Shropshire Local Plan Review - Preferred Scale and Distribution of Development

Introduction

The 'Preferred Sites' Consultation Document is available on the Shropshire Council website at: www.shropshire.gov.uk/local-plan-consultation

The Consultation runs from Thursday 29th November 2018 to Thursday 31st January 2019.

This questionnaire has been provided to allow comment on the 'Preferred Sites' Consultation.

We advise you read through all the information provided in support of this consultation prior to starting your response. We would also suggest that you have a copy of the 'Preferred Sites' Consultation Document available to refer to as you work through the questions.

If when completing this Questionnaire your answer requires more space than allowed, please feel free to continue on a separate piece of paper and submit this alongside the completed Questionnaire.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information legislation (primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 2018 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

Once completed, this questionnaire can be submitted by:

- **Email to: planningpolicy@shropshire.gov.uk**

If submitting your own response, please enter your last name in the subject field of the email;
If submitting a response on behalf of a client, please enter their last name in the subject field of the email.

- **Post to: Shropshire Council, Planning Policy & Strategy Team, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND**

Shropshire Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation

Respondent Information

1. Please provide the following information about yourself:

Please note: we cannot accept anonymous responses.

Your Name:	Caroline Higgins
Company Name (if relevant):	Bayston Hill Parish Council
Position (if relevant):	Clerk to the Council
Address:	Parish Office, Lyth Hill Road, Bayston Hill, Shrewsbury
Post Code:	SY3 0EW
Phone Number(s):	01743 874651
Email Address:	baystonhillpc@hotmail.com

2. If you are responding on behalf of a client, please provide the following information:

Client Name:	
Client Address:	
Client Post Code:	
Client Phone Number(s):	
Client Email Address:	

Shropshire Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation

Delivering Local Housing Needs

3. Do you think Shropshire Council should introduce a cross-subsidy exception site policy, allowing an element of open market housing to support the delivery of affordable housing?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

It is difficult to envisage how the scheme can support the single plot exception scheme, (see paragraph 2.3), which by definition can have only one dwelling and cannot therefore subsidise another dwelling on the same site.

This policy would supplement national policy within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

4. Which option would be preferred (subject to viability assessment):

- [x] Development mix to be assessed on a site by site basis; OR
- [ ] A set development mix (comprising rented/low cost home ownership, secured as affordable in perpetuity and sufficient open market housing to cross-subsidise these properties). *This mix will be geographically defined and subject to findings of a viability assessment undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review.*

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

The proportion of market housing on such schemes should be restricted to a maximum of 50% and be considerably lower in most instances to demonstrate that these schemes are meeting local housing need. A market housing percentage of 25% or below would be preferable.

The emphasis will be on maximising development of local needs rented/low-cost home ownership opportunities.

Shropshire Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation

Windfall Development

The Local Plan supports appropriate windfall development where it complies with the policies within the Local Plan. As such, Shropshire has historically always had high levels of residential and employment windfall development.

5. Do you consider that it is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their housing guideline?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

6. Do you consider that this is appropriate for some settlements to include a windfall allowance to help deliver their employment guideline?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

Shropshire Council considers it appropriate to identify employment allocations only within the Strategic / Principal Centres and the Key Centres located within the Green Belt.

Shrewsbury Place Plan Area

46. Shrewsbury:

a) Do you agree with the preferred housing and employment guidelines for Shrewsbury?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

b) Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Shrewsbury?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

Maintenance of the 'Green Gap' between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury has been identified as a key objective by residents of Bayston Hill. It is reassuring to note that this has been recognised in the Local Plan Review and important that its extent is clearly defined to prevent erosion as a result of rural exceptions sites or speculative development proposals around the perimeter.

c) Do you agree with the preferred mixed-use allocation SHR158/SHR060/SHR161 in Shrewsbury?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

It is preferable that development in a town the size of Shrewsbury takes place in a planned fashion as this is the best way to provide a suitable range of infrastructure to support the new housing. It will be important to phase development of this large site to ensure it is built out from the town centre first. Employment use is likely to include some retail provision but it is important that the retail offering does not compete with the town centre, particularly the rich blend of small independents that give the town its character and attract tourism. The density of housing should also be allowed to decrease towards the edge of the site to reflect the more scattered pattern of rural developments.

d) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation SHR057(part)/SHR177 in Shrewsbury?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

e) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation SHR216 in Shrewsbury?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

f) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation SHR145 in Shrewsbury?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

The proposal to create a new access onto Hereford Road is likely to increase the numbers of vehicles using the A5/A49 Dobbie's roundabout and is likely to add to the existing congestion around the entrance to Meole Brace Retail Park where traffic is regularly backed up towards Meole Brace roundabout. There is a central reservation on Hereford Road so any new access is likely to be left turn only. This will force residents and visitors (including carers if developed as a care home) to drive all the way around Dobbies Island in order to access the town centre unless an access is retained via the retail park. The alternative is to install either another mini-roundabout or a light controlled junction to enable vehicles to turn right. Either option will add to the pressure on the retail park roundabout which will have a knock on effect on the Meole Brace roundabout, negating any improvements that may have been expected from its recent remodelling. If this site is to be developed it will be essential to

g) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation SHR166 in Shrewsbury?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

47. Baschurch:

a) Do you agree with the identification of Baschurch as a Community Hub*?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

**The exercise undertaken to identify Community Hubs is summarised within the Hierarchy of Settlements Document available at: http://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan-partial-review-2016-2036/*

b) Do you agree with the preferred housing guideline for Baschurch?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

c) Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Baschurch?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

d) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation BNP024 in Baschurch?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

e) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation BNP035 in Baschurch?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

48. Bayston Hill:

a) Do you agree with the identification of Bayston Hill as a Community Hub*?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

Bayston Hill recognises that it is a Community Hub and expects to provide for some development. It has a mix of facilities and infrastructure which ensures development can take place in a sustainable way but the facilities are already overstretched and vulnerable. Development is much less sustainable if it takes place rapidly on a small number of larger sites, such as is proposed. The recently completed Community Led Plan revealed a clear preference within the community for smaller developments. This was made clear by the Parish Council during the pre-consultation discussions with Shropshire Council and

**The exercise undertaken to identify Community Hubs is summarised within the Hierarchy of Settlements Document available at: http://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan-partial-review-2016-2036/*

b) Do you agree with the preferred housing guideline for Bayston Hill?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

The allocation of 200 houses over the plan period will be difficult to achieve without extending the development boundary as the density estimate of 30 houses per hectare is unrealistic. Recent developments in Bayston Hill and the outline scheme design for site BAY 050, (Former Oaklands / Glebelands site) have average densities of 16.9 dwellings per hectare and it is recommended that this figure is used as a more appropriate estimate when assessing site capacities. Shropshire Council has estimated 100 houses on site BAY 039, which is far lower than the theoretical capacity of the site based on 30 houses per ha.

c) Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Bayston Hill?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

Shropshire Council proposes to re-draw the development boundary to include site BAY 039 which was promoted for development in 2017. Shropshire Council rejected the site on the grounds it was outside the development boundary and would result in the loss of higher quality agricultural land. It was decided that the planned housing numbers in Bayston Hill were likely to be significantly exceeded and that the enhanced proposal of 25% affordable housing was not considered to sufficiently outweigh the conflict with the development plan. This decision was reached just 12 months ago and nothing has changed other

d) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation BAY039 in Bayston Hill?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

The Parish Council objected strongly to this development in 2017 due to the poor access via Lyth Hill Road and the probability of additional traffic causing the junction with Hereford Road to become overwhelmed. Whilst the Highways Agency did not object formally they indicated that the combined effect of developing both BAY 039 and BAY 050 would push the junction beyond its capacity. Promotion of both sites is therefore unacceptable.
The site is remote from most of the existing facilities in the village and its development will have a negative impact upon

e) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation BAY050 in Bayston Hill?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

The numbers of houses proposed, together with the delivery of a Community Hub is in line with the Council's aspirations however the mix of housing has not been defined. Bayston Hill has a need for retirement bungalows and low cost 2and 3 bedroom homes. This is evidenced in the recently completed Community Led Plan survey, (2018) the results of which were shared with Shropshire Council Planning Policy Team in August. It is anticipated that this scheme is ready for submission for outline planning and the Parish Council will wish to review the final scheme before deciding if it will be supported but if approved the site is likely to be available at an early stage in the plan period. The Parish Council recognises this site as the

49. Bicton:

a) Do you agree with the identification of Bicton as a Community Hub*?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

**The exercise undertaken to identify Community Hubs is summarised within the Hierarchy of Settlements Document available at: http://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan-partial-review-2016-2036/*

b) Do you agree with the preferred housing guideline for Bicton?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

c) Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Bicton?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

d) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation BIT022 in Bicton?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

50. Bomere Heath:

a) Do you agree with the identification of Bomere Heath as a Community Hub*?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

**The exercise undertaken to identify Community Hubs is summarised within the Hierarchy of Settlements Document available at: http://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan-partial-review-2016-2036/*

b) Do you agree with the preferred housing guideline for Bomere Heath?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

c) Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Bomere Heath?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

d) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation BOM019 in Bomere Heath?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

e) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation BOM020 in Bomere Heath?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

51. Cross Houses:

a) Do you agree with the identification of Cross Houses as a Community Hub*?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

**The exercise undertaken to identify Community Hubs is summarised within the Hierarchy of Settlements Document available at: http://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan-partial-review-2016-2036/*

b) Do you agree with the preferred housing guideline for Cross Houses?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

c) Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Cross Houses?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

d) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation CSH004 in Cross Houses?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

52. Dorrington:

a) Do you agree with the identification of Dorrington as a Community Hub*?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

**The exercise undertaken to identify Community Hubs is summarised within the Hierarchy of Settlements Document available at: http://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan-partial-review-2016-2036/*

b) Do you agree with the preferred housing guideline for Dorrington?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

53. Ford:

a) Do you agree with the identification of Ford as a Community Hub*?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

**The exercise undertaken to identify Community Hubs is summarised within the Hierarchy of Settlements Document available at: http://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan-partial-review-2016-2036/*

b) Do you agree with the preferred housing guideline for Ford?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

c) Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Ford?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

d) Do you agree with the preferred housing allocation FRD011 in Ford?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

54. Hanwood:

a) Do you agree with the identification of Hanwood as a Community Hub*?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

**The exercise undertaken to identify Community Hubs is summarised within the Hierarchy of Settlements Document available at: http://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan-partial-review-2016-2036/*

b) Do you agree with the preferred housing guideline for Hanwood?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

c) Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Hanwood?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

55. Longden:

a) Do you agree with the identification of Longden as a Community Hub*?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

**The exercise undertaken to identify Community Hubs is summarised within the Hierarchy of Settlements Document available at: http://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan-partial-review-2016-2036/*

b) Do you agree with the preferred housing guideline for Longden?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

c) Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Longden?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

56. Nesscliffe:

a) Do you agree with the identification of Nesscliffe as a Community Hub*?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

**The exercise undertaken to identify Community Hubs is summarised within the Hierarchy of Settlements Document available at: http://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan/local-plan-partial-review-2016-2036/*

b) Do you agree with the preferred housing guideline for Nesscliffe?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

c) Do you agree with the proposed development boundary for Nesscliffe?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don't know / no opinion

Please use this space to make any comments about this:

Shropshire Local Plan Review - Preferred Sites Consultation

Further Information

63. Do you think any additional 'Community Clusters' to those identified in within the Preferred Sites Consultation Document should be formed? Or any of the existing 'Community Clusters' identified within the Preferred Sites Consultation Document should be removed?

- ☐ Yes - added
- ☐ Yes - removed
- ☐ No
- ☑ Don't know / no opinion

Please use the space to make any comments on Community Cluster(s).
Please also use this space to specify the Community Cluster(s) you feel should be added or removed and any community support you are aware of for this proposal:

64. Please use the space below to make any further comments on this Consultation:

Shropshire Council has invested in a number of Landscape Assessments but has not published one covering Lyth Hill Country Park, despite its popularity and importance to the health and well-being of numerous residents and visitors alike.
It has failed to adequately explain why it has rejected sites assessed as GOOD in favour of sites assessed as FAIR, in direct conflict with the views of the Parish Council. The main reason appears to be the unknown availability of these sites, which Shropshire Council has thus far failed to investigate.
Five sites within the Bayston Hill Parish boundary have been designated as SHR (Shrewsbury) development sites, which indicates that any development will contribute to the target allocations for Shrewsbury rather than Bayston Hill. This has been used in the past by speculative developers to argue that housing targets have not been met within the parish, disregarding the developments at Bestune Way and Otter Drive in their efforts to secure approval for sites within the Green Gap.
Bayston Hill Parish Council urges Shropshire Council to re-designate these sites as BAY sites and consult fully with the Parish Council over any development proposals. It is only marginally reassuring that these sites have not been included as preferred sites at this stage as continued delay over the delivery of housing on site BAY050 is likely to encourage developers to promote

Call for Sites – Gypsies and Travellers

Alongside the 'Preferred Sites' Consultation, Shropshire Council is undertaking a 'Call for Sites' to identify sites available to meet the potential accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers. If you are aware of a site that you consider may be appropriate to meet these needs, please provide relevant details using the 'Call for Sites' Form available on the Shropshire Council website at: https://shropshire.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-planning/local-plan-partial-review-2016-2036/call-for-gypsy-and-traveller-sites

Once completed, this questionnaire can be submitted by:

- **Email to: planningpolicy@shropshire.gov.uk**

If submitting your own response, please enter your last name in the subject field of the email; If submitting a response on behalf of a client, please enter their last name in the subject field of the email.

- **Post to: Shropshire Council, Planning Policy & Strategy Team, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND**