also expressed that the policy was overly complex, technical and poorly related to other policies and existing SPD, with overlap identified. It was suggested that it is unclear in respect of the role of rural settlements which are not Community hubs or Clusters and that additional criteria are required to control exceptions housing. Additionally several respondents suggested that restrictions

relating to replacement buildings are unreasonable & conflict with NPPF and government changes to permitted development for dwellings. In contrast there is some support for viability assessment and concern is expressed by other respondents regarding potential for misuse of provisions for agricultural workers dwellings. Whilst there is general support for tourism related development, there is a suggestion that holiday let permissions should be limited to prevent abuse and that there should be no conversion of holiday lets to full time dwellings. Also it is requested that safeguards are put in place to try and ensure that employment development is directed to appropriate locations, including where infrastructure is available, and that the employment provided is not just short term. The issue of infrastructure provision and how it is achieved to support development is also raised as a general concern. The potential for agricultural development to be considered as employment development was put forward. Various specific detailed wording amendments are put forward by respondents to better reflect NPPF and legal precedent.

Draft Policy MD8: Infrastructure Provision

49% of 57 respondents support the draft policy, whilst 30% do not. A range of organisations express support for different aspects of the policy, including the safeguarding of existing infrastructure and recognition of the value of landscape character and the setting of heritage assets. A number of respondents suggest that the clarity of the policy could be improved by defining the scope of 'strategic' infrastructure, and the derivation of 'agreed' objectives. Some respondents consider that the policy is not sufficiently supportive of renewable energy infrastructure to be compliant with the NPPF. More specific guidance is sought in respect of solar farms and the safeguarding of social and cultural infrastructure. Reference to the potential for impacts on specific heritage assets is suggested as part of the explanatory text

Draft Policy MD9: Safeguarding and Improving Employment Investment – Key Issues Raised

Stakeholders support the comprehensive approach to both protecting existing employment areas (Policy MD9) to maintain their economic use and to managing new allocations (Policy MD4) to support economic investment in the County.

The strengths of Policy MD9 were considered to be: the support for key employers by providing security of tenure for their operational sites, the safeguarding of local employment opportunities, the protection of accessed and serviced development land and the promotion of brownfield land for re-use and redevelopment. The inclusion of a specific, evidence based test in Policy MD9 to determine development proposals for alternative land uses on existing employment areas was also considered to significantly strengthen the policy. The concerns expressed about Policy MD9 related to whether the protection of existing employment areas was justified in locations with significant levels of vacant land and premises and whether the process of determining the most appropriate use or re-use of existing employment land would be open, fair and equitable. A desire was also expressed for Policy MD9 to address the development needs of land based industries whose operational sites accommodate other operations or other businesses. Whilst farm based enterprises are generally in more isolated locations, it was suggested that the

trend towards accommodating industrial and business enterprises was created some significant and marketable, farm based investment locations.

Local stakeholders recognised the need to protect existing employment areas to secure the long term sustainability of communities. It was recognised that access to local employment would provide the opportunity to reduce the need to travel and facilitate a reduction in the use of cars and other private vehicles. There was a desire for communities to actively determine whether local employment areas should be protected through their Neighbourhood, Community or Parish Plans. It was suggested that the need for protection should be balanced against the demand for new housing development as a means to protect the long term sustainability of communities.

Draft Policy MD10: Retail Development

A range of comments were received from statutory consultee, town and parish councils, local community/interest groups and local residents. Of those responding electronically 51% supported the draft policy, whilst 24% disagreed. Some gave specific support to the draft policy's approach of town centre protection. Some thought the policy should go further by requiring Impact Assessment on all retail development over 200sqm, even in the town centre. Other comments representing national retailers believed the draft policy went too far in restricting changes of use away from retail in Primary shopping areas, and therefore contrary to the NPPF. Other comments felt that the draft policy placed too much emphasis on the need for Impact Assessments and should have regard to the need to positively promote Meole Brace Retail Park as a retail destination. Others felt the policy could be more positively framed, for instance by identifying opportunities for people to 'live over the shop'.

Draft Policy MD11: Tourism Facilities and Visitor Accommodation

The majority of respondents (63% 32/51) agreed or strongly agreed with the draft policy wording of MD11. A number of respondents welcomed a draft policy that supported the development of quality tourism and leisure proposals in appropriate locations whilst seeking to retain the intrinsic qualities of the offer within Shropshire. The Canal and River Trust supported the positive references to the canal network and the principle of canals being protected from other forms of development as multi-functional assets. English Heritage suggested inclusion of reference to heritage value of canals and World Heritage Site guidance in the policy. The Environment Agency supported the inclusion managed retreat of existing sites in areas of highest flood risk.

Some respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed (12/51 14%) with elements of the draft policy. Some respondents felt that the policy as drafted was too onerous (in relation to identifying a need for a countryside location as expressed in MD7 and referenced in MD11) with regards to the guidance set out in NPPF paragraph 28 regarding support for all rural tourism developments. The consistency with the NPPF was also raised as an issue in relation to the reference to accessibility of some visitor accommodation and larger scale development. That there is no explicit reference in the policy to the re-use of existing buildings in the countryside for tourism use was also raised as an issue. Concern was also raised that specific policies relating to a marina in the Oswestry Local Plan was not being sufficiently replaced. Broseley

Town Council highlighted that village and town community led plans should be referenced in the evidence base to reflect locally identified tourism priorities that might not be covered through other tourism strategies. Oswestry Town Council and Ludlow Town Council highlighted the importance of market towns in tourism offer should be recognised.

Draft Policy MD12: Natural and Historic Environment

The majority of respondents, 64% (35 out of 55) respondents supported the draft policy. Of all the comments made, suggestions for changes to the wording of either the policy or the supporting text were the most frequently expressed. Some of these came from interest groups such as the Woodland Trust or the Shropshire Geological Society and as such were concerned with improving the protection of particular assets such as geological features or ancient woodland and veteran trees. The other comments in this category were from members of the public, Town or Parish Councils and site promoters. They raised issues ranging from a desire to protect visual amenity or high quality agricultural land to suggestions as to how deal with the differences between designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Site or settlement specific comments formed the next most frequently expressed type of comment, followed by the view that the natural and historic environment should be covered by separate policies rather than combined as in the draft policy. A few respondents expressed concern that whilst they supported the draft policy, Shropshire Council might not implement it in full. The National Trust did not support the draft policy on the basis it would weaken protection of the most important assets by setting the same standard for them as for locally valued assets. Stretton Climate Care disagreed with the draft policy because they were concerned that it might restrict renewable energy infrastructure proposals.

Natural England strongly supported the draft policy. English Heritage felt that two separate policies would offer a clearer and more robust approach. This is in part due to the quite specific terminology for the historic and natural environment and also for heritage assets, the fundamental importance of the concept of significance.

Draft Policy MD13: Waste Management Facilities

66% of 47 respondents support the policy. A range of respondents welcome different aspects of the draft policy, including measures to protect water resources and geology and control recycling at mineral sites. The EA suggest extending guidance on open air composting facilities to cover extensions to existing facilities and inserting a link to recent guidance concerning the interaction of the planning and permitting regimes. Concern is raised that the current wording is too open-ended and does not, for example, meet the requirements of paragraphs 132 to 135 of the NPPF with respect to avoiding harm to Shropshire's natural and historic environment. A number of respondents are concerned about the visual impact of bin stores.

Draft Policy MD14: Landfill and Land Raising Sites

59% of 43 respondents support the policy. A range of respondents welcome different aspects of the draft policy, including the protection of water resources. A criteria based policy is considered appropriate by the Environment Agency in the local

context and Worcestershire County Council confirm that the proposed policy approach is consistent with cross boundary discussions in the West Midlands area.

Draft Policy MD15: Mineral Safeguarding

51% of 45 respondents support the policy. A range of respondents welcome different aspects of the draft policy, including the protection of water resources and the safeguarding of mineral resources. The Mineral Products Association fully supports the draft policy approach. English Heritage would like to see the scope of the policy extended to address safeguarding existing and future supplies of traditional building and roofing stone using the evidence base supplied by the Strategic Stone Study. They consider that the policy could also provide a positive framework (NPPF 144) for facilitating small-scale, short-term and intermittent mineral workings to supply both conservation work and locally distinctive materials for new build. Broseley Town Council suggests changes to recognise the long term economic value of mineral resources and a clearer explanation of the sterilisation of mineral resources.

Draft Policy MD16: Managing the Development and Operation of Mineral Sites

47% of 49 respondents support the policy (12% do not). A range of respondents express support for different aspects of the policy including protection for ecology and support for ecological networks and the recognition of the value of local buildings materials. Some respondents express concern about restoration controls and the protection afforded to the AONB. The Coal Authority welcomes the positive tone of the policy, which it considers appropriately reflects guidance in the NPPF. Lafarge Tarmac consider that there should be greater emphasis upon the need for the comprehensive working of minerals and more emphasis on the 'great weight' that local planning authorities should give to 'the benefits of the mineral extraction, including to the economy' (NPPF 144). The Mineral Products Association suggest a range of amendments to improve the policy and are particularly concerned that the flexible approach proposed in MD16(5) should not imply more lenient treatment for operations to work locally distinctive materials since this would be anti-competitive. English Heritage suggests minor changes to clarify the approach to impacts on water resources.

APPENDIX G: REVISED PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION 2013: KEY ISSUES RAISED

Albrighton Place Plan Area

Albrighton

Q1. Do you agree with the proposed extension of the allocation of land east of Shaw Lane (site ALB002) and its associated increase in total housing target for Albrighton from a total of 200 homes to a total of 250 homes?

2 responses were received, from the site promoters and from the RAF museum, both agreeing with the proposed increase. The promoters of the 'Kingswood Road Land' (KRL) allocation ALB002 cross-referred to the Albrighton Neighbourhood Plan 'Light' (NP), which notes the benefits of a larger site include the potential for the provision of station parking, school drop off and a wider choice of new housing (NP paragraphs 4.36-4.41). KRL supports those aims. The Neighbourhood Plan identifies the need to facilitate an alternative access along Kingswood Road to that which currently has the benefit of planning permission, to allow a more comprehensive approach to the land's long term development. KRL have begun testing options for how a development of circa 180 homes could be delivered whilst achieving the objectives of the NP. The progression of the option plans has demonstrated that there are a number of scenarios in which the 180 homes could be provided, particularly if the 80 homes that already has consent is 'replanned' as part of the exercise.

KRL support the principle of the area of land that has been allocated in the SAMDEV; it is accepted that it provides an allocation larger than what is required to deliver 180 homes. Evidently this provides a greater level of flexibility to deliver the most appropriate solution for a 180 home development. KRL does however query the omission of the land south of the primary school from the allocation. Whilst it is accepted that the inclusion of this land will extend the allocation further beyond what is strictly required, inclusion of it will ensure all practical options can be properly assessed. The land has the potential to deliver pedestrian and cycle routes back to Shaw Lane and it would be unfortunate to miss the scope for realising this opportunity. KRL therefore encourages Shropshire Council to consider the inclusion of the parcel of land south of the primary school within the allocation.

KRL take this opportunity to encourage the SAMDEV to provide for a degree of flexibility in the application of 'target capacity'. Where so many options exist, it would be prudent to allow for a degree of flexibility with regard to the precise number of homes required. The NPPF stresses flexibility and KRL is committed to meeting the infrastructure requirements as far as practicable on a development of this scale. The options that have been progressed to date suggest that matters such as a highway connection from Shaw Lane to Kingswood could potentially be better and more realistically achieved via a development of a slightly larger scale.

KRL is keen to avoid piecemeal development, considering it essential that development at Shaw Lane be informed by a wider masterplan strategy for growth for the whole of the KRL site (which includes the remaining 'safeguarded land') to give the community a degree of ownership and comfort of the long term vision and prospects for the site. KRL is keen to establish the scope of this and how aspects such as the reservation of land for leisure can be dealt with through the SAMDEV and subsequent planning application process.

Q2. Do you agree with the proposed allocation of land at Whiteacres for small scale housing development of up to 16 homes (ALB003 site)?

Three of the four responses were favourable with regard to allocation of the site, with the fourth, from English Heritage, pointing to the need for sensitive and high quality design to sustain and enhance the significance of the conservation area and its setting.

The land owners of ALB003 support the development of the site for residential housing, but they do not support the latest wording in the Revised Preferred Options consultation and request that the site is allocated for 30 open market dwellings. The landowners have sought to demonstrate that an open market use would be the most deliverable and that the achievable number of houses (30) is in accordance with advice sought from the Shropshire Council Highways Department.

The landowners disagree with the proposed wording in the NP that ties the site to retirement properties because of the relatively large provision of such accommodation in the area. They have approached a number of retirement home providers who state that site ALB003 was not suitable for retirement dwellings due to lack of roadside frontage and the walking distance to high street. They claim that an unrestricted open-market development can help balance the local housing stock in accordance with Core Strategy policy CS11.

3. Other comments

The Cosford Museum

The Cosford Museum commented that they would be opposed to any employment growth within Cosford itself and are reassured to see no industrial allocations identified. In taking a proactive role in protecting the future of the site, the Museum would like to work with the Local Planning Authority in using the Museum's current masterplan as the basis of a Development Brief for the site. This would then provide an approved planning strategy for implementing a long term vision for the site while safeguarding the Museum's future at Cosford.

Flooding

The Environment Agency (EA) recommended that Shropshire Council checks with its Flood and Water Management team where surface water is discharging to, as the EA understands that there no/limited capacity in the Albrighton Brook.

Alternative site

One alternative site was proposed on land to the East of Newport Road (ALB008) for up to 175 homes and a medical centre, community hall and special needs housing. The site is promoted as a sustainable site that helps facilitate provision of health and community facilities.

One comment was received that land to the north of the Bushfield Estate (between Newport Road and the railway / A41) should not be considered for development as it is prone to flooding (eg. flooded in July 2006). Natural drainage brings flood water towards existing housing. Remedial work has brought an improvement but anxiety still exists. The respondent also pointed to the site's proximity to the Nature Reserve.

Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area

Bishop's Castle

Question 1: Do you agree that site BISH013 should be allocated for a maximum of 40 houses?

The majority of respondents, 77% (41 out of 53) agreed that BISH013 should be allocated for up to 40 houses. Many of those felt that the site was in a good location.

Bishop's Castle Town Council strongly supported the allocation of BISH013 for a maximum of 40 houses. They felt that; any development at this location will cause little visual impact on the town; the desire lines from the town are to the north east; there is easy access to the site via Dog Kennel lane and A448 or Schoolhouse Lane and Station Street and the site is close enough to the town centre for residents to walk into the town.

Question 2: Do you agree that site BISH021 should NOT be allocated for 40 houses and 20 independent living units?

The majority of respondents, 83% (43 out of 52) agreed that BISH021 should not be allocated for housing and independent living units. They cited concerns over access, traffic and flooding as the main reasons for not allowing development on the site.

Bishop's Castle Town Council supported the statement that site BISH021 should not be allocated for 40 houses and 20 independent living units. They felt that the proposal would cause major traffic problems because of the difficulties accessing the site via Kerry Lane and that the only other possible access from Welsh Street has documented traffic problems due to its narrowness. They added that this site is further from the town centre than BISH013 and therefore residents will be more likely to drive into the town centre exacerbating the traffic congestion already being experienced in the town centre.

Bucknell

Question 1: Do you agree that the housing growth target for Bucknell should be 100?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference, comprising 75% (6 out of 8 persons) disagreed with the proposed housing growth requirement of 100 dwellings, although this target was agreed with Bucknell Parish Council. Comments related to two principal issues: the scale of housing growth and the capacity of the infrastructure of the town to accommodate this development. One respondent questioned whether Bucknell required any further growth to 2026. Other respondents questioned whether Bucknell could accommodate the anticipated and significant increase in population from the housing growth and whether there are sufficient employment opportunities to deliver sustainable development despite the potential for new light industrial development in the Revised SAMDev Option. There was some support for housing development but at the lower level of 50 houses to be located at the Timber Yard (following the relocation of existing businesses) with some unquantified windfall development in the rest of village. The capacity of strategic water, electricity and drainage infrastructure to serve the proposed development of 100 dwellings was raised but would equally need to be addressed at the lower level of 50 dwellings plus windfall development. A key issue raised in relation to infrastructure was the capacity of the roads to serve local residents, the services in the town and through traffic to the principal neighbouring centres including Craven Arms and Knighton.

Question 2: Do you agree that the combined Timber Yard/Station Yard should be allocated for a mix of up to 50 houses and some employment uses?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference, comprising 58% (7 out of 12 persons) supported the allocation of the Timber Yard / Station Yard for housing development which was unanimously supported by Bucknell Parish Council and proposed by others as the only preferred development site in Bucknell to 2026. The Timber Yard area was promoted as having no impediment to development, could remediate a poor quality site and had sufficient capacity for further housing, if required to further facilitate the viability of the development and the delivery of infrastructure. It was also suggested the Timber Yard area would regenerate this underused part of Bucknell adjoining the railway station. Shropshire Wildlife Trust preferred the Timber Yard area as it was not affected by proximity to wildlife site and views from the AONB like the previous preferred site. Concerns were expressed about the viability, scale, design of the development at the Timber Yard area and a number of specific constraints were identified including the risk of flooding but the Environment Agency confirmed that recent modelling showed the site was not at risk subject to adequate safeguarding measures.

Question 3: Should the remainder of the houses be delivered through windfall development or on an allocated site?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 67% (6 out of 9 persons) agreed that any further development should be delivered on unidentified windfall sites as a more acceptable growth pattern for the village. The preference for windfall sites focused on redeveloping brownfield sites before releasing greenfield sites and the need for careful monitoring of the village infrastructure capacity. Other respondents questioned whether the scale of windfall development (48 dwellings) could be delivered in Bucknell if the Timber Yard area only delivered 50 dwellings. It was suggested, the scale of windfall development could be reduced to a deliverable level if a further housing site was allocated at BUCK009. BUCK009 was believed to have low landscape sensitivity and offered the potential to manage any impacts on the AONB through careful design and landscaping.

Question 4: Do you agree that BUCK003 (land adjoining Redlake Meadow) should NOT be allocated for 40 houses?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference, comprising 75% (6 out of 8 persons) agreed BUCK003 should not be allocated. Respondents suggested that the preferred form of development in Bucknell to 2026 should be to redevelop brownfield sites and to assess the impacts of this development on the character of Bucknell and its infrastructure before committing any greenfield sites for development. It was suggested that significant constraints to the development of BUCK003 were its location within the AONB, its situation close to a protected wildlife site and its effect in extending development into the countryside with the potential to indicate an eastward direction of growth for Bucknell, in the longer term. Subject to the scale of the proposed development, BUCK003 received some limited support based on the potential to deliver a highway access directly off the B4367, the level topography of the site, availability of services and the absence of any significant flood risk.

Other Comments – Development Boundary

It is proposed to retain the development boundary around the village of Bucknell which was considered to offer the most appropriate strategy for the village. Whilst removing the boundary was considered to provide a more flexible strategy by more readily accommodating development the retention of boundary gives greater certainty over the scale and pattern of development in the village.

Clun

Question 1: Do you agree that the housing growth target should be 70 (the preferred options target was 100)?

There is no consensus about the preferred housing growth requirement for the town of Clun. Preferences expressed showed a simple split of opinion between those who opposed the lower housing requirement (50%) and those in favour of the new requirement for 70 dwellings (50%). However, the respondents who objected to the new requirement for 70 dwellings also expressed some limited support for an even lower housing requirement. In the absence of a clear consensus, the views of Clun Town Council (as the local elected representative body) should be taken as properly representing the wishes of the community.

Question 2: Do you agree that the number of houses on site CLUN002 (land to the rear of the GP's surgery) should be increased from 40 to 60? Note: If the growth target is 70, then having 60 houses on this site means that the number to come forward through windfall is reduced to 8, taking into account those already built or committed.

The majority of respondents indicating a preference, comprising 75% (6 out of 8 persons) disagreed that CLUN002 should deliver a minimum of 60 houses. The views expressed were that the desire for a higher number of houses on CLUN002 simply reflected the significant size of CLUN002 and the reliance on this single allocation. Alternative views indicated that the higher number of houses on CLUN002 could readily be accommodated through the use of a small corridor of land adjoining the proposed allocation and in the same landownership. It was suggested that this would achieve a safe and visible highway access and a sensible layout within the site. It was also identified that a second site at CLUN001 was available for development, this could help to deliver a suitable pattern of development in Clun and the site could be developed subject to appropriate design and landscaping.

Other Comments – Clarification of Strategic Approach

Clun Town Council clarified the strategic approach to the delivery of the revised housing requirement for 70 dwellings in Clun. Contrary to the expression of the strategy in the SAMDev Revised Preferred Option, Clun Town Council wish to favour the delivery of housing on allocated site CLUN002 by requiring a minimum of 60 dwellings on this site and for the balance of development on windfall sites to deliver a maximum of 8 dwellings in the rest of the village.

Lydbury North

Question 1: Do you agree that the housing growth target for Lydbury North should be 20 (the preferred options target was 25)?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 63% (12 out of 19 persons) disagreed with the proposed housing growth requirement of 20 dwellings. The principal arguments presented by those seeking no growth at all, suggest that it is difficult to prove the need for 20 new houses when there is already a supply of properties for sale which offer a range and choice of housing sizes, character and price. The provision of 20 new houses is also expected to increase the physical size of the village by up to 10% which could harm the character of the village. It is therefore, suggested that 10 houses would be a more appropriate target for Lydbury North. Irrespective of the scale of development, it suggested that development should be sustainable allowing for new employment creation, and in turn, manage the degree of out commuting must be managed to ensure it does not affect the viability of the village shop by failing to increase demand for this essential local service. These issues lead to the conclusion that the proposed strategy for Lydbury North could be undeliverable and unsustainable and also neglects the needs of surrounding villages and hamlets.

These views are balanced against the recognition that the housing requirement is agreed by Lydbury North Parish Council following a local housing survey and informal local consultations. It is recognised that the housing survey made the case for further housing to provide a choice of accommodation for older people and also to secure the future of the school by providing housing at an affordable price for young, local families. It is advocated that the strategy deliver the proposed housing progressively through the plan period and target local housing need / demand.

Question 2: Do you agree that site LYD001 should be reduced in size so that it accommodates fewer houses (the preferred options number was 12)?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 68% (13 out of 19 persons) agreed that LYD001 was a suitable and developable site for new housing with the potential to gain access from Habershon Close as an extension to the existing housing. The general preference was for 4 to 6 smaller dwellings to ensure affordability with adequate provision for residents parking. There was a desire for the new development to respect the surrounding housing especially to avoid any adverse impacts on the isolated and relatively low lying dwellings to the east of LYD001.

Question 3: Do you agree that site LYD002 should be allocated for housing?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 65% (13 out of 20 persons) agreed that LYD002 was a suitable and developable site for new housing. It was recognised that LYD002 could be developed in conjunction with LYD001 as both sites are in close proximity to each other, they are both suitable for development and have ready access to service infrastructure in the immediate locality. There is, however, a preference for 6 dwellings on LYD002 with adequate parking for both new residents and some further provision to relieve parking issues in the locality around South View. The preference for small scale development on LYD002 reflects the desire to disperse new development across the village to respect the scale and character of Lydbury North.

Question 4: Do you agree that sites LYD007, LYD008 and LYD009 should be allocated as a combined site for housing? (This combined site would only be feasible if the bungalow is included in it)

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 65% (13 out of 20 persons) disagreed with the proposal to develop sites LYD007, LYD008 and LYD009 as a combined housing site with the possibility of seeking a mixed use development with employment. Responses raised the following issues: it was felt there was no need / demand for employment development in Lydbury North due to the scale of employment opportunities in Bishops Castle as the nearest largest service centre. The location of these three sites would be adversely affected by the local highways as the lane serving the sites is narrow and forms part of a cross roads onto the B4385 and the locality of the sites offers only limited access to service infrastructure. It was also felt, the sites should not be combined because the potential redevelopment of the unsightly garage site would only be secured by developing open sites at LYD007 and LYD008 impacting on the countryside setting of Lydbury North. The redevelopment of the garage site was also seen as adversely affect an existing resident living in an existing property on the garage site. It was noted, however, that should the unsightly garage site be redeveloped, this would improve the visual character of the village and this might be possible because the garage site has direct access. It was further suggested that any new housing should be small scale, affordable and respect the scale and character of Lydbury North.

A number of specific points were made about this combined site: the consultation does not take into account whether the two landowners wish to co-operate and the fact that a covenant on LYD009 (the garage site) is held by the landowner of LYD007 and LYD008. It is possible that the financial aspirations for the redevelopment of LYD009 may make the

combined scheme unviable. It is also questioned whether the mix of uses, type of houses and the density of the development required to satisfy the financial and sustainability objectives for this combined proposal can satisfactorily respect the character of this area of the village and the intrinsic value of the adjoining countryside.

Question 5: Do you agree that site LYD010 should be allocated for housing?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 69% (11 out of 16 persons) disagreed that LYD010 is a suitable and developable site for new housing. Responses raised the following issues: it was questioned whether any new houses were needed in Lydbury North and whether it was necessary or appropriate to develop LYD010 given the poor road access, the presence of a natural water spring close to the site and the potential impacts on the amenity of existing residents. Other responses suggested that any development on LYD010 should be very small scale comprising one or two dwellings and should only be permitted with the support of those residents adjoining the site.

Question 6: Do you agree that site LYD011 should be allocated for housing?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 67% (12 out of 18 persons) disagreed that LYD011 is a suitable and developable site for new housing. Responses raised the following issues: it was questioned whether any new houses were needed in Lydbury North and whether it was necessary or appropriate to develop LYD011 given the limited availability of service infrastructure in the locality, the cross roads access onto the B4385, the narrow access road to the site and the potential impacts on the amenity of existing residents arising from an anticipated increase in local traffic and the elevated position of LYD011 overlooking the existing housing surrounding the site. Other responses suggested that any development on LYD011 should be very small scale comprising one or two dwellings possibly up to 4 dwellings and that such small scale development should only be permitted with the support of those residents adjoining the site.

Question 7. Do you agree that site LYD005 should NOT be allocated for housing?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 81% (13 out of 16 persons) agreed that LYD005 is not a suitable and developable site for new housing. Responses raised the following supporting issues: the site lies within the conservation area and is further constrained by a covenant restricting the use of the land. This site, like others in the village, would also raise concerns about the number and type of housing that might be developed.

Brockton

Question 1: Do you agree that Brockton should become part of a Community Cluster with Lydbury North?

Lydbury North Parish Council is preparing a Neighbourhood Plan alongside the SAMDev Plan and are considering whether Brockton should be a Cluster as the second principal settlement in the Parish. Lydbury North Parish Council will seek the majority view of Brockton residents about the most appropriate designation for their village and their preferred designation will be shown in the SAMDev Plan. Brockton is currently designated as countryside.

The majority of respondents comprising 50% (7 out of 14 persons) agreed with the potential designation of Brockton as a Community Cluster. The views expressed about this potential designation are that the residents of the village should decide whether becomes a Cluster and this potential designation should not adversely affect the residential amenity enjoyed by the existing residents.

Question 2: Do you agree that Brockton should have a housing growth target of 5?

The majority of respondents comprising 71% (10 out of 14 persons) would agree with the potential housing growth requirement for Brockton if the village were designated as a Community Cluster. The views expressed about this potential designation are again that the residents of the village decide the scale of development and this should not adversely affect the residential amenity enjoyed by the existing residents. Other views supported the scale of development in Brockton to reduce the demand for new housing to be provided in Lydbury North village as the local Community Hub. It was suggested that all applications in Brockton be considered on their merits which reflects the objectives of national planning policy.

Clungunford and Clunbury

Question 1: Do you agree that the Clungunford and Clunbury cluster should be extended to include the settlements of Abcot, Hopton Heath, Beckjay, Shelderton, Twitchen and Three Ashes?

There is no consensus about the preferred distribution of development in the Cluster of Clungunford and Clunbury. Preferences expressed in the consultation on the SAMDev Revised Preferred Option showed a simple split of opinion in relation to the suitability of the named settlements with a single preference for development to be focused in the principal settlements of Clungunford and Hopton Heath. It is considered that the views of the Parish Councils of Clungunford and Clunbury properly represents the wishes of the community as their elected representative.

Question 2: Do you agree that the housing growth target for the Cluster should be 15?

The majority of respondents comprising 75% (3 out of 4 persons) agreed with the housing requirement of 15 dwellings for the Cluster of Clungunford and Clunbury. One of these respondents suggested that the housing requirement could be higher still at 20 dwellings.

Hope, Bentlanwt and Shelve

Question 1: Do you agree that the Hope and Shelve Ward of Worthen with Shelve Parish should be designated a Community Cluster with development in recognised named settlements?

There were 5 responses to this question, of which 3 respondents agreed that the Hope and Shelve Parish Ward should be designated as a Community Cluster.

Question 2: Do you agree that each development site should be no more than 2 houses?

Of the 5 respondents, 4 agreed that each development site should accommodate no more than 2 houses.

Snailbeach, Stiperstones and Pennerley

Question 1: Do you agree that the Heath Ward of Worthen with Shelve Parish should be designated a Community Cluster with development in recognised named settlements?

Of the 4 respondents to this question, 2 agreed and 2 disagreed that the Heath Ward of the Parish should be designated as a Community Cluster.

Question 2: Do you agree that each development site should be no more than 2 houses?

There were 4 respondents to this question and 3 agreed that each development site should accommodate no more than 2 houses.

Worthen and Brockton

Question 1: Do you agree that the Worthen Ward of Worthen with Shelve Parish should be designated as a Community Cluster with development in recognised named settlements?

There were 9 responses to this question, of which 5 did not agree that the Worthen Ward should be designated as a Community Cluster. Two of these 5 responses were from landowners or site promoters who felt that the two settlements function together as a Community Hub rather than a Community Cluster.

Question 2: Do you agree that the housing growth target should be 30?

There were 9 responses to this question, of which 5 did not agree that the housing growth target should be 30. Of these 5, 2 were from landowners or site promoters who felt that the target should be higher because the Cluster either contains more settlements now or that the size of Worthen and Brockton merits more housing.

Question 3: Do you agree this should be met through windfall and infill development?

There were 8 responses to this question of which 6 agreed that the housing target should be met through windfall and infill development.

Question 4: Do you agree that no more than 10 houses should be built in each 1/3 of the plan period?

Of the 8 responses to this question, 5 agreed that no more than 10 houses should be built in each third of the plan period.

Question 5: Do you agree that no more than 5 houses should be built on each site?

There were 9 responses to this question of which 5 agreed that no more than 5 houses should be built on each site.

Question 6: Do you agree that site WORTH002 should NOT be allocated for housing?

All 6 respondents agreed that WORTH002 should not be allocated for housing.

Bridgnorth Place Plan Area

Bridgnorth

Q1 Do you agree with the move of the employment allocation that was previously proposed south of the bypass to land north of Wenlock Road (ELR077)?

| Q1 | Number | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|--------|------------|
| Total Respondents to Q1 | 39 | |
| Yes | 19 | 48.7% |
| No | 19 | 48.7% |
| Blank | 1 | 2.6% |

Tasley Parish Council reaffirmed their objection to development at Tasley, and do not consider the revised preferred option to be any better than the previous preferred option. They were particularly concerned about a substantial amount of new industrial development in proximity to existing residential properties. The Parish Council have grave concerns that there would be no new roundabout at the junction with the main Bridgnorth to Shrewsbury Road and that access to the new housing may have to be via Church Lane, which would not be safe.

Quite apart from whether this is the right site, many respondents queried the need for additional employment land at all with so much vacant employment land at Chartwell and Stanmore Industrial Estates. It was pointed out that the threatened closure of Bridgnorth Foils would increase the amount of vacant employment land in the town. Many were unconvinced that there was market demand for business premises, given Bridgnorth's poor connectivity relative to sites in Telford and the metropolitan area and the large amount of employment land available in Telford. There was some scepticism that development could be controlled to prevent retail uses, which in turn would negatively impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre.

It was clear that many respondents value the countryside beyond the bypass and wish to avoid both greenfield development and crossing the bypass. The untouched countryside was cited as important to the town's attraction to visitors and the tourist industry.

Half of respondents thought that this option was less appropriate than the original 2012 Preferred Option. Conflict with adjoining residential uses was a significant concern.

The developer considers this option to be undeliverable, due to the following constraints:

- The topography is unsuitable; major earth moving would be required to accommodate large frame buildings, the cost of which would render development unviable.
- Incompatible with the livestock market; industrial buildings would reduce the parking and vehicle manoeuvring space required for the functioning of the livestock market.
- Shared access between the livestock market, employment and residential uses is inappropriate.
- Insufficient land is available to deliver 6 hectares of additional employment land.

Q2 Do you agree with the deletion of the mixed uses and accompanying infrastructure that was previously proposed on the land north of Wenlock Road (previously site reference BRID001/BRID020b/09; now replaced by employment site reference ELR077)?

| Q2 | Number | Percentage |
|----|--------|------------|
|----|--------|------------|

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

| | | |
|--------------------------------|----|-------|
| Total Respondents to Q2 | 36 | |
| Yes | 16 | 44.4% |
| No | 17 | 47.2% |
| Blank | 3 | 8.3% |

It was recognised that the proposed change was in response to comments made in 2012, and that Shropshire Council, “was listening”. Some felt that it made sense to maximise and develop the existing employment-related uses of the area (ELR077) with its existing infrastructure rather than having to create a new site across the bypass.

A number of respondents would like no development whatsoever on this site. Some queried the need for employment development, suggesting that Stanmore Industrial Estate or Stourbridge Road would be more suitable locations. Others queried mixed use development, particularly its perceived threat to the vitality and viability of the town centre.

Concern was expressed about the traffic impact, and the need for a roundabout on the A458 was mentioned.

Other point-of-views expressed were that a supermarket and petrol filling station is needed to serve the local community. Community uses and some housing were also welcomed by some for this site. A number felt that the 2012 ‘mixed use’ proposals were preferable and should not be deleted.

Q3. Do you agree with the proposed reduction in the number of homes proposed on Land north of Church Lane (BRID020a) from 300 to 250?

| Q3 | Number | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Total Respondents to Q3 | 36 | |
| Yes | 16 | 44.4% |
| No | 16 | 44.4% |
| Blank | 4 | 11.1% |

There was some support for 250 houses, or even 500, but many respondents would prefer to see even fewer, or no new houses at all, in Tasley. Alternatives suggested included re-allocating the un-used land at the Chartwell Industrial Estate off Stourbridge Road for residential development; utilising small brownfield sites across the town for residential re-development; directing development to villages, in order to make them more sustainable; and allocating land in the Green Belt at The Hobbins (near Stanmore Industrial Estate). A number felt that there is no demand for housing from local residents, and that development encourages people from elsewhere to move to Bridgnorth. Some new housing in recent years has been slow to sell, and there has been a perception that affordable housing has gone to non-local people. Some queried whether new houses would be affordable by local people.

There was concern about traffic, with requests that no additional traffic be added to Church Lane (although the lane should remain open for pedestrians to access the countryside and community wood). There was also concern that developing this site will lead to never-ending development to the north-west of Bridgnorth, over-topping the capacity of infrastructure and services.

One objector asked that the silent majority are not ignored, and that many of the objectors, “presumably do not wish to spoil their view from their nearby dwellings without realising that the building of their current dwelling once spoilt someone else's view. It is (therefore) obvious

that the hundreds and hundreds of non-voters are not strongly against this development of land.”

Affordable housing was sought by a number of respondents, along with services and amenities to serve the population. Opinions varied over whether there was a need for retirement housing in this location. One comment suggested that plenty of open space and possibly a lower density would be welcome.

The Shropshire Wildlife Trust did not object to the proposals but highlighted the significance of the land beyond the proposed site BRID020a where an ecological corridor exists from Brick Kiln Plantation through The Hook Farm and to the Cantern Brook.

Bridgnorth Town Council were concerned that there were too many unanswered questions about the ability of the town's infrastructure to cope with a large influx of houses, and that as housing could come from windfall development they could not accept Shropshire Council's proposals for the development at Tasley.

Other Comments

Claverley

It was suggested that Claverley should be designated as a Community Hub due to its role as an important centre in the locality, providing services and facilities.

Ditton Priors

One comment was received in support of the allocation of DITT005, citing the limited scope for infill development within the development boundary. It was suggested that the boundary of preferred site DIT005 should be extended to the south to make the site more viable to developers, allow a good mix of affordable housing and accommodate 20 houses.

Oldbury & Cross Lane Head

It was suggested that the settlements of Oldbury and Cross Lane Head should be included as a Community Cluster as settlements in sustainable locations which can accommodate a modest level of development over the plan period.

Sherrifhales

One comment was received to the effect that the Parish Council has overlooked needs of the local community in saying 'no' to any open market housing.

Bridgnorth's Future

Some respondents clearly value the town's historic character, and do not wish to see this change. It was claimed that the proposals were developer-led rather than demand-led.

Others pointed to the need to bring employment to the town, alongside affordable housing and services. There was support for the original target of 1,200 homes, and support for additional mixed uses and residential development in the town centre.

Green Belt

One respondent referred to the Green Belt as an area in which development should be restricted.

Primary Shopping Area

There was support for the proposed primary shopping area, with the additional comment that business rates should be reviewed to promote balance and variety. Comments were

received that a supermarket at Tasley should NOT be built due to its adverse impact on the High Street, which in turn would greatly reduce visitor numbers and hence income for local businesses.

Villages

One respondent suggested that the housing requirement should be allocated to the larger villages around Bridgnorth (such as Monkhopton, for example) to encourage their sustainable development and support of local services. Ditton Priors was cited as a good example of how villages should work.

Astley Abbots Parish Council requested that development does not encroach on the very rural parts of the parish.

Wildlife

It was claimed that the fields in question at Tasley provide habitat for declining birds such as lapwing, curlew and yellowhammer. A thorough ecological survey and adherence to the Shropshire Biodiversity Action Plan and other wildlife conservation legislation is sought.

Broseley Place Plan Area

Broseley

Q1. Do you agree with the proposed deletion of the employment allocation between Coalport Road and Rough Lane (ELR016)?

All 4 responses were unanimously in favour. It was welcomed as addressing concerns over traffic volumes past the school and restricted access.

Q2. Do you agree with the proposed addition of the employment allocation at land south of Avenue Road (ELR017)?

All 3 responses received on this question were unanimously in favour.

Q3. Do you agree with the proposed change of development boundary along the north-west edge of Broseley?

3 respondents were in favour, 1 was against stating, "The alteration removes a significant proportion of the urban area from what is considered the built up area of Broseley, removing undeveloped sites that could make a positive contribution towards the future of Broseley and the surrounding area. No robust evidence to support this removal of land. Therefore existing development boundary should be retained."

Q4. Do you agree with the proposed change of development boundary around Jackfield?

4 respondents were in favour. 1 was against on the grounds that this area should not be opened up whilst the north-west boundary is being pulled back. English Heritage neither supported nor objected to the proposed change, providing that all development proposals in this extended area have full regard to the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site Management Plan and other supporting guidance such as the Public Realm Guidance.

Q5. Do you support the addition of the Primary Shopping Area in Broseley as shown on the map?

All 4 respondents were in favour of the proposed area.

Q6. Other comments?

Town Council are satisfied with the content and have no further comments to make.

Concern was expressed that a reduction in the amount of employment land required, downwards from the previous figure of 2 hectares of land, would undermine the future success of Broseley.

Proposed an alternative site on land to the west of Bridge Road (site ref BROS007sd) for the following reasons:

- i) the lack of an allocation of housing land will have considerable impact on future of Broseley and will severely restrict the opportunities for young people to remain in the town. The proposed approach of relying on a windfall allowance of 35 homes is not robust. Not allocating sites removes the degree of control that the LA would have benefitted from in respect of assessing suitable, available and deliverable sites.
- ii) this site is well located in the context of the town and would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring sites, contributing to the existing residential nature of the area.

Proposed an alternative site at Coalport Road (BROS016) for up to 30 dwellings for the following reasons:

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

- i) the majority of respondents stated during the last consultation that the target is insufficient to cater for Broseley's housing needs, yet no further allocation has been made;
- ii) there is uncertainty that the scheme on Dark Lane is deliverable, as the previous developer has dropped out;
- iii) unlikely that a windfall allowance of 35 houses will be met and small scale sites would not deliver the range of community benefits that an allocated site can;
- iv) this site can offer community benefits - 5 affordable homes and new open space to serve eastern side of Broseley.

Request the extension of the development boundary to include 44, 46 and The Old Rectory Bungalow, Ironbridge Road. These sites are contiguous with the settlement and are brownfield sites capable of accommodating re-development without detrimental impact to the locality.

Church Stretton Place Plan Area

Church Stretton

Question 1: Do you agree that the housing growth target should be 370?

The majority of respondents to this question, 74% (125 out of 168), did not support the target of 370 houses for Church Stretton. The main response was that there are many empty or unsold properties in the town and that this proves that there is no need for any more. Other concerns were; that the town's existing infrastructure would not be able to support this level of growth; that development would have an adverse effect on the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), on the environment or on views; and that this target was higher than that either proposed at the Preferred Options stage or the one supported by the Town Council. The main issue raised by the Shropshire Wildlife Trust was a negative impact on the environment whilst the Strettons Civic Society felt that 300 houses would be acceptable. Church Stretton Town Council disputed the target, feeling that it was unnecessary, arbitrary and bore no relation to any known statistic on local housing need. They stated that they did not believe that the Planning Authority had provided adequate justification for the increase in housing numbers, but if 370+ houses had to be accommodated, then this could be achieved through more appropriate sites.

Question 2: Do you agree that site CSTR027/9 (which will be accessed from the A49) should be allocated for up to 85 houses?

The majority of respondents, 96% (521 out of 540) did not wish to see CSTR027/9 (the New House Farm site) allocated for up to 85 houses. The most frequently raised issue was a negative impact on the environment – more specifically, visual amenity, landscape character and/or the AONB. The other main issues were; the safety of the revised junction on the A49; the distance of the site from the town and thus a feeling that this location was unsustainable; this site was against community wishes and the preferences of the Town Council and that this was only the first stage of what would become a much larger development in the future.

The CPRE, the National Trust, the Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership, the Shropshire Wildlife Trust and the Strettons Civic Society did not support the allocation. The main issue was the negative impact on landscape character and visual amenity. Other concerns were; the overall sustainability of development at this distance from the town centre; that housing here would set a precedent and lead to more development in the future; development was against policy (national and local); the visitor centre was not needed as there is one in the town centre; the benefits of the tourism development were not proven or wanted and the proposals would have a negative effect on tourism.

The Town Council did not support the allocation of the site for housing. They disputed that the site has a low landscape sensitivity, feeling that the promoters own documents show this to be incorrect and thus that there is a clear conflict with the NPPF, the Core Strategy and the Church Stretton Town Design Statement. They stated that the visual amenity of the AONB would be severely affected with a consequent economic and visual impact on the town and its setting. Their other concerns were; that the amended junction with the A49 could result in overtaking manoeuvres which would conflict with right turns into and out of the minor road; the quickest route to the schools from the site could lead to children crossing the A49 and the railway tracks: drainage problems would arise from the underlying geology of boulder clay and the distance of the site from the town centre would increase car traffic and/or lead to new shops and facilities being needed on the site.

They objected to the proposal on the grounds that; it is in breach of national and county level policy relating to the protection of AONBs; it is contrary to all community objectives set out by the Town Council underpinning the selection of sites for future development; it fails any test

of sustainability; it lacks the requisite support of the Highways Agency in respect of access; it represents inappropriate urban sprawl that would scar the iconic Stretton Valley and there is near total opposition from the local community and beyond. They also objected to any visitor centre on the site, feeling that this would draw trade away from town and diminish the role of the existing visitor centre.

Question 3: Do you agree that site ELR070, which will be accessed from the A49, should be allocated for employment?

The majority of respondents, 93% (286 out of 306) did not wish to see ELR070 (New House Farm West) allocated for an employment use. As with CSTR027/9 the main concern was the impact on visual amenity and/or the Shropshire Hills AONB. Other frequently raised issues were; the presence of empty employment units in the town; the safety of the access from the A49; no justification of the need for more employment land and the distance of the site from the town centre.

The negative impact on visual amenity and/or the AONB was the main issue raised by CPRE, the National Trust, the Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership, the Shropshire Wildlife Trust and the Strettons Civic Society along with the distance of the site from the town centre. None of these organisations supported the allocation.

Church Stretton Town Council did not support the allocation of ELR070 for the same reasons as they did not support the allocation of CSTR027/9. These include; the hazard at the A49 access; the negative visual impact; the distance from the town centre; and the urbanising effect of a mixed development a mile from the town centre. They felt that the allocation of ELR070 would adversely change the character of the AONB; introduce light pollution in an area noted for its dark skies; increase the volume of traffic on the busy A49; create an accident black spot on the A49; and be a catalyst for further development - either to service this site or for further phases of expansion.

Question 4: Do you agree that site CSTR018 should be allocated for up to 25 houses only?

The majority of respondents, 68% (132 out of 193) did not support the allocation of CSTR018 (the school playing fields) for 25 houses. The most frequently raised concern was that development here would close the gap between All Stretton and Church Stretton. This was closely followed by the feeling that development on this site would be detrimental to visual amenity. Many respondents objected to the allocation of this site on the basis that they wanted to see more playing fields rather than less.

Sports England stated that the development of the site would only be appropriate if it conforms to the requirement of the NPPF to provide equivalent or better facilities in relation to quantity, quality and accessibility. The Strettons Civic Society did not support the allocation on the basis of; the impact on visual amenity; the diminishing of the gap between All Stretton and Church Stretton; a detrimental impact on the setting of the town in the AONB and the loss of facilities for the newly formed rugby club.

Church Stretton Town Council would prefer that there were no development on this site but is suspending judgement pending further information on the comparative advantages and disadvantages of developing housing, employment and sports facilities only on the linked site CSTR014, or on both CTR014 and this site.

Question 5: Do you agree that site CSTR019 should be a reserve site for up to 25 houses?

A slight majority of respondents, 51% (85 out of 167) agreed that CSTR019 should be a reserve housing site. Of these, most felt that the site would integrate well with the existing

housing and that development here would have less visual impact on the setting of the town or on the AONB than alternative sites. A much smaller number of respondents felt that the site could accommodate more houses and that it should be allocated in its own right. Of those who disagreed, the main issues were visual impact, the danger of an access onto Sandford Avenue and the feeling that there is no need for more housing.

The Strettons Civic Society supported the development of this site, feeling that was better than the school playing field because of its lower impact on the AONB landscape. They suggested that it could absorb 40 houses, assuming the affordable homes element included some 1 bedroom properties.

Church Stretton Town Council supported development on CSTR019, feeling that it should be brought forward as a key site for up to 40 houses. Their support was based on the fact that the site is contiguous with the existing development boundary and would thus provide a positive settlement edge and with sensitive planning should have little effect on the AONB.

Question 6: Do you agree that site CSTR014 should NOT be allocated for a maximum of 90 houses?

A small majority, 55% (80 out of 145) respondents to this question disagreed with the question. In other words, they wanted CSTR014 to be allocated for housing. Of these respondents, many felt that the site could accommodate between 40 and 55 houses and that it could be a reserve site in case CSTR018 did not come forward. The main reasons given were that CSTR014 was less visually intrusive and closer to the town centre (than other revised preferred sites). Visual impact was the most frequently expressed concern of those respondents who agreed that the site should not be allocated.

The Strettons Civic Society supported the allocation of CSTR014 for housing, considering that it would be less intrusive as an extension into the AONB. They suggested that the site could accommodate up to 40 houses without seriously impairing the AONB.

Church Stretton Town Council was strongly supportive of a mixed housing/employment and playing field development on CSTR014 if it can be agreed between all of the relevant parties, be accommodated within the available space and be sufficient to enable some cross-subsidy of the playing field enhancements.

Question 7: Do you agree that site CSTR014 should NOT be allocated for employment use?

The majority of respondents, 67% (68 out of 101) agreed that CSTR014 should not be allocated for employment use. The most often expressed views were that there empty employment units in the town centre and that an employment use here would create inappropriate levels of traffic for the current roads.

The Strettons Civic Society accepts development on this site and notes that it could accommodate up to 110 houses and or employment land.

Church Stretton Town Council was strongly supportive of a mixed housing/employment and playing field development on CSTR014 if it can be agreed between all of the relevant parties, be accommodated within the available space and be sufficient to enable some cross-subsidy of the playing field enhancements.

Question 8: Do you agree that site CSTR020 should NOT be allocated for a maximum of 85 houses?

The majority of respondents, 75% (80 out of 108) agreed that CSTR020 (Snatchfields) should not be allocated for housing. The most frequently expressed views were that:

development here would have an unacceptable visual impact; there is poor vehicular access; there are drainage problems and the site offers a good route for walkers.

Both the Strettons Civic Society and Church Stretton Town Council supported the removal of this site as a proposed housing allocation.

Question 9: Do you agree that the development boundary should be amended to include site CSTR028?

The majority of respondents, 68% (93 out of 137) agreed that the development boundary should be amended to include CSTR028. Most felt that this was sensible extension of the town.

Both the Strettons Civic Society and Church Stretton Town Council supported the development boundary amendment.

Question 10: Please tell us if there any other comments that you wish to make

There were 108 responses to this question. The most frequently expressed issues were: that given its location in an AONB the town should not be ruined by development; objections to the process – most often that community wishes were being over-ruled; the surrounding villages should take some development; there are other suitable sites in the town centre and a reiteration of opposition to the allocation of CSTR027/9.

The Strettons Civic Society and Church Stretton Town Council wanted the Burway (CSTR006) and the Wetlands (CSTR012) allocated for housing and CSTR013 for employment.

Church Stretton Town Council also felt that the SAMDev Revised Preferred Options process had some deficiencies, namely that: Shropshire Council had refused a public meeting on the proposals; defective information had been put before Cabinet; the outcome of the consultation on the five proposed Conservation Areas was not made public prior to the Revised Preferred Options consultation: there is a lack of transparency as responses from the public to the previous round of consultation were not available on the Council's website; a technical appraisal of ELR070 was not available; a Community Benefit Assessment was not provided for the mixed use site and the Revised Preferred Options consultation took place before the results of the 2013 update to the Housing Market Needs Assessment were known.

Cleobury Mortimer Place Plan Area

Cleobury Mortimer

- 1. Do you agree with the reduction in proposed number of houses from around 28 to around 14 at land on Tenbury Road, Cleobury Mortimer (CMO002)?**

The majority of respondents (68% 34/50) supported the reduction in number of dwellings proposed on Land at Tenbury Road (CMO002). Some respondents raised issues about the ability of the infrastructure of the town to cope with any level of new development identifying poor road infrastructure, traffic and parking issues on High Street, and a lack of employment opportunities. Others stated that there have been a number of recent housing developments in Cleobury Mortimer which reduces the need for further housing. Others expressed concern about recent new development changing the character of Cleobury. A number of respondents supported new housing in Cleobury. The Environment Agency raised concerns about surface water drainage due to the capacity of Pudding Brook.

KINLET, BUTTON OAK and BUTTON BRIDGE

- 2. Do you agree that Kinlet, Button Oak and Button Bridge should be a Community Cluster?**

The majority of respondents (78% 28/36) disagreed with the identification of Kinlet, Button Oak and Button Bridge as part of a Community Cluster. Concerns were raised over the lack of infrastructure and facilities, including public transport, to support new development. The need for any new housing to be in keeping with that already existing in settlements and for new development to not to take away from the character of the villages was identified as a key issue.

- 3. Do you think a growth target of up to 30 dwellings by 2026 (with 20 in Kinlet and 5 each in Button Bridge and Button Oak) is appropriate?**

The majority of respondents (82% 32/39) did not agree with the number of dwellings proposed for the settlements in the Community Cluster. The lack of facilities, public transport, shops and employment in the area was raised a concern with the need to commute by car an issue. The need for any new housing to be in keeping with character of the settlements was identified as an issue. Some concern was raised that the number of new dwellings for Kinlet was too high although it was recognised that as it was the largest village in the area it was the best location for most of the new development.

- 4. Do you agree that Land at Little Stocks Close, Kinlet (KLT001) should be allocated for around 20 dwellings with a mix of affordable and open market houses?**

The majority of respondents (33/38 87%) did not agree with the identification of the site. Many comments against the site related to the number of houses proposed rather than the site itself. Some respondents agreed that if new housing takes place in Kinlet that this was the most suitable site whilst raising concerns about the scale of development proposed. The loss of the open space on the edge of the village was also raised as a concern. Others raised issues relating to the lack of sufficient infrastructure to support new development in the

village and considered that there would be potential be issues from having more affordable housing in the village.

5. Do you agree that a development boundary should be identified for Kinlet?

The majority of respondents (92% 34/37) supported the identification of the development boundary for Kinlet. Respondents felt that it was important to delineate the edge of the settlement to stop potential development going into the countryside.

6. Do you agree that no Community Cluster should be identified within the Parish of Neen Savage?

The majority of respondents (190/191 99%) agreed with these settlements not being named as part of a Community Cluster and supported the identification of the Parish under the countryside policies. Neen Savage Parish Council reiterated that the area should remain as countryside.

7. Do you agree with the allocation of around 0.5 ha (around 0.3 ha remaining including the current planning permission) of employment land at the existing Old Station Business Park, Neen Savage (ELR071)?

The majority of respondents (82/106 77%) disagreed with the proposed employment at the existing old station business park. A number of commented that there was no need for more land to be used for employment in this location as an unrelated application for conversion from agriculture to business use permitted at another site in Neen Savage earlier in 2013. Others commented that there was no need for more land to be identified as the existing area was not full and that any new employment development in the area should be located in Cleobury Mortimer as the identified key centre. Some responses regarded this as being the right area to expand into should expansion take place of the Old Station Business Park.

8. Please tell us if there any other comments that you wish to make? (Please only comment on the Revised SAMDev Plan. Comments on any current planning applications should be made on the planning webpage.)

Hopton Wafers PC and Stottesdon and Sidbury PC supported the information in the document. Wheathill PC sought the inclusion of Wheathill in the existing proposed Community Cluster. A number of respondents commented on the importance of localism on the approach to new development in the rural area and paying particular regard to the views of Parish Councils.

Craven Arms Place Plan Area

Craven Arms

Question 1: Do you agree to the allocation of Newington Farmstead (CRAV030) as a small scale housing allocation to deliver around 5 key workers houses and to secure the conservation and enhancement of the historic buildings of Newington Farm?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 73% (27 out of 37 persons) agreed with the proposed allocation of Newington Farmstead as a brownfield site to provide key worker accommodation to support the employment provided by Euro Quality Lambs and the business of the new abattoir. It was suggested this development required a good standard of restoration of the historic farm buildings and a suitable layout and design to respect its setting. Areas of concern related to the proximity of the flood plain, provision of a suitable access from the A49 and provision of either open space for residents of the development or access to the adjoining parkland. It was also suggested that public access be provided to the parkland with concerns expressed about longer term encroachment of development into the countryside.

Question 2: Do you agree with the amended boundary for Land off Watling Street (CRAV002), which will now accommodate 25 dwellings?

Question 3: Do you agree with the removal of the allocation of 25 dwellings proposed at the Roman Downs site? (It is noted that securing the completion of the care home is still a priority).

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 77% (34 out of 44 persons) agreed with the proposal to seek the completion of the Care Home on the partially developed site at CRAV010. The views suggest the completion of the Care Home should be the priority before any other development in the town to remove this eyesore which affects local residents and damages the character of the town. The respondents suggest it is essential to secure the completion of Care Home to provide services offered to local residents and to complete the Roman Downs development. Alternative views suggest this is a key brownfield site within the built form of the town. It is considered the site should be developed for 25 affordable homes offering an appropriate mix of house types.

Question 4: Do you agree with the defined boundary for the Newington Farm employment site (ELR053)?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 66% (25 out of 38 persons) agreed with the extent of the allocation of land at Newington Farm for the development of a new abattoir. The views suggest this development will be good for employment in the town but seek the following: the creation of quality jobs offering opportunities for young people, preservation of the parkland with its significant landscape and mature woodland and field trees, protection of the fragile river environment, assessment of ordinary watercourses traversing the site to the north and south, preservation of the setting of The Lodge listed building and resolution of traffic issues on the A49. Objections to the proposal sought a much smaller developable area possibly located further north away from The Lodge, protection of the countryside, control over the scale of industrial development along the A49 and consolidated employment land provision extending eastwards from the A49, away from the centre of the town.

Question 5: Do you support the proposed highway junction on land to the west of the A49?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference comprising 73% (25 out of 34 persons) agreed with the proposed highway junction on the A49 north of Craven Arms. The views

suggest this highway development will make a positive contribution to the town but seek the following: evidence of highway need, provision of a roundabout / traffic island of a suitable design to avoid congestion on A49, detailed assessment of the optimal location for the junction but preferably north of The Lodge listed building but with minimal loss of roadside woodland, support for provision of local employment possibly exclusively for Newington Farm. Further concerns relate to the impacts of a further traffic island on through traffic in the town, the impact of the Long Lane level crossing on traffic flows south of the proposed new junction and the need for an upgrade of Watling Street to cope with potential displacement of traffic from the A49.

Question 6: Do you agree with the allocation of a further 2.5ha of employment land on land to the west of the A49 (ELR055)?

Question 7: Do you agree with the reduction of the Reserved Employment Site from 3.5 to 2.5ha?

Question 8: Do you agree to the increase in the overall employment land provision to 17ha to reflect the changes in the provision of land for employment development for Craven Arms?

Question 9: Do you agree with the defined boundary for the Key Area of Change along Corvedale Road to create an eastern gateway for the town as a focus for regeneration initiatives?

Question 10: Please tell us what types of uses or development you'd wish to see within this Key Area of Change?

Diddlebury Parish (excluding Diddlebury)

Question 11: Do you agree there should be a Community Cluster in Diddlebury Parish?

The majority of respondents comprising 80% (8 out of 10 persons) agreed with the proposed designation of a Community Cluster in the Parish of Diddlebury. The views expressed about the Community Cluster show a desire to satisfy the needs of the local community for affordable housing to achieve and support a sustainable community in this less accessible rural location.

Question 12: Do you agree that this Cluster should include the settlements of Bache Mill, Boulton, Broncroft, Corfton, Middlehope, Peaton, Seifton, Sutton (Great and Little), Westhope?

The majority of respondents comprising 58% (7 out of 12 persons) agreed the named settlements should be included in the Community Cluster. The views expressed about the named settlements showed a desire for development to be focused into Aston Munslow, Munslow and Shipton which provide a range of services and are easily accessible on the B4368, the principal road route through the Corvedale. Other views suggested that settlements located off the B4368 (especially Broncroft) should not accommodate any further development (other than single large houses) as they are only accessible via narrow country lanes, have inadequate water supplies and development could be detrimental to the landscape character of the AONB.

Question 13: Do you agree that the settlement of Diddlebury itself should be designated as countryside?

The majority of respondents comprising 71% (10 out of 14 persons) agreed with the proposed designation of Diddlebury village as countryside with the view being expressed that its natural designation should not be questioned. Other views questioned whether the Community Cluster would benefit from the inclusion of Diddlebury village as it is easily accessible, provides a range of services and facilities including a church, school and village hall and would be the most appropriate location for small scale housing development.

Question 14: Do you agree that each of the settlements in the Cluster should accommodate around 5 houses (but not to exceed 10 houses) in consultation with the local communities and Parish Council?

The majority of respondents comprising 83% (10 out of 12 persons) agreed with the proposed scale and approximate distribution of development for the Community Cluster to deliver a flexible strategy capable of supporting the needs of the communities involved. Other views expressed focused on the need for housing that will be affordable to local people especially through the delivery of affordable social housing developments.

Other Comments – Countryside

Departing from the issues relating to the Community Cluster for Diddlebury Parish. The view was expressed that the village of Wistantow (within the Craven Arms Place Plan area) should be designated as a Community Hub. Wistanstow is proposed to be designated as countryside in the SAMDev Plan but is considered to be a sustainable location for growth as a larger settlement located along the A49 Trunk Road with a range of services and facilities which already support the surrounding smaller settlements.

Ellesmere Place Plan Area

Ellesmere

Q1: Do you agree that the development boundary should be amended to exclude an area of land adjacent to the Mere to the north east of Church Street/Talbot Street?

The majority (85% of 87 respondents) support the proposal to amend the development boundary to exclude an area of land adjacent to the Mere at Church Street/Talbot Street. Of the comments received supporting the proposal, most people are concerned that development of the land in question would have a detrimental impact on the Mere which would also have a knock on effect on tourism for the town. A very small number of respondents feel that development could improve this untidy site.

Q2: Do you agree that site ELL016 should not be carried forward as a potential site for housing?

The majority (89% of 88 respondents) agree that this site should not be allocated for development due to its location adjacent to the Mere and the negative impact this could cause, as well as a negative on tourism. A small number of respondents feel that the land should be used to extend the cemetery.

Q3: Which of the following housing allocation options do you support for Ellesmere?

The majority of respondents (87% of 97) support Option 2, whilst 7% prefer Option 1 and 6% prefer neither, or did not express a preference. The comments received supporting Option 2 are mostly concerned with this location being preferable for the town due to traffic problems elsewhere, offering employment opportunities for town whilst boosting the local economy, providing much needed tourism facilities and meeting the housing needs of the town. A significant number of people are concerned that the town's infrastructure needs improvement, particularly schools and health facilities. A small number (3) including Shropshire Wildlife Trust are concerned that Option 2 will have a negative impact on the natural environment. English Heritage has concerns about development at the north east end of the site, due to the proximity of the conservation area and Ellesmere Yard group of listed buildings. The Canal and River Trust have also raised a concern over the impact on Ellesmere Yard as well as the canal corridor character and quality, stating that the marina may not be able to achieve a licence to connect to the waterway.

Cockshutt

Q4: Do you agree that sites CO002a and CO002b should each be allocated for up to 5 houses?

The majority (80% of 46 respondents) agree with the proposal to allocate the 2 proposed sites. Only a small number of comments were received regarding this. One person is concerned that the village does not have sufficient facilities and services to support more growth whilst another person thinks that this site to the west of Shrewsbury Road is in the most suitable area for development. One objection raised issues concerning access and highway, stating that development on the east of Shrewsbury Road would be preferable as most village facilities are located to the east.

Q5: Do you agree that sites CO005 and CO023 should be allocated for a combined total of 5 houses?

The majority (79% of 47 respondents) agree with proposal. The comments received were similar to those regarding the previous question, as the proposed allocations are located within close proximity to each other. One comment received expressed concern in relation to site CO023 as it does not have a clearly defined south western boundary, which could lead to future development proposals that may be difficult to resist.

Dudleston Heath/Elson

Q6: Do you agree that sites DUDH001, DUDH002 and ELS001 should NOT be carried forward as potential sites for housing?

The majority (79% of 43 respondents) agree that sites DUDH001, DUDH002 and ELS001 should not be carried forward for allocation as housing sites. Two people commented that ELS001 is located in an area where highway access is potentially unsafe and one person has commented that these sites are valuable agricultural land and should be preserved.

Q7: Do you agree that site DUDH006 should be allocated for a maximum of 29 houses including the outstanding consent for 9 houses?

The majority (74% of 46 respondents) agree with the proposal to allocate this site. Of the comments received, it is noted that as the site is partly brownfield, this is preferable and also that the location on the south side of the B5069 will provide a better balance to the village. There is some concern that the size of the proposed development is too high and that the numbers should be reduced. The Parish Council support the proposed allocation and Welsh Water has commented that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on their sewerage assets.

Welsh Frankton

Q8: Do you agree that WFTN001 should be allocated for up to 7 dwellings and accessed from Lower Frankton Road?

The majority (61% of 44 respondents) agree with the proposed allocation of 7 dwellings. One comment received states that there is potential to accommodate more houses on the site. Of those respondents who disagreed with the proposal (16 of 44 respondents, 36%), concerns were made about access to and from the site. There were concerns that the development would create a divide through the village and provide potential problem with access to facilities. It is felt that any development should be built to the north of the A495 to prevent this. Other concerns were around loss of view and the visual impact the proposed development would have on the surrounding countryside.

Q9: Do you agree that WFTN002 should be allocated for up to 5 dwellings and served by a single access?

The majority (61% of 46 respondents) agree with the proposal, citing good access to the site as the main reason. It is also felt that there is the potential within the site to create green fields and provide communal open space. Of those respondents who disagreed with the proposal (16 of 46 respondents, 35%), it was felt that access to the site would be unsafe, due to the junction being located at the brow of a hill. The location of the single access road would be on a busy stretch of the A495, causing a potential danger to both motorists and pedestrians. There are concerns that more houses have been proposed to the north of the A945, creating a ribbon style development, which would allow for very little community enhancement. The proposal is situated adjacent to a Grade 2 listed church and as a result, the design of the proposed development would have to be sensitive and of high quality.

Highley Place Plan Area

As there were no changes proposed to the Highley Place Plan area, no consultation questions were asked for any settlement in the Highley Place Plan area at this stage.

One response supporting the identification of land at Redstone Drive (ref: HIGH016) for allocation in the SAMDev stating that Highley is a sustainable settlement capable of a higher number of dwellings than is currently proposed.

Ludlow Place Plan Area

Ludlow

- 1. Do you agree with the proposed change in overall housing requirement for Ludlow between 2006 and 2026 from 750 to 875 dwellings (meaning approximately 344 new dwellings between now and 2026)?**

The majority of respondents (64% 7/11) disagreed with the proposed increase in housing requirement for Ludlow up to 2026. Ludlow Town council were concerned with the ability of the town's infrastructure to cope with the number proposed and preferred a target of between 750 and 800. Concern was raised that with a number of existing permissions yet to be implemented in the town there is no need for the level of development proposed and that these housing numbers will lead to a significant change to the town's environmental setting leading to development outside the bypass on agricultural land that would lead to problems on the A49. Ensuring that housing development did not lead to an imbalance with employment provision was also expressed as a concern.

Others argued that the number of houses proposed was still not sufficient to meet the needs of Ludlow over the Plan Period and the needs identified in the SHMAA, and was not in accordance with the strategic approach of Core Strategy Policy CS1. The housing requirement was also considered to not meet the objective assessed needs requirements in the NPPF and placed too much emphasis on the views of the Town Council. Concern was also expressed that the housing numbers would not ensure the deliverability of sites on the ground.

- 2. Do you agree with the allocation of around 47 dwellings at the current Community Hospital site LUD038?**

The majority of respondents (57% 4/7) agreed with the potential allocation of the current hospital site for residential use. The redevelopment of brownfield land was supported. Uncertainty over delivery of the site due to the announcement, during the consultation, that the NHS Trust were no longer looking to move services to a new Hospital at the Eco Park was raised as a concern. Ludlow Town Council stated that no consideration should be given to re-use of the site until the future of hospital is secured. English Heritage commented that any redevelopment would have to be sensitive to the listed buildings on site.

- 3. Do you agree with the amended site boundary for Land South of Rocks?**

The majority of respondents (70% 7/10) agreed with the proposed amended boundary of the site. Some concern was expressed that this was ribbon development leading to an impact on the town's setting and the loss of agricultural land. There was also concern over the impacts on the A49. English Heritage recognised that although there were no impacts on designated assets or buildings that it was important to have positive landscaping to ensure it responds well to the wider setting of the town.

Ludford Parish supported the amended site boundary although raised issues concerning with facilities to sustain housing development in this location access to the site over the A49. Ludlow Town Council supported the amendment with the same overall concerns. The Highways Agency sought further detailed discussions regarding the potential impacts on the strategic road network. The site promoter supported the amended boundary. Other responses highlighted that additional sites should be added to ensure deliverability of

housing requirement for the town or alternative sites should be preferred with the amendment reflecting that this site was not the best location for housing to meet Ludlow's needs.

4. Do you agree with the allocation for a mix of uses incorporating around 2.5 ha of employment land and around 80 houses on land east of the Eco Park?

The majority of respondents (70% 7/10) disagreed with the proposal for a mix of uses on this site. Concern was expressed that the level of development is too great with the consideration that existing brownfield sites in the town, and vacant units, were capable of meeting this development requirement. Another respondent argued that the development should be smaller in scale and not go as far east as Squirrel Lane. Ludlow Town Council supported inclusion of the site in the SAMDev Plan. Ludford Parish Council felt that the potential allocations should be revisited in light of the announcement by the Shropshire Community Health Trust that they were no longer looking to build a new hospital at the Eco Park. They felt other sites within the town's boundary should be explored further and were concerned about the impact on the A49. They also stated that the area would benefit from a comprehensive scheme with footpath, cycle and road links between Sheet Road and Rocks Green.

The lack of justification for a mix of uses proposed and how residential development would support the viability of economic development; and how the development will enable a link road northwards to Rocks Green and the lack of detail regarding the road was raised as an issue. The implications of SAMDev setting potential future strategic growth areas beyond the Plan Period and the implications for infrastructure planning were raised as concerns with the site. The Highways Agency highlighted the need for further discussion on the potential impacts on the strategic road network potential future impacts should connections be made to the A49. English Heritage recognised that although there were no impacts on designated assets or buildings that it was important to have positive landscaping to ensure it responds well to the wider setting of the town. The need to have new businesses in the area creating local job opportunities in a range of sectors was raised as a positive outcome of providing employment land east of the A49.

5. Do you agree with the allocation of land south of the Eco Park (ELR058) for around 3.5 ha of employment land?

The majority of respondents (66% 8/12) disagreed with the proposed allocation of ELR058 for employment development. Some respondents recognised the need to encourage appropriate economic development in the Ludlow and in attracting companies and investment into the town. Others commented that existing employment commitments and areas should be considered sufficient to meet future demand. Concern was expressed that if employment land was allocated and then not taken up it will blight the land. A number of concerns were raised about this location with some respondents stating that sites around the Eco Park north of the Sheet Road could meet the employment needs of the town and this location should not be considered for employment. Concern was expressed that the site may have other uses other than employment and that it should be removed from the site allocations process.

Ludford Parish Council were opposed to the proposed allocation of this site favouring the area between The Sheet and Rocks Green for future employment growth. They felt other sites within the town's boundary should be explored. Ludlow Town Council stated that this should only be considered when brownfield sites have been exhausted and existing employment parks have been upgraded for modern use. The site was supported as being capable of helping to meet long term employment needs of the town.

6. Do you agree with retaining the existing development boundary for Ludlow (please note that new site allocations will be included in the new development boundary if confirmed)?

The majority of respondents (5/8 63%) agreed with the development boundary as proposed including Ludlow Town Council. Others disagreed with the inclusion of proposed allocations within the new boundary and a site promoter objected to land at the Linney being excluded from the proposed boundary after being put forward for inclusion in the development boundary at preferred options. The lack of flexibility presented by defining a development boundary was raised as a concern.

7. Other Comments

One respondent highlighted that the SAMDev should include retail allocations in the proposals for Ludlow. Ludlow Town Council stated that affordable housing and key workers dwelling should be key to meeting housing needs in the Plan. Residential sites at Foldgate Lane, north of Rocks Green, and off Bromfield Road were put forward for inclusion in the SAMDev Plan.

Market Drayton Place Plan Area

No questions were asked on Market Drayton town as no changes were proposed from the Preferred Options stage.

CHESWARDINE

Q1: Do you agree that the proposed housing site at New House Farm CHES001 should be removed from the Plan?

There is a split view from respondents regarding the removal of CHES001 from the Plan (50% of 4 in agreement and 50% of 4 not in agreement). Those supporting removal of the site were concerned about the availability of infrastructure and in particular the impact on the road network. Those not supporting the removal of CHES001 highlighted the importance of growth to help maintain local services. Detailed comments in support of the site were also provided in relation to the site being on previously developed land, there being local support for the site through the SAMDev Preferred Options consultation and the site being within a sustainable location, given its close proximity to facilities and services and forming a natural extension to the village boundary.

Q2: Do you agree that the housing target should be reduced to about 11 houses to be built in Cheswardine by 2026?

The majority of respondents indicating a preference (40% of 5) do not agree with reducing the housing target since they consider Cheswardine to be a sustainable settlement. In particular concerns were raised about the need to provide housing for a growing population, particularly young people. Although a further 40% of respondents did not indicate a preference for the housing target, comments received did include disappointment that Cheswardine is designated as a Cluster rather than a Community Hub and the tight drawing of the development boundary providing little opportunity for further development. Those supporting a reduction in the housing target (20% of 5) identified the lack of a regular bus service as a particular constraint.

HINSTOCK

Q3: Do you agree that the housing target should be reduced to about 60 houses to be built in Hinstock by 2026?

The majority of respondents (60% of 5), including the Parish Council, agree with reducing the housing target since it is only considered to be a small reduction (from 63 at Preferred Options). Those respondents (40% of 5) not in favour of reducing the housing target considered Hinstock to be a sustainable settlement with a range of local facilities and amenities which require additional development in order to remain viable. In addition, it was considered that reducing the housing target by 3 dwellings would have a minimal impact on the village.

STOKE HEATH

Q4: Do you agree that Stoke Heath should be a Community Hub?

The majority of respondents (66% of 32), including the Parish Council, agree that Stoke Heath should be a Community Hub, viewing that a small level of development would be beneficial in improving the area. However, a number of respondents (31% of 32) believe that Stoke Heath should remain 'open countryside'. In particular concerns have been raised about what evidence has led to the change in development status and whether there are sufficient local amenities to support future development. Other respondents (3% of 32) did

not indicate a preference but did highlight concerns about allowing development on woodland sites.

Q5: Do you agree that the housing target of about 20-25 houses to be built in Stoke Heath by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority of respondents (66% of 32) feel that the housing target is appropriate. In particular, those supporting the housing target consider that additional growth may ensure the longer term viability of local facilities and services. However, other respondents (34% of 32) do not agree with the housing target, and raise concerns about what evidence has led to change local views on the development status for Stoke Heath and whether there is sufficient infrastructure and local amenities to support future development.

Q6: Do you agree that the former military site at Warrant Road Camp (STH001) should be allocated for the development of up to 25 homes, to include an element of live/work and/or self-build homes, amenity area and nature reserve?

Although views were relatively split, the majority of respondents (53% of 32) agree with allocating STH001 for up to 25 homes. However, of those in agreement, 2 respondents (6% of 32) indicated support for either site and 2 respondents (6% of 32) highlighted that whilst they were not objecting to STH001 they preferred land off Dutton Close (STH002). In addition, a number of respondents (47% of 32) do not agree with allocating STH001 for up to 25 houses but would prefer the 20-25 houses to be built across the two sites (STH001 and STH002) thereby maintaining existing open spaces.

Q7: Do you agree that land off Dutton Close (STH002) should be allocated for the development of approximately 20 homes to include a mix of house types and contribution towards improved recreation facilities?

The majority of respondents (59% of 32), including the Parish Council, agree that STH002 should be allocated for approximately 20 homes. Points raised in support of Dutton Close include the established access to the play area and new development forming a natural extension to existing housing. However, of those in agreement, 2 respondents (6% of 32) indicated support for either site. A number of respondents (38% of 32) were not in agreement with allocating STH002 but would prefer the 20-25 houses to be built across the two sites (STH001 and STH002) thereby maintaining existing open spaces.

WOORE

Q8: Do you agree that the housing target of about 50 homes to be built in Woore by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority of respondents (76% of 21), including the Parish Council, do not agree with the housing target for Woore. The Parish Council have amended their position following growth since 2010 and do not want further housing allocations, in light of committed development at Candle Lane and the former Phoenix Works. In preference, the Parish Council would like a windfall target of 15 dwellings to cater for any infill development over the Plan period. This view is supported by the majority of respondents, with many indicating that recent growth in Woore is sufficient. Only 1 respondent not in favour of the housing target expressed concern that it should be increased, highlighting the sustainability of Woore as a settlement and presence of existing services and facilities. Other respondents (24% of 21) support the housing target but raise concerns regarding the presence of a development boundary to maintain a separation between Woore, Irelands Cross and Pipe Gate.

MORETON SAY CLUSTER

Q9: Do you agree that Bletchley, Longford and Longslow should be included within the Moreton Say Community Cluster?

The majority of respondents (67% of 3) agree with including Bletchley, Longford and Longslow in the Cluster. Only 1 respondent (33% of 3) was not in agreement.

Q10: Do you agree that the housing target of about 20 homes to be built in Bletchley, Longford, Longslow and Moreton Say by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority of respondents (67% of 3) agree with the housing target. The respondent not in agreement with the housing target raised concerns about the impact on the countryside and the need to concentrate development in larger settlements.

TERN HILL QUARRY

Q11: Do you agree that the proposed mineral site extension at Tern Hill is removed from the Plan?

The vast majority of respondents (88% of 32) agree with removing the mineral site extension at Tern Hill. Those not in agreement (12% of 32) have raised concerns that other interested parties may consider quarrying this site or feel there is insufficient information available about any site extension proposals to be able to comment.

OTHER ISSUES

Market Drayton

The Town Council has confirmed their position that all development should remain within the boundary of the town. They have also provided a list of sites to consider for sporting and recreational use. Whilst the majority of respondents support both the overall housing target and proposed allocation for 400 dwellings, some concern has been raised by promoters of other sites that further allocations should be made in order to provide greater certainty.

Stoke Heath

Concern has been expressed about the need to complete community consultation before determining development proposals for Stoke Heath. In particular, a number of respondents have queried why the Parish Council has only put forward two sites for consideration, why the only options are located within Stoke Heath and other areas within the Parish are not referenced and why only one site will be taken forward.

Cheswardine

The promoter of a site in Cheswardine considers that the development status for the settlement should be reconsidered to include the potential for a small allocation.

Hinstock

Whilst 1 respondent expressed their support for the preferred option, another respondent raised concerns over the suitability of the access and queried whether alternative sites are more deliverable and have the potential to offer substantial contributions to local infrastructure.

General

Other comments were received from The Canal and River Trust who highlight the need for any development within the Colehurst, Tyrley, Woodesaves (Sutton Lane) Woodseaves (Sydnall Lane) Cluster to relate appropriately to the local waterway and to maximise the benefits that such a location can provide to the creation of sustainable communities. The MOD also expressed concerns that insufficient reference has been made to Clive Barracks

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

or Ternhill as important existing defence sites with a need to protect these for future defence purposes.

Minsterley and Pontesbury Place Plan Area

Q1: Do you consider that the joint housing target for Minsterley & Pontesbury for (up to) 260 dwellings by 2026 to allow additional local housing allocations in the Plan is appropriate?

Of 95 respondents, the majority, 59% did not agree with the target but of the 38% which supported it, this included Pontesbury Parish Council. Most frequently the comments made suggested that there were too many houses proposed for the sites and/ or settlements and that there was no evidence of the local need or demand for the number of dwellings proposed. Respondents highlighted lack of local employment and inadequate local infrastructure and facilities, in particular roads, transport, drainage and schools, to support development. Traffic impacts, including safety issues, were a significant concern. Local flooding and sewage issues were also identified and there was a feeling that there would be too many dwellings to be integrated into the community and that this level of development would negatively impact on sustainability and village character/spirit. It was also suggested that target is developer rather than planner led, without appropriate consideration for constraints.

There was however a strong indication in responses that there is a need for some housing, in particular to provide for affordable and smaller dwellings. A site agent highlighted that the target is in line with the Core Strategy, similar to previous development rates and could realise community aspirations and retention of heritage assets. More general comments suggested that housing could be acceptable with appropriate mix of types, adequate infrastructure provision and traffic management, with some concern that it should be focused on local need. The need for fair distribution between Minsterley & Pontesbury was also identified.

Q2: Do you agree that the amended Hall Farm site (MIN002/MIN015) should be allocated for a mixed use including the development of up to 17 dwellings, employment and limited retail?

Of 68 respondents, opinion was fairly evenly divided with 43% supporting the allocation and 46% not. The issues raised most often by respondents were that there are too many houses and that retail is not required, not viable and that the proposal would negatively impact on existing businesses. Other concerns related to repositioning of the development boundary, loss of farmland, noise and light pollution and to impacts on the heritage asset, village and setting. It was suggested that this is an inappropriate out of centre location and that Hall Bank, Pontesbury is a preferable allocation. Additionally it was submitted that the allocation fails to meet NPPF criteria/tests and that housing was previously rejected by Parish Council.

Respondents supporting the allocation commented that more retail is needed and that the proposed housing is appropriate in scale and in character with village providing an opportunity to improve local character, conserve buildings, and prioritise the use of a brownfield site. Some respondents supported housing but not commercial/retail development.

More general comments indicated that an appropriate housing mix including affordable is needed with smaller scale development preferred. Consideration of access, flood/sewage issues and clarification of level of retail were also highlighted as necessary.

English Heritage commented that development should safeguard heritage assets using evidence base to inform decision making. No reply was received from Minsterley Parish Council.

Q3: Do you agree that the amended Hall Bank site (PBY018 and PBY029) should be allocated for a mixed use including the development of up to 60 dwellings, retail, open space and parking?

Of 103 respondents, some 60% did not agree with the allocation and 33% supported it. A number of people commented on the scale of development considering that there were too many houses for site and/or settlement and that the previous site identified should be taken forward. Some questioned local need for housing and were critical that there was an insufficient level of affordable housing. The issue raised most often by respondents related to the inability of the local infrastructure to accommodate more development, with traffic impacts, access and road safety issues being most frequently referred to. Also specifically identified were the lack of local employment and facilities and the limitations of other infrastructure, such as schools and doctors together with the need for drainage/ sewage improvements. A significant number of respondents commented that retail is not required and were concerned about the retail proposal impact on village centre & viability of existing businesses. There was also concern regarding potential nuisance, including the car park attracting antisocial behaviour. A number of comments focused on loss of farmland and environmental impacts, including on village character, open space and setting, or on village spirit and residential amenity. It was suggested that development would be isolated by the one way system and may be too dense and lack character. Representations highlighted the need to deal with and the potential exacerbation of flooding issues. It was also suggested that there is no requirement for open space and that the site won't achieve community objectives in particular an effective parking function and linkage of the play area.

Supporting comments suggested that this is an appropriate village expansion site providing opportunities to meet future needs of the settlement, relocate and improve local retail offer and lessen village parking problems. Some people supported retail and not housing and vice versa, with a desire to provide an appropriate mix including needed local/affordable housing. One comment suggested that retail site should be restricted for relocation of the existing local retailer, the Coop, this reflecting a desire for the retention of local businesses. Other comments suggested that a smaller development more contained to the village would be better and that development should be phased with the nursery retained.. A large number of respondents highlighted the need for infrastructure improvements including school expansion, sewage, access, transport, footpath and roads to facilitate development. Community facilities, including green space provision, and masterplanning/appropriate details were identified as important. The site promoter highlighted that this allocation will provide the opportunity to realise housing and other community aspirations included within the Parish Plan including additional car parking, open space, opportunities to enhance the local retail offer and to provide better integration of the recreation area.

Pontesbury Parish Council commented that it supports this scheme, providing infrastructure limitations are addressed before any development starts, there is a high percentage of affordable housing for local people and development is on a phased basis. The Environment Agency commented that they have agreed the scope of modelling for the site Flood Risk Assessment(FRA) to inform the site allocation, in particular how much of the site is developable. The Agency indicated that the PBY018 and PBY029 are likely to be developable subject to a detailed FRA.

Q4: Do you agree to changes to the development boundary to include land to the West of Hall Bank (PBY018) if the Hall Bank site is allocated?

Of 89 respondents, some 60% indicated that they did not agree with the change to the development boundary and 38% supported it. However, since many of the comments submitted appeared to relate to the Hall Bank or Minsterley Road proposals (not included in this consultation) rather than the development boundary issue, yes/no answers may also have reflected this. The comments largely reiterated issues summarised in relation to

Question 3 . In addition representations highlighted the following points:- this is a flood area; there is no free space; land too small/unsafe; there would be loss of greenspace and the link to countryside; this would be against ethos of development boundary; the site would be better used as green space; concern regarding adequate provision for footpath; this would result in further development; the strip of land too small and will attract vandalism. Other responses identified the need to allow sufficient garden area, space between properties and significant green area adjoining former rail line. Also that landscaping is required at Hall Bank to minimise landscape/resident impact. It was also commented that there needs to be a review of the rationale for current development boundary position. Pontesbury Parish Council agreed with the proposal and commented that it would be a tidying up exercise only.

Please tell us if there any other comments that you wish to make?

Many of these responses reiterated issues, such as inappropriate scale, need, infrastructure limitations and environmental impacts that had been raised in relation to previous questions. There were also several comments relating to proposals (such as the Callow Lane site) not included as part of this consultation, including neighbour objections, other site promoters and the Shropshire Wildlife Trust who are critical of the inclusion of the Callow Lane site due to proximity to SSSI. A number of site promoters object to non-inclusion of their land, indicating that their sites have not been fairly considered and should be allocated in addition to those identified or that they would be a more appropriate allocation than those sites taken forward. Lack of amendment to the development boundary and non-identification of smaller settlements, such as Plealey, to provide development opportunities for local people is also raised by some respondents. More generally it is suggested that there has been inadequate consultation about proposals and the plan does not provide certainty, as proposals have already significantly amended within an 18 month timescale. The view is expressed that proposed development provides for in-migration, will not address affordability issues and will affect property value. It was also suggested that facilities provided should include dog exercise area, allotments, bus pull-in, village hall and amenities for younger people and that traffic calming should be incorporated. Completion of Minsterley-Pontesbury cycle link and other cycle provision in new developments is highlighted as a priority. There were fears that development could increase antisocial behaviour and that parking problems would be exacerbated. An alternative development strategy suggested is to add services to other villages to make them desirable places to live. There was also an aspiration for carbon zero development and maintenance of ecosystems. Whilst there was generally support for affordable housing a comment was raised that the levy is unethical and should be stopped.

Much Wenlock Place Plan Area

Much Wenlock is working with Shropshire Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for the whole parish of Much Wenlock. The SAMDev Revised Preferred Options did not show any preferred options for land allocations as it was mutually agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan would seek to bring forward sites for housing and employment.

OTHER ISSUES

Much Wenlock

The Town Council has confirmed that the Neighbourhood Plan will bring forward sites for housing and employment. However, the agent acting for the development site east of Bridgnorth Road expresses concern that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the development needs of the town as set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Concern is expressed that the Neighbourhood Plan housing policy refers to the provision of housing through infill development on brownfield sites and exception sites but that there is no evidence that such suitable sites exist. The agent also considers that the Neighbourhood Plan proposed limit of 25 dwellings for land east of Bridgnorth Road is arbitrary, leading to an inefficient use of a greenfield site and failing to take on board the significant opportunities presented by a comprehensively planned development of 85 dwellings. Given the infrastructure requirements for access and drainage, the agents question whether a lesser development, of even 40 dwellings, would be deliverable. The agent therefore seeks the allocation of the full site east of Bridgnorth Road in SAMDev to ensure the town's development needs within the wider context of Shropshire are delivered. The Shropshire Wildlife Trust seeks clarity on the possibilities to input into consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan, which they would welcome.

Cressage

The Hereford Diocesan Board of Finance has expressed concern that settlements outside the parish of Much Wenlock, such as Cressage, have been overlooked. It feels that Cressage is a sustainable settlement, with access to a wide range of facilities and services, and should therefore be formally recognised as a Community Hub, accommodating a modest level of growth. As a result, the Hereford Diocesan Board of Finance promotes a site to the south west of Cressage off Manley Road.

Buildwas

The Parish Council has confirmed that they would like to be designated as a Community Cluster. Work is ongoing within the Parish to identify the preferred level of growth in light of community consultation. However, Agents acting on behalf of 1 respondent do express support for Buildwas as a Community Cluster with the potential for small scale development to bring benefits to the local community.

Oswestry Place Plan Area

Oswestry

Q1: Do you agree that the allocation of OSW002, being Land off Gobowen Road, should be reduced from 80 to 36 dwellings, served by an access of 'country lane' character from the Gobowen Road?

Whilst there is some support for the reduction of the target for this site, the overwhelming majority of respondents (95% of 152 respondents and a separate petition of 5760 signatories) do not support any form of development near the Old Oswestry hill fort, including this site. English Heritage does not support the allocation of this site (OSW002) because of the harm the proximity of the development is likely to have on the significance of the hill fort and its setting. Oswestry Town Council and Selattyn & Gobowen Parish Council are extremely concerned about potential impacts on the hill fort and its setting and are keen to be heavily involved in any future discussions. Oswestry & District Civic Society and local archaeology and landscape organisations recognise that the need for new housing and a commitment to Oswestry's future may justify limited development in northern Oswestry, but oppose development on OSW002 because this would interrupt sight lines to and from the monument, would represent a significant incursion into the setting of the monument and may set a precedent for subsequent development.

Other key issues identified by respondents include the impact of housing development on the setting and visual separation of the hill fort and archaeology in the vicinity of the site, together with the loss of wildlife value and recreation space which development implies. There is a widely held view that the hill fort has significant unrealised potential as a tourism asset for the town, but that this potential would be compromised if housing development proceeds. There is also a perception that the housing growth target for Oswestry is out of date; a perception that the SAMDev consultation process has been flawed and inconsistent with the Council's 'Statement of Community Involvement'; and concerns that the Heritage Impact Assessment completed by the site promoter is flawed and inconsistent with national guidance.

Q2: Do you agree that the allocation of OSW003, being Oldport Farm, Gobowen Road, should be increased from 25 to 35 dwellings, including re-use of existing buildings where possible, removal of poor quality agricultural buildings and structures, and the provision of a 100 space car park for visitors to the Hill Fort, information boards and new footpath linkages to the Hill Fort?

As above, the overwhelming majority of respondents (95% of 152 respondents and a separate petition of 5760 signatories) do not support any form of development near the Old Oswestry hill fort, including this site. Some respondents consider that this is a more sensitive site than OSW002. However, many respondents, including by English Heritage and the Oswestry & District Civic Society, recognise that the sympathetic conversion of the main farm house and other traditional farm buildings, and the demolition of redundant, modern farm buildings could make a positive contribution to the setting of the hill fort. There is also widespread recognition of the value of improved access, car parking and interpretation arrangements to help the site play a bigger role as one of the town's key tourism assets, although most respondents would prefer these improvements to take place without any new housing. A number of respondents question the scale of car parking proposed and express concern about the impact of any increase in footfall on the fragile archaeology and habitat value of the site. Any work to the Oldport Farm site should be the subject of a detailed brief that takes into account the farm's sensitive location.

Q3: Do you agree that the allocation of OSW004, being Land off Whittington Road, should be reduced from 125 to 117 dwellings, with the northern extent of the development area pulled back towards the Whittington Road, with a landscaped edge, and with the proposed 2-3 hectare employment area to the west of the A5/A483 junction removed altogether, to leave open views to/from the Hill Fort?

As above, the overwhelming majority of respondents (95% of 152 respondents and a separate petition of 5760 signatories) do not support any form of development near the Old Oswestry hill fort, including this site. Whilst many respondents welcome the reduction in the scale of development proposed, many respondents do not consider that this is sufficient to mitigate views and sight lines to and from the monument and that the scale of development should be further reduced or that the site should not be developed at all. However, English Heritage considers that the reduced spatial extent of the proposed allocation helps to retain views across open land to and from the Hillfort, and that development is therefore acceptable. However, the scale of development means that its design quality will be crucial they would welcome continuing involvement in the detailed design and master planning of this site. The Oswestry & District Civic Society and local archaeology and landscape organisations consider that the reduced footprint represents a less significant interruption to sight lines, and now have no objection, subject to appropriate landscape treatment of the development edge. A number of respondents are concerned about setting a precedent for subsequent development in this area. The Shropshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the reduction in the size of the site but notes that the environmental network surrounding the old railway line and the bypass zone needs to be protected and enhanced.

Q4: Do you agree that the proposed employment land in the Eastern Gateway Sustainable Urban Extension (OSW024) should be replaced by additional housing, creating capacity for a further 120-180 dwellings?

A small majority (48% of 33 respondents to this question) do not support the replacement of proposed employment land by housing. Key concerns relate to the need to maintain an appropriate balance between housing and employment in the town, although a number of respondents would support the proposed replacement provided that the loss is compensated by additional provision elsewhere in the town.

Q5: Do you agree that the overall employment target for Oswestry should be increased from 35 to 45 hectares over the Plan Period?

The majority (67% of 33 respondents to this question) support increasing the target. Many respondents express concern about a growing population having to increasingly commute out for work and therefore welcome any measures designed to deliver economic benefits to the area. Some respondents suggest sticking with the lower target for the time being, with more land being released when there is evidence of demand.

Q6: Do you agree that ELR042 (2ha), being Land North of Whittington Road, should be allocated for employment, subject to access off Whittington Road, improvements to the A5/A495/B4580 junction and to pedestrian/cycle links to/from Oswestry, and a landscape buffer to the A5 to reduce visibility from the Hill Fort?

The majority (54% of 39 respondents to this question) support allocation of this site. Some concern is expressed that development in this area could set a precedent to develop land to the east of the bypass, whilst other respondents would support such an approach to deliver a new village with infrastructure as an alternative to some of the existing preferred housing sites. Whilst the proposed landscape buffer is welcomed as a means of maintaining the

quality of one of the 'gateways' to the town, there is some concern that this will have an adverse impact on the sight lines to and from the hill fort.

Q7: Do you agree that ELR043 (23ha), being Land South of Whittington Road, should be allocated for employment, subject to access off Whittington Road, improvements to the A5/A495/B4580 junction and to pedestrian/cycle links to/from Oswestry, and a landscape buffer to the A5 to reduce visibility from the Hill Fort?

The majority (54% of 39 respondents to this question) support allocation of this site. Development may represent an opportunity to establish a technology park and linked to the existing BT. However, some concern is expressed that development in this area could set a precedent to develop land to the east of the bypass. There are also concerns about highway capacity at the Whittington Road roundabout and that development could impact on view to and from the hill fort.

Q8: Do you agree that ELR072 (23ha), being Land at Mile End East, should be allocated for employment, subject to access off the A5, improvements to the A5/A483 Mile End junction and to pedestrian/cycle links to/from Oswestry, and landscape buffers to the A5?

The majority (74% of 35 respondents to this question) support allocation of this site, although there is some concern that development will exacerbate the adverse impact of recent development on the main entrance gateway to Oswestry and establish a precedent for development east of the bypass.

Q9: Do you agree that the development boundary for Oswestry should be amended to include land adjacent to Oakfield, Middleton Road?

The majority (65% of 29 respondents to this question) support the proposed amendment.

Q10: Do you agree that the development boundary for Oswestry should be amended at Green Pastures, Weston Lane?

The majority (57% of 30 respondents to this question) support the proposed amendment which is supported as a natural 'rounding off' of development in this part of the town, although the capacity of Weston Lane is known to be limited so any additional development will need to carefully consider highway issues.

LLANYMYNECH & PANT

Q11: Do you agree that the overall housing target for Llanymynech & Pant should be increased from 50 to 50-100?

A small majority (47% of 32 respondents to this question), including the Parish Council, support increasing the target. Whilst some respondents consider that development of this scale will enable incremental growth of the village to help meet housing needs and will help to integrate the Badger's Green development into the village, others note that there are unsold houses and are concerned about infrastructure capacity.

Q12: Do you agree that LLAN001, being Former Railway Land, should be allocated for 32 dwellings?

The majority (61% of 28 respondents to this question) support allocation of this site. The site promoter confirms that investigations have revealed the site is capable of development, and will bring with it improved parking facilities for the adjacent bowling green and wider village recreation area. Agreement with the adjacent landowner has been obtained for a

connection from the site to the surrounding footpath network. However the promoter for the other preferred option suggests that development of their site (land east of Barley Meadows LLAN009) should proceed in advance of this site to reflect the fact that it is closer to the village centre and to enable the establishment of links between the canal tow path, playing field, village hall and the former railway land (LLAN001). Development may also offer the potential for a cycle link to Barley Meadows. One respondent is concerned about whether 32 houses can be accommodated without loss of the existing habitat value of the site and without compromising future restoration of the railway.

Other issues:

The landowner (supported by the Parish Council) requests consideration of a minor revision to the Development Boundary to include Tregarthen, Tregarthen Lane, Pant, as it makes sense of an existing anomaly.

ST MARTINS:

Q13: Do you agree that STM029, being Land at Rhos y Llan Farm, should be allocated for a mixed use site, comprising 80 dwellings, employment uses and land for community recreation and sports facilities?

A clear majority (73% of 26 respondents to this question), including the Parish Council, support allocation of this site. The site promoter confirms that they do not consider there to be any technical constraint to the delivery of the site and have therefore sought pre-application advice. They also consider that allocation of a single site provides greater market certainty and will therefore enable quicker delivery of the scheme including the identified community benefits. It is proposed that the provision of improved pedestrian links to the relocated St Martins primary school could be provided as a 'first-stage' to the development of the site. However, other respondents consider that placing all the proposed housing development for a village on a single site represents a change in the character of existing development in St Martins and limits competition. There are also concerns that the site will deliver recreation facilities in a location which is more remote than the alternative site at Griffin Farm (STM009).

Q14: Do you agree with the removal of possible housing site, SMT009, being Land at Griffin Farm?

A majority (64% of 25 respondents to this question), including the Parish Council, support removal of this site. However, the site promoter considers that the site should be the preferred location for recreation facilities given its strategic location relative to the village and an increase in the housing target to provide additional housing to help to deliver these.

KINNERLEY CLUSTER:

Q15: Do you agree that the settlements of Kinnerley, Maesbrook, Dovaston and Knockin Heath should be a Community Cluster?

A majority (80% of 22 respondents to this question), support the establishment of a cluster in a way consistent with the findings of the recently adopted Kinnerley Neighbourhood Plan.

Q16: Do you think that the target of a further 50 dwellings to be built in Kinnerley, Maesbrook, Dovaston and Knockin Heath by 2026 is appropriate?

A majority (55% of 20 respondents to this question), support the proposed housing growth target consistent with the findings of the recently adopted Kinnerley Neighbourhood Plan, although some respondents feel that more housing, particularly affordable housing might attract families, which in turn support the viability of local schools and shops. More housing

development would be appropriate in Kinnerley since whilst it has good existing facilities, it could also help in re-opening the pub.

Q17: Do you agree that KYN001, being Land Adjacent Kinnerley Primary School (0.8ha), should be allocated for 12 dwellings?

A majority (75% of 20 respondents to this question), support the proposed allocation of this site, consistent with the findings of the recently adopted Kinnerley Neighbourhood Plan. The Shropshire Wildlife Trust comments that the site is immediately adjacent to the Weir Brook and the design of any development should provide for a buffer area to ensure that there is no adverse impact on water quality or quantity.

Q18: Do you agree that KYN002, being Land West of School Road (0.9ha), should be allocated for 12 dwellings?

A majority (76% of 17 respondents to this question), support the proposed allocation of this site, consistent with the findings of the recently adopted Kinnerley Neighbourhood Plan.

Q19: Do you agree that MBK001, being Land at Greenfields Farm (0.26ha), should be allocated for 4 dwellings?

A majority (67% of 18 respondents to this question), support the proposed allocation of this site, consistent with the findings of the recently adopted Kinnerley Neighbourhood Plan, although one respondent considers that the number of houses proposed on the site (4) is too few.

Q20: Do you agree that MBK009, being Land Adjacent to The Smithy (0.44ha), should be allocated for 5 dwellings?

A majority (72% of 18 respondents to this question), support the proposed allocation of this site, consistent with the findings of the recently adopted Kinnerley Neighbourhood Plan, although one respondent considers that the number of houses proposed on the site (5) is too few.

Q21: Do you agree that development in Dovaston and Knockin Heath should be limited to small infill plots?

A majority (68% of 19 respondents to this question), support the proposed allocation of this site, consistent with the findings of the recently adopted Kinnerley Neighbourhood Plan. Some respondents are concerned that the local community's reluctance to extend the development boundary will only deliver further larger houses, rather than housing which is affordable by local young families, and that this will further erode the traditional character of the village. A site promoter suggests that this could be addressed through the allocation of a specific additional site beyond the current development boundary.

SELATTYN CLUSTER:

Q22: Do you agree that the overall housing target for Selattyn, Upper/Middle/Lower Hengoed and Pant Glas should be reduced from 20 to 5 dwellings?

A majority (52% of 27 respondents to this question), including the Parish Council support the proposed reduction in the housing growth target for the cluster. However, several respondents are concerned that such an approach will undermine the provision of more affordable and local needs housing to help support a more sustainable community. There is also concern that the proposed reduction is not justified by appropriate evidence.

Q23: Do you agree that no specific site will be allocated for housing in Selattyn, and development should be limited to 5 dwellings, within the existing development boundary?

A majority (71% of 21 respondents to this question), support the proposed approach to housing development in Selattyn. However, there is concern that restricting development to infill only and the retention of existing development boundary may change the character of a village by promoting the development of existing greenspace and increasing density. Whilst there is support for avoiding a specific site allocation, restricting numbers to 5 dwellings is considered short sighted, since affordable family homes would help support the viability of the local school.

WESTON RHYN CLUSTER:

Q24: Do you agree that the settlements of Weston Rhyn, Rhoswiell, Wern and Chirk Bank should be a Community Cluster?

A majority (65% of 26 respondents to this question), support the proposed cluster. However, a number of respondents feel that Weston Rhyn is a sustainable settlement which is capable of supporting a higher number of houses than the proposed housing growth target with no more than small-scale infill housing development anywhere else in the parish. In addition, opportunities for infill development within Weston Rhyn are considered limited and this may require the allocation of additional land. One respondent takes issue with the process by which the cluster was identified and considers that identification of the proposed cluster by the Parish Council has not been justified by sustainability evidence or adequate community consultation.

Q25: Do you think that the target of a further 78 dwellings (continuation of existing trend of 6 per year) to be built in Weston Rhyn, Rhoswiell, Wern and Chirk Bank by 2026 is appropriate?

A small majority (54% of 24 respondents to this question) support the proposed housing growth target for the cluster. The Parish Council that the agreed housing growth target of 78 is already coming under significant pressure from current and proposed planning applications.

Q26: Do you agree that a site should be 'allocated' for 25 dwellings in Weston Rhyn? If "yes", which of the proposed sites, WRN001 or WRN010 would be the best location?

A small majority (57% of 21 respondents to this question), including the Parish Council, support the allocation of a site for 25 dwellings in Weston Rhyn. Of those that expressed a preference, a small majority (50% of 8 respondents), including the Parish Council, preferred WRN010. The Parish Council consider WRN001 unsuitable for development due to the very narrow access with no footpath from High Street. There are also concerns about drainage and flood risk. In contrast, the Parish Council supports WRN010 (off Aspen Grange) as preferred site because it benefits from direct access through the Aspen Grange to Station Road. The area is considered by the Parish Council and other respondents to be preferable due to its proximity to village services and the adjacent recreation space. Welsh Water comments that there have been isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system downstream of both sites which will need to be overcome if development is to proceed. WRN010 is crossed by a public sewer which may affect the development density and layout of the site. Welsh Water confirms that there is no capacity constraint at the Waste Water Treatment Works to which waste water from these sites would drain.

Q27: Do you agree that WRN016, being Land at the Sawmills, Rhoswiell (1.1ha), should be allocated for 20 dwellings?

A small majority (55% of 20 respondents to this question) do not support allocation of WRN016. The Parish Council support the allocation of this brownfield site although they are concerned that the site is being promoted for a larger number of houses than that for which it is allocated. Respondents who do not support allocation are concerned that it will not

contribute greatly to the community or local housing needs, but would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and tourism value of the canal. The site promoter confirms that the site is “deliverable” within the plan period and there are no technical environmental or engineering constraints that would prevent it from coming forward during the early part of the Plan period. However they also note that the site is capable of delivering a higher level of housing which would make the allocation of a greenfield site in Weston Rhyn unnecessary. Other respondents consider that the site could take more housing than the total for which it is allocated. Welsh Water notes that there have been isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system downstream of this site which will need to be overcome if development is to proceed. The site is also crossed by a public sewer which may restrict the layout and development density of the site. Welsh Water confirms that there is no capacity constraint at the Waste Water Treatment Works to which waste water from these sites would drain.

Q28: Do you agree that development in The Wern should be limited to individual or small infill plots?

The majority (80% of 20 respondents to this question) support the proposed approach to future housing development in The Wern. One respondent notes that the Parish Council previously considered allocating a site. Whilst supporting the proposed approach, some respondents suggest alternative boundaries to those proposed to include additional land.

Q29: Do you agree that, following the recent consent for 7 dwellings, no further development in Chirk Bank should be allowed?

The majority (84% of 19 respondents to this question) support no further development in Chirk Bank due to a lack of amenities in the village, potential impacts on the World Heritage Site and its buffer zone and highway constraints. However, some respondents consider that Chirk Bank could accommodate more housing and another site should be allocated to come forward later in the Plan period.

OTHER ISSUES:

Several respondents took the opportunity to comment on parts of the Oswestry Place Plan area which were not subject to consultation in the Revised Preferred Options.

Identification of Hubs and Clusters

There are concerns that it has not been possible to comment on settlements or promoted sites in the Oswestry area where the Parish Councils have chosen not to put their villages forward as hubs or clusters (eg. West Felton, Morda, Trefonen). There are concerns that the council's ‘rural rebalance’ approach will not be delivered where some villages are excluded. It is not clear whether the fact that these parishes will therefore have limited CIL revenue has been adequately explained to the local community. Some respondents feel that the decision to let Parish Councils decide whether to opt-in or out is flawed since they are not equipped or funded to make major decisions affecting the shape of their villages for the next 20 years.

Llanyblodwel Cluster

A site promoter noted that infill opportunities within the development boundaries for Porth Y Waen and Llanyblodwel are extremely limited and requested that a further review of the Cluster be undertaken and consideration given to inclusion of their client's site.

Oswestry Rural

A site promoter noted that Oswestry Rural Parish Council has not chosen to list Morda as a Community Hub or Cluster and challenges the role of Parish Councils in helping to determine planning policy for their areas. Instead, Hub or Cluster status should be based on planning criteria which would indicate the need for further development. In the case of Morda, the settlement is considered to be of a sufficient size and contains a range of services and

facilities for it to be described as a “Hub” and further consideration should be given to their clients’ site for future residential development. By contrast another respondent considers that it is essential that the countryside should never be compromised.

Whittington Hub

Several local residents are concerned that development of the preferred site allocations should not impact adversely on existing adjacent property by generating avoidable traffic impacts or exacerbating flood risk.

Park Hall Cluster

A site promoter requests further consideration of PARK004 as a preferred site. The site is considered to be a sustainable and deliverable brownfield site abutting the existing built form of the village which could deliver up to 30 houses as a contribution to the growth target of up to 50 dwellings for the cluster within the plan period.

Gobowen

A number of respondents consider that the Plan should protect the existing rail yard site in Gobowen (GOB024) from housing in order to secure the future of the proposed heritage railway / cycle track project. The promoter of site GOB008 confirms that concerns about the deliverability of the site have now been resolved, and there is now no impediment to its early development.

Shifnal Place Plan Area

Shifnal

Question 1: Should all the land at Lamledge Lane be included within the development boundary?

| Answer Options | Online Responses | Paper Responses | Total | % |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 155 | 67 | 222 | 40.4% |
| No | 226 | 101 | 327 | 59.6% |
| Total | 381 | 168 | 549 | |

There were some positive responses to this question. It is felt by some of the respondents that Lamledge Lane should be kept in the development boundary as employment land, or used for industrial purposes. It is thought that the site is suitable for a supermarket or medical centre. It is also thought that the site would benefit from being in the development boundary due to nearby existing employment. One respondent did feel that land to the south of Lamledge Lane should be allocated for employment use. Other respondents felt that the land should be used for budget housing, which some feel is very much required in Shifnal.

Many respondents had a negative view of this proposal for various reasons including traffic issues, flooding and overdevelopment. It is felt that there would be substantial traffic issues surrounding this proposal, as the current road system as it stands, would not be able to deal with the increased volume of traffic. Many respondents feel that there would be serious delays along Innage Road and Aston Road, especially during term time. Any development along Lamledge Lane would turn Curriers Lane into a rat run, causing further problems of congestion. It is felt that alternative routes are needed as the Bradford Street and Park Street junction could become very congested.

Many respondents feel that any development would create a feeling of urban sprawl and change the character of Shifnal. Further development would result in the overdevelopment of Shifnal, causing the area, as many feel, to become a suburb of Telford. There were also concerns from some of the residents that any extra development, whether it is for housing or employment purposes would further exacerbate flooding issues. It is felt that current surface water drainage is insufficient and couldn't cope with any extra development.

Question 2: As playing fields have strong protection in any case, should the land between Idsall school/Shifnal Primary School and Coppice Green Lane be taken out of the 'safeguarded land' designation and included within the development boundary? To see a map of Shifnal [click here](#)

| Answer Options | Online Responses | Paper responses | Total | % |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 47 | 19 | 66 | 12.2% |
| No | 326 | 147 | 473 | 87.8% |
| Total | 373 | 166 | 539 | |

Many respondents are against this proposal due to the loss of green fields. Residents want this land to be protected from both residential and commercial development and only used by the school. There is much confusion over the meaning of safeguarded land; many respondents think this means that the land is to be safeguarded against any future development and to remain as open countryside. It is felt that any development on this land may set a precedent for future development, resulting in a loss of more open space.

The road structure and facilities will be unable to accommodate the increasing population and as such the land should be kept free of houses and traffic. Not only are there concerns about the volume of traffic using these roads, many residents feel the access land is too narrow; it is already busy during

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

school times and would be unable to cope with any extra traffic. There is a consensus that the development would also be too close to the motorway. Finally there are concerns regarding insufficient drainage, where development of the land could cause potential flooding.

Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed allocation of land at Coppice Green Lane (site SHI017)?

| Answer Options | Online Responses | Paper responses | Total | % |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 86 | 39 | 125 | 22.6% |
| No | 295 | 132 | 427 | 77.4% |
| Total | 381 | 171 | 552 | |

The consultation highlights that traffic and congestion issues needs addressing, especially along Aston Street/Curriers Lane and Stanton Road junction. It is felt that the roads are too narrow to deal with the increased level of traffic and any additional traffic would lead to further congestion in Shifnal town centre. The development would result in major delays along Innage Road and Aston Street. It is thought by many residents that there would be a serious issue of traffic safety outside Idsall School, as the roads are not wide enough, and that to balance this; the road outside the school should be restricted to 20mph. It is also thought that there could be access problems from the development and another access point should be considered to reduce the potential impact of congestion and traffic safety. One of the main reasons for objecting was due to the existing road network, which is thought to be too busy and hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists.

It is felt that the current level of infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate the increasing population. If the infrastructure is developed further to support the population, the integrity of Shifnal will be destroyed. The Coppice Green Lane site is too far away from any amenities and would become a satellite town. Springhill Trading Estate is more suitable for residential development and Coppice Green Lane is thought to be more suitable for leisure and educational purposes.

Many respondents felt that flooding and drainage issues would be a major concern resulting from the development. The drainage culvert between the proposed estate and Admirals Way is known to flood and any development could severely impact this.

Many respondents also feel that there would be major ecological damage caused by the development, having a detrimental effect on wildlife habitats. The land in question is a Greenfield site and should be safeguarded against any future development. It is thought that brownfield sites should be considered for any development first. Many residents feel that development on this site would lead to overdevelopment of Shifnal and would result in urban sprawl, thus having a negative impact on the character of the area.

However, one resident was in support of the development, providing that improvements to Aston Street and other surrounding roads are made.

Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed allocation of land at The Uplands, south of Wolverhampton Road (site SHI002)?

| Answer Options | Online Responses | Paper Responses | Total | % |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 121 | 51 | 172 | 31.2% |
| No | 259 | 121 | 380 | 68.8% |
| Total | 380 | 172 | 552 | |

The majority of respondents had a negative view point regarding development at The Uplands, as it is thought that the area is not a sustainable location for future development. It is thought that the area will become overdeveloped, resulting in urban sprawl. Many feel that Shifnal does not have the infrastructure to cope with an increasing population; the schools are at capacity and the pavements

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

are too narrow creating a problem for pedestrians. Traffic safety is a concern and it has been suggested that alternative routes through the town centre are needed.

Many residents are of the opinion that the area does not need any more housing, due to the lack of green space and that Greenfield sites must be protected; if there is to be development, the land should be considered for a school expansion and not for housing. Some respondents have suggested that the site be used for a care home, as this is thought to be needed in Shifnal. Other issues include the risk of flooding and drainage problems, which are already a current problem and could be made worse from development. The site also houses protected species such as Great Crested Newts.

Question 5: Should Lamledge Lane Industrial Estate be protected for employment uses, preventing redevelopment for other uses?

| Answer Options | Online Responses | Paper Responses | Total | % |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 322 | 156 | 478 | 87.2% |
| No | 57 | 13 | 70 | 12.8% |
| Total | 379 | 169 | 548 | |

Many of the respondents feel that the site is suitable for development, but should be retained for employment uses only. There is a consensus that perhaps Telford is a better location, as there are a number of empty factories and available sites. It is thought that if the site is to be developed it needs to be cleaned up and used only for proper industrial units with proper infrastructure, as the current site is undesirable and unsafe. The type of employment use needs to be considered in terms of noise and light pollution, due to nearby housing and schools. Some respondents feel that the present industrial sites are sufficient for Shifnal and no development should take place.

With regards to transport, it is felt that the location of the site would make it unsuitable for employment use as there is no public transport to and from the area. This makes it an unsafe and undesirable location to work in.

If development is to proceed on this site, it is thought that it would cause an increase of traffic and congestion. It is thought that the road facilities are unsuitable and would need to be developed before any development takes place. There is also a concern that the country lane and access points would not be considered safe for the potential increase of traffic.

Other respondents were concerned with flooding and drainage issues and the effect development would have on the local environment.

Protection should improve sustainability of Shifnal, otherwise could become dormitory town for Telford and Wolverhampton

If the land isn't protected now for employment use, could it be used at a later date for residential development which is unsuitable for Shifnal?

Those respondents who were in favour of development felt that employment opportunities should be encouraged, as it would help to develop a sense of community. It is also thought that land is needed for employment is more houses are to be built. Some respondents felt that currently there aren't enough jobs in Shifnal and any area that can offer places for employment should be kept for that use.

It is thought that the location and size of the site is a good sized area to promote light industrial use. There is plenty of space for existing businesses and a number of current units which are not occupied; thus allowing use at a later date. Some felt that the site could be developed as a mixed use development site of business and residential. The area could be screened without destroying the nature of the site, as well as allowing transport movement without disturbing nearby residents.

Question 6: Do you agree with a target of 5 hectares of land for employment-related development, to be provided on sites SHI004 and ELR021?

| Answer Options | Online Responses | Paper Responses | Total | % |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 189 | 106 | 295 | 56.5% |
| No | 178 | 49 | 227 | 43.5% |
| Total | 367 | 155 | 522 | |

Many respondents were concerned with the level of development and road safety. Many respondents would prefer no development, that the proposed development is excessive and feel that there are suitable sites available for industrial use in Telford. It is thought that the Lamledge Lane site is sufficient. Growth targets are not the right way forward and this proposal is an attempt to encourage further development to the area; there is no such thing as employment related opportunities.

If the land is to be used for employment, it should only be used for employment related purposes only, rather than residential. Land which is currently used for employment purposes should stay as such.

Many respondents feel that the current road structure is inadequate and would not be able to cope with any further traffic. Any development on the site would result in congestion problems, especially along Aston Street. If development is to take place, industrial traffic must be routed away from the town centre.

There are concerns about development taking place on Greenfield land and the resulting loss of open space and woodland. It is thought that Greenfield site must be protected to prevent a loss of habitat and retain agricultural land. The land should only be developed if there is a genuine local need and many respondents are unsure as to whether there is.

Other issues raised by the respondents included issues of flooding and surface water drainage and whether the proposed development would have an effect on house prices. Some respondents felt that only ELR021 should be developed

Of those respondents who responded positively, it was felt that employment related development on these sites would provide potential opportunities to attract large enterprises. It was recognised by some that there is and will be a need for jobs within Shifnal, especially if more houses are to be built.

Question 7: Do you agree with a target of 1,600 homes (804 more than have planning consent to date) for Shifnal over 2006-2026?

| Answer Options | Online Responses | Paper Responses | Total | % |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 35 | 11 | 46 | 8.3% |
| No | 346 | 160 | 506 | 91.7% |
| Total | 381 | 171 | 552 | |

Of those who responded and disagreed with the target of 1,600 homes, one of the main concerns is with the level of housing that is proposed. Many feel that too much growth will spoil character of the town and will ruin the integrity of Shifnal as a rural market town. The majority of respondents feel that the target growth is excessive and should stay at 800. According to one respondent, 800 houses is a 30% increase; more than Shifnal's fair share. It is thought that other market towns around Shropshire should have more housing being built, to alleviate the pressure from Shifnal. An increase in residential development will only result in an increase of jobs being needed, which may cause Shifnal to become a dormitory town. It is agreed that further housing is needed, but not to this extent; too many houses too quickly. Concerns that the housing built won't be affordable and young people will be priced out of the area. Springhill Trading Estate is thought to be the most appropriate housing site due to its accessibility into town and the inclusion of brownfield land. The number of houses on this site could be increased and the site at Coppice Green Lane taken out.

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

Any development will undoubtedly cause an increase of traffic, especially on Innage Road and Aston Street. Current road networks can barely sustain the population as it is and it is felt that any development would result in further delays and congestion, particularly during peak hours. Issues have been raised concerning the safety of the Aston Road/Bradford Street junction. Improvements to the road system are needed; traffic calming measures, road widening and a possible one way system to help alleviate traffic. Traffic should also be diverted around the town to help reduce congestion. Current car parking is also limited and would be insufficient for an increasing population.

Many respondents have concerns that the level of infrastructure is not sufficient for an increasing population. Many concerns surround the local schools and the doctors surgery; both at capacity and unable to withstand an increasing population. The area has no petrol station or leisure facilities, such as swimming pools and a cinema.

Other concerns include flooding and drainage problems, building on Greenfield land and the protection of the countryside.

Positive responses show that there is acceptance that the town needs to grow to develop services for future generations. Some feel that Shifnal has the community infrastructure to cope and should be considered one of the main locations for housing development. Development will allow the town to become more vibrant, with facilities and transport links.

Question 8: Please tell us if there any other comments that you wish to make? (Please only comment on the Revised SAMDev Plan. Comments on any current planning applications should be made on the planning webpage.)

The consultation has highlighted that there are a number of concerns surrounding the level of development proposed in Shifnal. Many respondents feel that too many houses have been proposed and the number is more than any other town in Shropshire; 800 houses are more than enough and should be reviewed after 2026. It is thought that the number of houses suggested for Shifnal is out of proportion and will result in a 60% increase of the size of the town, compared with other towns such as Albrighton where there is only a 14% increase. A balance is needed between housing and town centre facilities and further housing would destroy that balance.

The proposed development will destroy Shifnal's integrity as a market town and as a result will become a suburb of Telford. Green space will be swamped by development, ruining the character of the area. Building on countryside and on Greenfield land will destroy what open space is left in Shifnal. It is felt that there would be environmental impacts and negative effects on local wildlife. There are protected trees and species such as Great Crested Newts on site; extensive habitat mitigation measures would need to be undertaken. One response from a local resident states, "*Shropshire Council should adhere to existing greenbelt boundaries for Shifnal. Councils own preferred options show there are more than enough suitable sites within Shifnal.*"

It is felt by many respondents that there isn't the infrastructure to cope with an increasing population; the existing infrastructure is unable to meet current demands. Schools are already at capacity and medical practices can't cope with current demand. The construction of a supermarket would have a serious detrimental effect on Shifnal's independent shops. Whatever development is approved must be matched by improvements in community infrastructure, as more investment is needed in providing local amenities.

Many respondents feel there are and will be issues with Shifnal's road infrastructure. There are already problems concerning the current volume of traffic, further development to the town would cause major delays and congestion problems, particularly around Aston Street and Haughton Road. Further traffic would cause issues of road safety, especially during school drop off times. It is felt that maybe a ring road is needed around Shifnal to deal with excess traffic. Any highways improvements must include Haughton Lane and traffic calming measures are needed.

Any development would cause issues of flooding, particularly around Wesley Brook and Park Lane. Priorslee reservoir doesn't have the capacity for further development. If development is to take place, areas of open water need to be effectively managed. There is a concern that development will also cause a problem with surface water drainage.

SAMDev Plan Publication March 2014: Consultation Statement

Other issues raised include the level of housing that will be affordable and having development on brownfield sites rather than building on Greenfield. One respondent was concerned that Haughton Road and the Uplands were originally classed as alternative sites and instead are now part of SAMDev.

One respondent had the following suggestion, *“sell off a narrow strip of the large playing fields at St Andrews Primary School fronting Wolverhampton Road to enable a residential development there and put the sale proceeds towards building a new St Andrews School on the (slightly smaller) site to replace the existing buildings that are becoming rather tired and in need of major renovation. The existing school could remain operational whilst the new school is being built within the playing field land.”*

The consultation also highlighted some positive response from local residents. It was felt that the proposed development sites were logical as they are bounded by existing infrastructure. Affordable housing is needed in Shifnal; without future development of social housing, people may be priced out of the area.

Shrewsbury Place Plan Area

Shrewsbury

Q1: Do you agree that Land at Ditherington Flaxmill (SHREW198- part) should be allocated to accommodate mixed uses including approximately 120 dwellings?

The majority of respondents (27 out of 32, 88%) agree to the land being used for mixed use development. There is also support for the development from English Heritage. Of those who disagreed, there was a concern about the existing listed buildings currently on the site.

Q2: Do you agree that, for the Shrewsbury West Sustainable Urban Extension (SHREW002, 035, 083, and 128/ELR64, 67 and 68), the reference to the relocation of the Park and Ride facility should be removed from the policy guidelines, the previously proposed relocation site switched to housing land, the Land Use Plan amended accordingly and, as a consequence, the number of houses increased from 720 to approximately 750?

Of the small majority of respondents (13 out of 22), 59% agreed with the proposal. Few respondents provided any comments on the proposal. A single comment was made against any development taking place on Greenfield land. Other concerns were raised about access off Welshpool Road and potential traffic and parking problems. It was also felt that there could be environmental impacts surrounding the developments which may result in ecological damage.

Q3: Do you agree that Land at Weir Hill Farm/Robertsford House, Preston Street and Land off London Road (Reserve Site) (Site SHREW027– parts) should be combined into one site for 550-600 houses in two parts with separate access points and with the eastern edge of the development area pulled further back from the river corridor? (See questions 5 and 6 for the two parts separately).

Of those who responded, only 9 out of 25 (36%) agreed that the land should be combined into one site. Concerns about the proposal were raised about the increase of traffic along Preston Street and London Road as well as highway safety and noise levels. Both proposed access routes are thought to be potentially dangerous. It was felt that all new homes should be accessed via London Road and that potential traffic problems would just be shifted from Preston Street to London Road. Some respondents raised the issue about drainage and the risk of potential flooding. There is a concern about how the existing water supply will cope with further demand. It is also noted that the proposed level of housing may cause a detrimental effect on local wildlife and the surrounding countryside.

Q4: Do you agree that Land at Weir Hill Farm/Robertsford House, Preston Street (Site SHREW027 – part) should be reduced from 400 to 150 houses accessed off Preston Street, subject to highway improvements to Preston Street and the Column roundabout, new open space to Preston Street and landscape buffer to Sunfield Park?

Of those who responded, 57% (15 out of 26) disagreed with any level of development on the site. The main issues which were raised centre around traffic concerns and the safety of the residents. It is thought that the proposed housing development will cause a further problem with the existing water supply and drainage problems, as it is felt that these facilities will not be able cope with the increased level of housing. There was a consensus that brownfield sites should be used for housing sites and not Greenfield land. Of those who agreed with the proposal, it was felt that the reduction of houses was more suited to the character of the area.

Q5: Do you agree that the former reserve site for 300-400 houses, Land off London Road (Site SHREW027 – part), should be allocated for between 400-450 houses

(incorporating part of site formerly put forward off Preston Street), subject to access off London Road?

The majority of respondents (17 out of 25, (68%)) disagreed with the proposal. It is felt that the level of development is not sustainable to the area and cannot be supported by the current level of infrastructure. The allocation for houses would result in major traffic congestion, as it is thought these particular streets are not designed to cope with the increased level. There are also concerns regarding access off Preston Street and the potential dangers of an increased volume of traffic. Some respondents did agree with the proposal, in that they felt the proposed development was required for the growth of the town.

Other general comments surrounding the proposed development at Preston Street

Some respondents have provided general disagreements with all of the proposed developments around Preston Street. There have been issues raised concerning congestion and parking problems and a general consensus that the existing road network around the column roundabout cannot be improved and therefore will not be able to deal with the increased number of vehicles. As a result this may result in pedestrian safety. There is also a concern about access at the junction of Preston Street and Portland Crescent. Some of the respondents feel that proposed developments will have an adverse reaction on local wildlife and cause severe environmental problems. It has been questioned about how suitable the land is for development; the potential drainage problems and an increased risk of flooding. Other comments raised include the economic impacts on local businesses, the insufficient level of local infrastructure to support more houses and the use of Greenfield land for development.

Q6: Do you agree that the allocation of Land off Shillingston Drive (Site SHREW105) – should be reduced from 250 to 230 houses, with reference to provision of additional open space/buffer area alongside the public footpath on the south-eastern boundary of the site, traffic management measures as may be required to Shillingston Drive and Battlefield Road, and a bond to provide a financial contribution to future junction improvements if necessary?

Only a small number of people responded to this and of those who did, 14 out of 19 (73%) agreed with the proposal. Of those who didn't agree, concerns were about environmental damage, particularly as the site is adjacent to Lion Coppice. It is felt that the development would cause ecological damage due to the unique nature of the development.

Q7: Do you agree that the former reserve site, Land North of London Road (Site SHREW001– part) be allocated for approximately 50 dwellings, with the eastern edge of the development area pulled further back from the river corridor and subject to appropriate landscaping to minimise visual impact on the corridor?

Only a small number of people responded to this and of those who did 57% agreed that the development needs to be moved away from the river corridor. Some of the general comments include wildlife concerns and access between SCAT and the crematorium. It is also thought that the pedestrian link between London Road and the river could be improved thus improving the value of the area.

Q8: Do you agree that Shrewsbury South SUE Land Use Plan should be amended to increase the area of open space at Sutton Grange, increase the potential extent of the Local Centre (subject to need and demand) and clarify the scope for mixed use development in the Oteley South character area?

The majority of people (15 out of 19 respondents (78%)) agreed with proposal to increase the area of open space. Those who commented were concerned about the ecological value of the site and commented on how having open space will provide a buffer to the Rea Brook LNR thus improving the ecological value of the area.

Q9: Do you agree that the Primary Shopping Area should be extended at Castle Gates and at Wyle Cop, with those areas being shown as 'Secondary Frontage'?

Only a small proportion of people responded to the question, but of those who did 63% (10 out of 16) agreed.

Q10: Do you agree with the proposed change to the development boundary at Sundorne Road between the former Territorial Army buildings and new medical centre?

Only a small proportion of people responded to the question, but of those who did 76% (13 out of 17) agreed. No comments were made about the proposal.

Q11: Do you agree with the proposed identification of a new development boundary around the curtilages of existing residential properties at the southern end of Shepherd's Lane, Bicton Heath?

Only a small proportion of people responded to the question, but of those who did 75% (12 out of 16) agreed. General comments have been made against the proposal.

Q12: Do you agree with the existing employment sites and areas in Shrewsbury proposed to be safeguarded as shown on the map?

Only a small proportion of people responded to the question, but of those who did 86% (13 out of 15) agreed. No comments were made about the proposal.

Alternative sites

New area of land proposed for Calcott Lane

Reserve sites

SHREW001: Reduction of houses needed

Other Preferred Sites

SHREW212: Increase of traffic between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill

SHREW095: Comments against the proposal due to its location

BASCHURCH

Q13: Do you agree that BAS017 (Land to West of Shrewsbury Road) should be allocated for up to 30 dwellings and provision of land for a medical centre and associated parking?

Q14: BOMERE HEATH Do you agree that Leaton and Dunns Heath should be removed as Community Cluster settlements?

A slight majority (11 out of 16, 69%) agreed with this. The rural character of the area should be preserved against any future development. Development would only result in an increase of traffic and congestion.

Q15: Do you agree that a development boundary should be identified for Bomere Heath on the basis of the current Local Plan boundary (amended to include the site proposed to be allocated for development, if this is confirmed)?

The majority agreed with this (13 out of 16, 81%)¹ comment made about the application: Not happy about the inclusion of the recreational site if this site is to be allocated for development.

NESSCLIFFE

Q16: Do you agree that the overall housing target should be reduced from 50 to approximately 30 dwellings for Nesscliffe?

Comments made for and against the proposal. 19 out of 29 respondents (66%) agreed with the proposal. Nesscliffe is seen as the only sensible location for housing, as new housing should be close to the services that are available. The area has the capacity for more housing; however the outlying areas of Nesscliffe should remain as countryside. It was felt that if development had to take place, it should only be for affordable housing and the development should be in plots of 10.

Of those who were against development, it was felt that there should be no development on the site at all

ALBRIGHTON

Q17: Do you agree that Albrighton should be identified as a Community Cluster settlement for limited infilling development/conversions, with a target of approximately 5 dwellings ?

The majority of respondents (13 out of 14 (93%)) agreed with the statement and felt that the right number of potential dwellings had been identified appropriately,

Q18: DORRINGTON, STAPLETON and CONDOVER Do you agree that land to the rear of the Old Vicarage (part of DOR017) with access off Church Road should be allocated for 16 dwellings?

Some respondents disagreed with the proposal as it would adversely affect greenfield land. The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal and felt the location of the proposed development was correct.

Q19: Do you agree with the amended development boundary for Dorrington?

The majority of respondents agreed with this and responded positively to the inclusion of the whole site for development.

Q20: Do you agree with the amended housing target for Dorrington of 30-35 houses (from 30) to reflect the addition of site DOR017?

Comments made to include a further piece of land.

FITZ, GRAFTON and NEWBANKS

Q21: Do you agree that Forton Heath and Mytton settlements should be removed from this Community Cluster?

11 out of the 15 respondents (73%) agreed with the proposal. No comments were given.

Q22: Do you agree with the amended target for the Community Cluster of 5-6 additional houses (in addition to recent consents)?

9 out of 15 respondents (60%) agreed with the amendment. No comments were made in support of this. 1 comment made about the number of houses proposed

GREAT NESS, LITTLE NESS, WILCOTT, HOPTON/VALESWOOD, KINTON and FELTON BUTLER

Q23: Do you agree that Great Ness, Little Ness, Wilcott, Hopton/Valeswood, Kinton and Felton Butler, should be identified as a Community Cluster for limited infilling/conversions only, with an overall target of 10-15 houses?

There is an even split between those residents who agree (48%) and those who disagree (48%) with the proposal. Concerns were raised about the general development of the site. It was felt that the land should stay as open countryside and only grant small scale planning applications. Some residents felt that as the areas proposed are hamlets and have no services, not only would there be no services provided for future housing, the increase of

dwellings would result in more traffic and congestion along small country lanes. It was also felt that development would be an exploitation of rural areas purely for economic gain. Of those respondents who did agree, it was felt that infilling was acceptable but only to a limited extent and the houses that were built should be only made available to local people.

HANWOOD and HANWOOD BANK

Q24: Do you agree with the reduction in the area of the proposed allocation site West of School (Site HAN011/R), with a consequential reduction in number of houses on the site to approximately 25 houses?

Only 12 out of 18 respondents (67%) responded to and agreed with this. However no comments were made. Concerns were raised about the increase of traffic through Cruckton, which may cause a danger to local residents. There were concerns that commuter traffic entering Hanwood from Pontesbury direction would not tolerate being delayed by traffic calming measures and Cruckton would become a 'rabbit run'. Concerns were also raised about the danger to pedestrians, cyclists and those on horseback. It is thought that road safety will only get worse from the increase of traffic, especially if there is a lack of traffic cameras where necessary.

MONTFORD BRIDGE WEST (Montford Parish part)

Q25: Do you agree that Montford Bridge West should be identified as a single Community Cluster settlement rather than linked with Bicton village?

10 out of 14 respondents agreed with this, but no comments were given. Objections made against the application

MYTTON

Q26: Do you agree that Mytton should be identified as a single Community Cluster settlement, with a target of 5 houses?

11 out of 19 respondents agreed with this, but no comments were made either for or against.

WALFORD HEATH

Q27: Do you agree that Merrington and Oldwoods settlements should be removed from the Cluster, with Walford Heath identified as a single Community Cluster settlement, with a target of 6 dwellings (in addition to 10 already approved)?

The majority of people agreed with this statement (10 out of 14, 71%). No comments were given in support. Few disagreed and of those who did, it was felt the local countryside would be affected.

Other Comments

It was felt that the consultation period should not have scheduled during the holiday period. There is much support for the re-opening of Baschurch train station. Land south of Radbrook should not be developed. SAMDev is an exploitation of rural areas and no houses should be built.

Wem Place Plan Area

Q1: Do you agree that the overall housing target for Wem should be should be reduced from 800 to 500 dwellings over the Plan Period?

The majority (63% of 19 respondents to this question) support the proposed reduction in the housing target, although some respondents, including the Town Council, remain concerned about the availability of local employment and infrastructure capacity to accommodate even the reduced level of growth. Other respondents consider that Wem is a sustainable settlement which could accept a higher number of new dwellings than the number proposed, pointing out that new housing would help support the town's existing shops and services.

Q2: Do you agree that the allocation of WEM003a, being Land of Pyms Road, should be reduced from 300 to 100 dwellings?

The majority (75% of 16 respondents to this question) support the proposed reduction in the size of the proposed allocation for this site, although many respondents, including the Town Council, remain concerned about the additional burden which they consider even this level of development will place on local services and facilities. Other respondents recognise that, of the available sites, this site represents the most sustainable option for new housing development in Wem.

Q3: Do you agree that the allocation of site WEM012, being Land at Tilley, should be reduced from 30 to 10 dwellings?

The majority (65% of 17 respondents to this question), including the Town Council, do not support the proposed reduction in the size of the proposed allocation for this site since the site is considered inappropriate for any scale of development due principally to flooding, traffic and sewerage issues. The Shropshire Wildlife Trust welcome the reduction in size in the site as this is likely to reduce biodiversity impacts on the River Roden. The agents for the landowner are disappointed with the reduction and point out that development is likely to deliver positive drainage benefits for the locality.

Other Issues:

A number of site promoters consider that the current preferred options sites are unjustified and perform less well against the assessment criteria than their alternative sites. Concern is expressed about the potential for development on the east side of the level crossing, which would exacerbate a situation which is already considered dangerous. Some concern is expressed about the need for the preferred employment site on Shawbury Road in light of the existing availability of established employment sites, the impact of development on a gateway site to Wem and noise and drainage concerns.

SHAWBURY

Q4: Do you agree with the removal of the employment land adjacent to Shawbury Industrial Estate?

All three respondents to this question support removal of the proposed allocation. This is consistent with the Parish Council's established views.

MYDDLE and HARMER HILL

Q5: Do you agree that the settlements of Myddle and Harmer Hill should be a Community Cluster?

All six of the respondents to this question supported the proposed Community Cluster to provide for sustainable growth in the parish.

Q6: An overall target of approximately 50 dwellings over the plan period is proposed for the Cluster. As there is already planning approval for 33 properties in the Parish, this would allow for a further 20 properties. Do you think that the target of a further 20 dwellings to be built within the parish of Myddle and Harmer Hill by 2026 is appropriate?

The majority (57% of 7 respondents to this question) support the proposed target of a further 20 dwellings. However, some respondents consider this to be too low citing the fact that responses to the recent Community Led Plan show that there is a level of community support for over 50 dwellings and for development around the edge and beyond the current development boundary.

Q7: Do you agree that development within Myddle and Harmer Hill is limited to infill development within the existing development boundary

Whilst the majority (50% of 6 respondents to this question) support limiting new development to infill, there are concerns that there is insufficient land available within the existing development boundary to provide for the proposed level of infill development. Infill dwellings can change the character of a village by eroding its existing green space and changing the housing density. Instead, it is suggested that we should allocate small housing sites adjacent to the existing development boundary.

WHIXALL, HOLLINWOOD, WELSH END, PLATT LANE, STANLEY GREEN, DOBSONS BRIDGE, BROWNS BROOK and MOSS COTTAGES:

Q8: Do you agree that the Community Cluster should be removed, returning the settlements to 'Open Countryside'?

All 8 respondents to this question support returning the settlements to 'Countryside Status'. The Parish Council advises that it may wish to review the sustainability of this position in future. However, the issue is divisive and some concern was expressed about this caveat by local residents.

OTHER ISSUES

Concern is expressed by agents for a landowner in Hadnall that the fact that it has chosen not to 'opt-in' means that the settlement has effectively been discounted and no housing allocation has been made. They consider that the village is a hub which provides a variety of facilities and that it should therefore be allocated some additional housing to sustain these local services.

Whitchurch Place Plan Area

Whitchurch

Q1. Do you agree with the proposed increase in the preferred housing target for Whitchurch from 1000 to 1200 dwellings between 2006 and 2026?

There were 63 responses to this question across all formats. A significant majority of these (79%) supported the proposed increase in the Whitchurch housing target from 1000 to 1200 dwellings over the plan period. Of those supporting the proposed increase there was recognition that this level of housing would help support the vitality of the town, and would meet the current demand for housing whilst supporting business growth. Of those who did not support the proposed increase there was concern this would lead to additional out-commuting should sufficient employment opportunities not be created, and that Whitchurch should not cater for under provision in other towns. There was concern raised over the level of proposed 'windfall' allowance and that further provision should be made through specific allocations to ensure delivery. Some respondents felt a higher housing figure would be more appropriate to support the vitality of the town, including Whitchurch Town Council who supported a figure of 1700 dwellings in the plan period.

Q2. Do you agree with the proposed new housing allocation at the Oaklands Farm (WHIT051) for 60 dwellings?

There were 52 responses to this question across all formats. A majority of these (65%) did not support the proposed allocation, whilst 35% were in support. Of those objecting to the proposal few gave specific reasons, although there was concern expressed about the use of this greenfield site ahead of other brownfield options in the town, and that this particular site did not benefit from a northern defensible boundary. It was noted that the applicants would need to take account of the site's ecological features, especially ditches and watercourses. Another comment was concerned about the impact the site may have on additional commuting through the town towards Chester and Manchester. In support of the site, it was acknowledged the site would help support the delivery of employment provision at the adjoining Waymills proposed allocation and that the on-site sewerage capacity would support residential development.

Q3. Do you agree with the removal of the proposed housing allocation at Liverpool Road (WHIT008)?

There were 52 responses to this question across all formats. A significant majority (94%) supported the proposal to remove WHIT008 as a proposed residential allocation, with only 6% continuing to support the site's inclusion. The key concerns expressed by those supporting the site's removal were over the potential highway impact on local traffic infrastructure, including along Wrexham Road, and that the site would lead to the over-development of the area.

Q4. Do you agree with the removal of the proposed housing allocation at Wrexham Road (WHIT037)?

There were 55 responses to this question across all formats. A significant majority (93%) supported the proposal to remove (WHIT037) as a proposed residential allocation, with only 7% continuing to support the site's inclusion, including the site's promoter. The vast majority of those supporting the site's removal were local residents who pointed to the concern they had over highways impact along Wrexham Road and the associated congestion and safety issues. Those who continue to support the site's inclusion were predominantly the site promoters who pointed to lack of technical rationale for its removal, the highway mitigation

and improvement measures proposed, and the continuing assertion that the site offers a natural and sustainable extension to the town.

Q5. Do you agree with the proposed increase in housing numbers at the preferred Tilstock Road site allocation (WHIT009) from 307 to 500 dwellings?

There were 58 responses to this question across all formats. A significant majority (84%) supported the proposed increase in housing numbers on the WHIT009 site, with 16% opposed to the increase. Of the respondents supporting the increase there were several comments made recognising the proposal's community benefits and general consensus that the location of the site was sustainable, would impact least on other properties, offered good access links and is close to the town's employment sites. Whitchurch Town Council supported the increase.

Of those who objected there was concern the proposed increase was too large. Welsh Water advised that further hydraulic modelling would be required and this should be funded by potential developers at the pre-application stage. Others felt the increase would lead to too high housing densities on site, would mean further greenfield development, and that limited weight should be given to the community benefits as their delivery was uncertain.

Other Comments on Whitchurch

A range of other comments were made on the SAMDev for Whitchurch which are summarised below:

New Site Options:

- Site north of the Grove is proposed for additional housing.

General comments:

- The development boundary for the town should encompass land to the east of WHIT047 (east of Station Road) to enable this site to be redeveloped commercially or for housing;
- Should not just fill in the packets of land to the by-pass as should keep some areas rural;
- Need for traffic installation of further traffic calming measures to avoid rat run through the town centre;
- Should develop brownfield sites first, such as the former dairy site at Mile bank;
- Objection to the preferred Mount Farm allocation (WHIT046) due to highway safety issues at Haroldgate and drainage issues;
- Further support from the site promoter for Alport Road site (WHIT021), but draft policy MD3 should have flexibility on numbers at site specific level.
- Welsh Water responded stating that should all proposed development happen improvements would be required to the Waste Water Treatment Facility (WWTF) to be funded through their Asset Management Plan or by developer contributions. Specific comments were made on the following preferred options sites: *WHIT046 (Mount Farm)* *WHIT021 (Alport Road)*; *ELR33 (land north of Waymills)*; *ELR35 (land at Heath Road)*
- Improved sports and leisure facilities in the town would vastly benefit the whole community.
- There is a need for the urgent installation of further traffic calming measures to reduce the likelihood of commuting traffic rat running through the town centre and to encourage it to use the nearest access point onto the Whitchurch by-pass
- Support shown for inclusion of Old Dairy Site (WHIT031).
- Site south of Pear Tree Lane continued to be promoted - appropriate infill site and would work cohesively with another small site south of 44 Chester Road which adjoins the development boundary and provide formal links to the public open space and LNR and be offered for inclusion in this facility.

PREES COMMUNITY CLUSTER

Q6. Do you agree with the removal of Prees Green, Lower Heath, Fauls and Sandford from the proposed Prees Community Cluster?

There were 43 responses to this question across all formats. A majority (77%) of those responding supported the removal of Prees Green, Lower Heath, Fauls and Sandford from the proposed Community Cluster, whilst 23% disagreed with the proposal. The Parish Council supporting the proposal arguing the settlements are not well defined and therefore development could easily become sporadic. The Parish Council also argued these areas don't have sufficient services which would result residents being reliant upon the car, and that there was additional concern over the poor safety record of the local roads.

Those objecting to the proposal argued the proposal would lead to the stagnation of already aging villages, and an increasing aged population in these areas. Others argued that most of the settlements did in practice share services and therefore should continue to be identified within the Cluster. There was also concern that approach was contrary to the rural rebalance policy in the Core Strategy, and that inward investment would be adversely affected due to the lack of CIL in those areas. More than one respondent questioned the evidence presented to support the removal of the settlements.

Q7. Do you agree with the inclusion of the site at Station Road (PRE005) as a 'reserve' site for approximately 13 dwellings to come forward if the Moreton Road allocation (PRE008) is considered unable to be delivered

There were 49 responses to this question across all formats. A majority (65%) supported the inclusion of the Station Road site (PRE005) as a 'reserve' site for around 13 dwellings should the preferred Moreton Road site prove undeliverable, whilst 35% disagreed with this proposal. Of those supporting the scheme there were no additional comments provided. Those not supporting the scheme included the Parish Council. Several responses highlighted the lack of footpath connected to the site and that the narrowness of the road would mean it difficult to deliver footpath improvements. Associated with this there was concern expressed about the proposed two accesses to the site. Several responses highlighted the lack of defined/defensible boundary to the north of the site. Some responses argued that there are sewerage problems in this area of the village, although it should be noted no objection was received from Severn Trent Water to this end. The site promoter of the Preferred site at Shrewsbury Road questioned the need to identify a reserve site arguing there is additional capacity at his site should the Moreton Road site prove undeliverable.

Other comments on Prees Community Cluster

A range of other comments were received relating to elements of the proposed Community Cluster in Whitchurch Rural / Ightfield & Calverhall parishes, which are summarised below:

- Concern over the preferred housing allocation at Shrewsbury Street (PRE002R, PRE011R PRE012R), in relation to the sewerage system in Brades Road, the width of highways and associated on street parking, the potential to increase the risks of flooding, and loss of environmental assets.
- In promoting their site at Station Road identified as 'reserve' in the Revised Preferred Options document, Planning Consultant Berry's considered the 'cluster' status of Prees to be insufficient for the role and scale of the village, and could in fact support a higher housing target. Consideration should be given to making the site a full allocation, to change the development boundary to include the site.

- In relation to Prees Higher Heath, there was a question over the continued not allocation of land for strategic purposes, and a proposal to develop around 12 properties on land at a property called “Berwick”, located adjacent the A41 on Heathwood Road.
- Further site promotion of land at Mill Lane (PHH009), Prees Higher Heath for approx 14 dwellings

WHITCHURCH RURAL / IGHFIELD & CALVERHALL COMMUNITY CLUSTER

Q8. Do you agree with the proposed increase to the preferred housing target for the Community Cluster to 90 dwellings between 2013 and 2026?

There were 39 responses to this question across all formats. A majority (82%) supported the increase in housing numbers whilst 18% disagreed. There were very few specific comments made on this question, although one respondent did raise concerns over the width of roads to accommodate this level of housing.

Q9. Do you agree with the proposed increase to the preferred housing target for Tilstock to 50 dwellings between 2013 and 2026?

There were 46 responses to this question across all formats. A majority (76%) supported the increase in housing numbers for Tilstock whilst 24% disagreed. Although in the minority, the majority of additional comments came from those opposed to the increase in housing numbers. A common theme was the lack of sufficient infrastructure in the villages to support the new housing, in particular drainage and road provision. The issue of drainage came up consistently with some respondents identifying the south of the village as a particular ‘hot spot’. A further concern was over the proposed access arrangements for the preferred Vicarage site to the south side of the village, and the impact this would have on the primary school’s peak time drop off and subsequent safety concerns. A further concern was raised over the pace of development and that the three proposed sites would also provide further opportunities for infill.

Q10. Do you agree with the inclusion of a new preferred housing site at land north of Tilstock Lane (TIL002) for 13 dwellings?

There were 42 responses to this question across all formats. A significant majority (90%) supported the proposed allocation of land to the north of Tilstock Lane (TIL002) for 13 dwellings, whilst only 10% disagreed. Of those supporting the site it was argued this site would cause the least disruption and would make the best use of the existing access to the village hall. Other responses highlighted that the development is on the right side of the village not to exacerbate the drainage concerns, and that there would be financial benefits to the village hall, although conversely a further comment argued the increased traffic flow of a new residential development would adversely impact on this area.

Q11. Do you agree with the inclusion of a new preferred housing site at Land adjacent to Russell House (TIL008) for 12 dwellings?

There were 43 responses to this question across all formats. A majority (77%) supported the inclusion of land adjacent to Russell House (TIL008) for 12 dwellings, whilst 23% disagreed. Again, most specific comments on this question site came from those opposed to the site’s inclusion. The main concern was the location of the site to the edge of the village, and in particular concern over the sustainability of the proposed community shop due to its location and overall need for such a facility. There was also concern expressed about the potential impact on the amenity of existing residents. The site promoter provided additional information on how the site would support the upgrading of the village’s drainage facilities and included the potential for the development to be self-contained through the use of a

BioDisc BE-BL High Performance Package Sewage Treatment Plant which would discharge to land to the south in the same ownership.

Q12. Do you agree with the proposed phasing of development outlined below?

There were 42 responses to this question across all formats. A majority (74%) supported the proposed phasing, whilst 26% disagreed. Those in support who made specific comments considered the phasing was appropriate and logical. However, a consistent theme of those who disagreed felt TIL002 should be included in the first phase as it was considered the most popular site in the village for housing. Another comment from the owner of TIL002 felt market forces should be allowed to dictate the pace of development rather than a phasing policy. There was also concern expressed that TIL001 (the Vicarage site) would in reality accommodate more than the proposed 25 dwellings.

Q13. Do you agree with the inclusion of a new preferred housing site at land West of Ash Parva (ASHP002) for 10 dwellings?

There were 50 responses to this question across all formats. A majority (72%) supported the proposed allocation, whilst 28% disagreed. However, it should be noted that a significant number supporting the proposal were not residents of either Ash Parva or Ash Magna. It is acknowledged that of those known respondents from Ash Magna and Ash Parva that out of 11 individual responses 9 were opposed to the scheme. In addition a petition signed by 25 residents of Ash (some of whom also responded individually) were opposed to the scheme.

Out of those opposed to the proposal there was general concern that the site was unsustainable as it would harm the appearance of Ash Parva as it would double its size, and would shorten the gap between the Ash Magna and Ash Parva. With regards the site's location some felt the site would actually end up being isolated without suitable access to services due to an insufficient footpath. A further point of concern was over the ability of the site to achieve safe access off Ash Road as it is in the 60mph zone and has poor visibility from the Ash Magna side due to a hedgerow on the road. Most of those objecting felt sites in Ash Magna were more suitable to accommodate development of this size, with some feeling that the split of development between Ash Magna and Ash Parva should be more representative of the relative sizes of their sizes and access to services.

The site promoter continued to offer support for the scheme, including a package of measures considered to mitigate and improve current infrastructure deficiencies, including the extension of the 30mph zone past Ash Parva going east, the formalisation of the existing footpath through the site to help link the two parts of the village, improved car parking provision in Ash Parva, the removal of the hedgerow to the west of the site to improve visibility for vehicles and enhancements to the nearby pond. Those locally in support of the site highlighted the need to encourage sustainable growth in Ash and that the proposed site would be ideal to support improvements to infrastructure given the package of measures being proposed.

Q14. Do you agree with the proposed increase to the preferred housing target for Prees Heath to 10 dwellings between 2013 and 2026?

There were 36 responses to this question across all formats. A significant majority (92%) supported the increase in housing target in Prees Heath to 10 dwellings, with only 8%. Of those that commented all agreed that the settlement was broadly sustainable and capable of accommodating the proposed growth.

Q15. Do you agree with the inclusion of a new preferred housing site at the former Cherry Tree Hotel (formally known as the Witch Ball) and adjoining land for 5 dwellings?

There were 40 responses to this question across all formats. A majority (82%) supported the inclusion of the site, whilst 18% disagreed. Of those who commented in support, it was considered the proposal would tidy up a dilapidated site and would re-use a brownfield site. Those who did not support the site's inclusion pointed to the potential for the premises to continue as a commercial business, and there was concern over the ability of the site to achieve safe access.

Other Comments on Tilstock/Prees Heath/Ash/Ightfield/Calverhall Community Cluster

A range of other comments were received relating to elements of the proposed Community Cluster in Whitchurch Rural / Ightfield & Calverhall parishes, which are summarised below:

- Consider that the views of residents have been misrepresented in the SAMDev reports, that insufficient consultation has taken place.
- Wanted it noting that the owners of TIL001 also own the best access to TIL002 via the driveway to the village hall and thus have a degree of control over whether or not the second site is developed. Further site concern over Sewerage system in Tilstock
- Concern expressed that Tilstock does not need multiple development sites at the same time.