

# Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan

**Interim Report to Shropshire Council in connection with SAMDev  
August 2012**

**Housing and Development  
and Economic and Tourist Development**

**This report forms part of the Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan. The full plan will be published later  
in the year.**

# Index

	<b>Page</b>
Background	
Introduction .....	3
The status of the Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan.....	5
Methodology.....	6
Housing and Development	
The interpretation of the results .....	9
The Planning Criteria.....	9
The Results from the Questionnaire.....	11
Preferred Development Sites.....	12
Economic and Tourist Development	
Economic Development.....	16
Tourist Development .....	20
Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development .....	22
Annex 2: Analysis: Economic and Tourist Development.....	41

## Background

### Introduction

1. Following a request from Kinnerley Parish Council, Shropshire Council granted Kinnerley Parish “Vanguard Status” in September 2011, as part of a national programme. Kinnerley Parish Council was awarded £18,000 by Shropshire Council, from funds allocated by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to carry out a Neighbourhood Plan.
2. The existing Parish Plan was published in 2005, but there have since been major changes in planning legislation. Our Neighbourhood Plan has been designed to examine in much more detail those areas considered by the community to be of particular importance to the well being of the Parish. Planning and housing development, economic development and tourism, the environment and community issues were considered to need a more exacting and detailed analysis than had been possible when the Parish Plan was written.
3. Our parish’s Neighbourhood Plan was scheduled to take place at the same time as Shropshire Council was carrying out its own county wide consultation on its Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) proposals. SAMDev was designed to identify, amongst other things, appropriate sites for future housing and employment development in market towns and parishes throughout the county.
4. Thus, at the time that the Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan was about to start its own consultation process to determine what type of housing development was appropriate and to identify preferred sites and directions of development, SAMDev was due to go out to consultation in Kinnerley on the same subjects.
5. It was agreed between the Parish Council and Shropshire Council that it would be inappropriate that these two almost identical planning exercises, with very similar goals, should proceed independently and simultaneously. The decision was taken that the official SAMDev consultation should not take place in Kinnerley Parish yet, but that the Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan should undertake this planning investigation on its own, as it had the capacity to carry out a more extensive and thorough consultation.
6. This agreement stipulated that the Planning Topic Group Section of the Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group would have to meet timetables established by Shropshire Council for their county-wide SAMDev consultation. As a consequence, the planning report had to be completed before the other sections of the Neighbourhood Plan. This Interim Planning Report is, therefore, being published as a separate document whose results will be used by Shropshire Council in addition to its own SAMDev consultation process. This report will then be incorporated into the final Neighbourhood Plan, together with sections on community and environment issues.

## Background

### **The Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan (KPNP) in the context of the Shropshire Plan**

7. There have been fundamental changes to the National and County planning systems in the last twelve months. The National Planning Policy Framework and the Localism Act have been introduced by Central Government, and Shropshire Council is in the process of completing its own Local Plan introducing its local planning strategy and guidelines for the whole of Shropshire.
8. The new Localism Act 2011 does give parishes the right to make their own policy about housing needs and development, through a process of community consultation and neighbourhood planning. Nonetheless, all neighbourhood plans still need to fit into the planning policy and structures of both Central Government and Shropshire Council.

### **The context of the KPNP**

9. **Our Neighbourhood Plan** will give our community an opportunity to have a greater say in planning decisions in this parish. The Plan (which will include this report) will enable our Parish Council and the community in the Parish to shape and guide any future development. It will be an evidence based plan, agreed through consultation with the residents of the Parish and in consultation with Shropshire Council. As well as being an integral part of the Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan, this report will directly influence SAMDev and become a

supplementary planning tool to be read in conjunction with Shropshire Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) as part of the Shropshire Place Plans. This will mean that the contents of this report must be given material weight when deciding planning applications in our Parish.

10. **The Local Development Framework (LDF)** is a group of documents which sets out the planning policies and guidelines for Shropshire for the period 2012 – 2026.
11. **The Core Strategy** is the main LDF document, which sets out Shropshire Council's strategic objectives for future development and growth, and was formally adopted by Shropshire Council on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2011. It is the starting point for planning decisions for Shropshire and is supported by the following two documents: -
  - i. **Place Plans.** There are 18 Place Plans covering the whole of Shropshire. Kinnerley Parish is included in the Place Plan centred on Oswestry and the area previously included in the old Borough of Oswestry. This Place Plan is a partnership between Shropshire Council, Kinnerley Parish Council and the communities in our Parish. Place Plans are intended to identify the local priorities and infrastructure requirements for each of Shropshire's communities. Our Place Plan provides the forum for Kinnerley Parish to influence development in our area, building on requirements identified in the Neighbourhood Plan, Parish Plan and other community based workshops. It melds

## Background

together the “bottom up” aspirations of local communities and “top down” policies originating in Shropshire Council and gives a voice to all community led plans.

- ii. **SAMDev**, working alongside the Core Strategy, sets out to identify, amongst other things, appropriate sites for future housing development, direction of growth and scale of development. Consultation between Shropshire Council, the public and organisations such as Parish and Town Councils has been going on across the county for many months. The latest round of consultation, on the preferred options for sites, number of houses and direction of development in every parish in Shropshire ended on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2012. Kinnerley Parish Council will submit this report as the Parish’s response to this ongoing SAMDev consultation process.

12. **The Community Infrastructure Levy.** This new national levy seeks to ensure that any development contributes to the cost of any infrastructure it will rely on. Shropshire Council brought it into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012, at a rate of £80 per square metre on all new rural housing, apart from affordable or social housing which is exempt. They have agreed to allocate 90% of the levy to the Parish Council where the development takes place. Local infrastructure priorities will become part of the annual review of the Place Plans, using information in the Neighbourhood Plan and needs identified through consultation

with the Parish Council and members of the public. These could then be funded from the levy.

### **The status of the Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan**

13. It was Shropshire Council’s view that because Kinnerley is a small rural parish and in line with Shropshire Council’s preferred approach, an informal joint approach to neighbourhood planning would be more appropriate. This would be cheaper to carry out than the formal option set out under the Localism Act 2011, of producing a neighbourhood development plan which would then be subject to an independent examination and referendum. Shropshire Council proposes to Adopt this plan and in doing so formally acknowledges that for them, as the Local Planning Authority, it will be used to guide discussions with developers and ultimately to inform decisions made on planning applications in Kinnerley Parish. Our Neighbourhood Plan will be jointly owned by Shropshire Council and Kinnerley Parish Council as part of Shropshire Council’s Place Plan. Thus it will carry legal weight when making planning decisions, and meets Shropshire Council’s standards for rigorous community consultation and evidence.
14. The results of our consultation on planning, housing development, employment land and tourism form the basis of this report. As noted above, the proposals within this

## Background

document will go forward, through the SAMDev process, and will be adopted by Shropshire Council as a development plan document against which development proposals have to be tested.

15. **The Consultation Process.** The credibility of our Neighbourhood Plan depends on widespread consultation and the quality of that consultation. The numerous meetings, workshops and group discussion groups are described later in this report; however the most important consultation process in relation to planning and housing development was the Household Questionnaire. 919 questionnaires were distributed to residents in all 486 households in the Parish. Kinnerley Parish is made up of a number of villages and hamlets; all members of the Parish, wherever they lived, were asked to comment on all or any questions asked in the Questionnaire. The response rate of 75% of the residents of the parish can only be considered remarkable and shows the interest and involvement people take in their parish. We consider that a response rate of this magnitude gives considerable authority to our Neighbourhood Plan. The data and the conclusions drawn from our analysis of the questionnaire are presented later in this report.

## Methodology

### Starting the process

16. The Parish Council is the body formally responsible for the Neighbourhood Plan. The formal resolution to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for Kinnerley Parish was made at the Parish Council meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> September 2011. A working party was formed to organise a community event and an information drop-in event was held at Kinnerley Parish Hall on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2011.
17. The Parish Council delegated the responsibility for producing the Plan to a Steering Group under Terms of Reference approved at the Parish Council meeting on 16th January 2012. The Steering Group is made up of members of the community as well as a small number of Parish Councillors and is chaired by a non-Parish Councillor. Parish Councillors met Shropshire Council officers on 23rd February 2012 to ensure that Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan was linked to the Shropshire Council Development Planning Process.
18. On 1st March 2012 over 30 people attended the important open evening which started the process in earnest. Volunteers opted to join one of the four topic groups of Planning and Development, Communities, Environment, and Economic Development and Tourism,

## Background

19. A website, [www.kpnp.co.uk](http://www.kpnp.co.uk), was set up to inform the community about the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan.

### Producing the Questionnaire

20. The first task of the Topic Groups was to devise the production of a questionnaire designed to ask residents the questions necessary for producing the Neighbourhood Plan. At the same time the Topic Groups also interviewed key people or groups within the community.
21. The draft questionnaire was approved by the Parish Council at its meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> May. It was decided that residents should be given the option of completing the questionnaire as individuals, or as a joint response for a household. It was also decided that the questionnaire should not be available electronically; all questionnaires were completed manually.
22. Once printed, the questionnaire was distributed by volunteers to 919 residents of 16 years and over, in all 486 households within the Parish. This was done on the weekend of 25<sup>th</sup>-27<sup>th</sup> May. The majority of completed questionnaires were collected in by 10<sup>th</sup> June although stragglers were accepted until 19<sup>th</sup> June. 460 wholly or partially completed questionnaires were returned, representing 690 individuals. This was a response rate of 75%. Each household also received a printed copy of the "Kinnerley Facts" booklet, which provided valuable facts and figures about the Parish, to keep if they so wished.

### Analysing the Questionnaire

23. All questionnaires were channelled back to the Project Manager, Irene Evison of Resources for Change Ltd. She used her team of paid workers to input the questionnaire responses through "SurveyMonkey", a widely used internet survey analysis engine, which had previously been set up to mirror the questionnaire. Each questionnaire took about 15 minutes on average to input, including transcribing all hand-written comments. Primary inputting took place from 10<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> June and refinements to that were completed by 4<sup>th</sup> July.
24. The reports that SurveyMonkey produced were based on the total of 460 Questionnaires. Because there was a mixture of individual and household responses it was necessary to interrogate the data further to be able to state the results in terms of total individuals. The SurveyMonkey data was exported to Excel spreadsheets and the data was re-sorted to "count" the total numbers of individuals represented by the returned questionnaires. Data was also re-sorted for relevant planning questions to establish the separate responses from each of the six identified villages where appropriate. Open questions were listed and categorised as necessary.
25. The numerical data produced within these spreadsheets was converted to bar-charts, and re-sorted by rank where appropriate, to make the results clearer and to aid in their interpretation.

## Background

26. Analysis initially concentrated on the planning section because of the requirements to report those as part of the SAMDev process. Preliminary planning results were presented at the public planning workshop meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> June. Further analysis and validation of the planning and other questions continued, and analysis of all closed questions was completed by 25<sup>th</sup> July.
27. Although 25% of residents chose not to respond to the questionnaire, and not all of those who did respond gave answers to all questions, the data obtained from analysis of the questionnaire is likely to be the best representation obtainable of the views of the whole Parish.

### Further Consultation

28. At the public meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> June, the preliminary planning results were presented in a PowerPoint presentation. After questions, the meeting was then split into smaller groups to discuss any points of uncertainty arising from the analysis to date, and then into village groups to discuss matters pertinent to each village. The results of these discussions were collated to aid in the interpretation of the questionnaire data.
29. Feedback from residents was also received from consultation exercises carried out by the Communities Topic Group and through informal meetings and Parish events. In addition, a

petition was received from some of the residents of Knockin Heath.



*The pictures above show some members of the public who attended the Planning Workshop which was held in Kinnerley Parish Hall on Thursday evening, 28th June 2012.*



## The Findings: Housing and Development

### The Findings

30. The findings are presented in this interim report in two sections:

Housing and Development, and

Economic Development and Tourism

## Housing and Development

31. The complete analysis of the results from the Housing and Development Section of the Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire is presented as Annex 1.

### The interpretation of the results of the Housing and Development section of the Questionnaire

32. Four sources of data were used to help with the interpretation of the results from the questionnaire:
- i. The results from the questionnaire itself
  - ii. Shropshire Council's Core Strategy
  - iii. Kinnerley Parish Design Statement
  - iv. Information from the public workshops and consultations
33. The Spatial Vision of Shropshire Council's Core Strategy states (on page 29) that, by the year 2026: "Rural areas will stay rural and villages will retain their separate, distinctive and varied

character" and that: "High priority will have been given to the provision of housing to meet the local needs of all households, including the elderly."

### The Planning Criteria

34. Having regard to Shropshire Council's Core Strategy, the Kinnerley Parish Design Statement and the results of the Neighbourhood Plan Consultation, the following policies are established, which:
- i. propose to address the need for smaller housing to restore the balance over the period 2012 – 2026, acknowledging the fall in average household size over the last 20-30 year period.
  - ii. propose that larger 4/5 bedroom houses should be built only on an infill site and only if the developer can demonstrate a particular community need.
  - iii. propose that housing development should be phased over the 2012-2026 period to ensure that the needs of local families can be met over this period.
  - iv. propose that new construction conforms to the principles in the Parish Design Statement, is built to a high standard of sustainability, and is carefully assimilated into the environment.
  - v. set out to encourage the construction of housing for people who will live in the Parish and either work in the

## The Findings: Housing and Development

- Parish, or in the nearby towns, using the local school and other facilities.
- vi. acknowledge the importance of protecting the distinctive and separate identity of the different villages and settlements within the Parish. The following open countryside should therefore be given protection:
    - a. between Knockin Heath and Dovaston,
    - b. between Dovaston and the Mountside bungalows in Kinnerley, and
    - c. between the Mountside bungalows and Kinnerley Parish Hall
  - vii. acknowledge the value placed on the views to the hills, especially to the Breidden Hills, and propose that these views should be maintained.
  - viii. note that the development pattern for the villages and hamlets is linear and propose that this should be maintained to avoid backland development, i.e. behind existing dwellings. This would result in a cluttered suburbanised development pattern which would overlook and reduce the visual amenities of existing dwellings.
  - ix. discourage development which leads to further ribbon development, which is defined as the outward spread of a settlement along both sides of transport routes.
  - x. define infill sites as one or two dwellings occupying a site within an otherwise extensive development frontage and confirm that private residential gardens are excluded from any definition of previously developed land. Sites in open countryside outside a development boundary are not considered to be infill sites.
  - xi. consider that Kinnerley Village, which has a school, pub, shop, post office, Parish Hall, extensive open space and playing fields and is on a bus route, is by definition a “Community Hub” (within Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy). For sustainability reasons, in particular reduction of the number of car journeys, it was felt that approximately half of the new housing required in the Parish as a whole should be within this Hub village and that the remainder of the new dwellings should be shared between the other smaller villages and hamlets.
  - xii. consider that the majority view of the respondents to the questionnaire should be used when deciding:
    - a. the number of new houses needed
    - b. the location of any new development
    - c. the size of any new dwellings

## The Findings: Housing and Development

### The Results from the Questionnaire

35. The detailed analysis of results from the questions asked in the Housing and Development section of the Questionnaire can be found in Annex 1 of this document. However the results of these questions are summarised below:

**Question 42: Do we need more houses in the next 15 years?**

72% were in favour of more housing

**Question 43: How many more houses do you think are needed?**

The number of houses which the majority of the respondents thought was needed for each village or hamlet was as follows:

Village/hamlet	Weighted mean, based on information from the whole Parish, rounded to nearest whole number
Kinnerley	23
Maesbrook	10
Dovaston	7
Knockin Heath	7
Edgerley	6
Total	54

**Question 44: What size houses do you think are needed?**

92% of respondents showed a preference for 1-2 bedroom houses and 3 bedroom houses

**Question 45: Do you or your family hope to rent, buy or built a house in the parish in the next 10 years.**

20% of respondents thought that they or their family might have a need in the future.

**Question 46: Should the Kinnerley Parish Design Statement be part of the Neighbourhood Plan?**

Over 90% of respondents thought that the Kinnerley Parish Design Statement should form part of the Neighbourhood Plan.

**Question 47: In which villages/hamlets should there be new housing?**

The majority of respondents thought that some development was necessary at each location listed in the questionnaire. While the responses from the residents of Knockin Heath, Dovaston and Edgerley showed that a majority of people do not want more new housing, their answers to Questions 43 and 49 showed that infill development within the existing development boundaries would be acceptable for a small number of new houses.

## The Findings: Housing and Development

### ***Question 48: Should development boundaries be retained, be extended to enclose any new development, or be removed?***

There was a substantial majority in favour of having development boundaries.

### ***Question 49: What size of development site do you think is appropriate in the various settlements?***

The results showed that the preferred options were:

- Kinnerley Village – a mix of sites but no single large sites
- Maesbrook – favoured infill and a number of small sites
- Dovaston, Knockin Heath and Edgerley – infill development only

### **Preferred Development Sites**

**All of the sites considered in this section have been registered by Shropshire Council as being actively promoted for development on behalf of the landowners. No other sites have been put forward.**

**(See Maps at the end of Annex One, page 38 onwards)**

36. In keeping with the above stated planning policy that the majority view of the respondents to the KPNP Questionnaire should be used, the principle was adopted that the only sites which would be considered for development would be those in which the overall responses from the questionnaire showed more people in favour of developing a particular site than

against developing it. Thus, only if the number of respondents answering “Develop” or “Develop Part” of a site was greater than the number saying “Do Not Develop” would a site be considered suitable for further consideration.

37. The consequence of this is that the great majority of sites put forward by landowners and identified on the five Maps are not considered further in this Plan, because the overall views of Parish residents did not consider them suitable. The remaining sites are considered in more detail below.
38. The recommendations given below are based not only on the “votes” from the questionnaire, but also on the answers to “open” questions in the questionnaire, on comments made at the Open Planning meeting held in Kinnerley Parish Hall on 28<sup>th</sup> June, and on responses from the Community Topic Group’s informal consultations.

### **Kinnerley**

39. Four sites had a “positive” vote (as defined above), namely (in ranked order, most popular first):

KNY0001	The site behind Coly Anchor
KNY0002	The site opposite to the school
KNY0007	Land off Church Lane
KNY0008	Land behind Jubilee House

## The Findings: Housing and Development

### **KNY0001: The extension to Coly Anchor**

40. A preliminary application has already been made for 12 houses on this site, situated at the western edge, furthest from the stream.
41. This site is RECOMMENDED for development. Vehicle access would be through the existing Coly Anchor estate.
42. It is RECOMMENDED that there should be pedestrian access from the new development into Bankfields Lane, to discourage the use of cars for journeys to the centre of the village.

### **KNY0002: The large site running south from the shop to Argoed Road**

43. This site is quite large, and it would therefore only be necessary to use part of the site to meet the target for the number of houses which it is agreed should be built in Kinnerley Village.
44. It is RECOMMENDED that part of this site should be allocated for development; the southernmost part, between School Road and Argoed Road. This part of the site is bordered by hedges, which would make an attractive natural boundary to the site (see map), and it is RECOMMENDED that these hedges be retained.
45. The safest vehicle access to the site is from Argoed Road. It is RECOMMENDED that there should be no vehicle access to this site from School Road.

46. Many comments have been made during the KPNP consultation exercise stating that there is a serious parking problem near the school entrance. It is felt that there is sufficient land on this site to allow the building of approximately 12 houses, together with the provision of a number of parking spaces allocated for the school use, adjacent to the hedge bordering School Road, and so it is RECOMMENDED.

### **KNY0007: Land to the east of Church Lane, running down to the Weir Brook**

47. Approximately half of this land is in the current Development Boundary, and we understand that previous planning applications have been rejected on the basis of poor access from Church Lane into School Road. Access to the southern part of this site could also be gained from Bankfields Lane, but this is likely to meet resistance from the residents of that lane, which is very narrow (see below) and has poor access on to the main road.
48. In view of the fact that the number of houses which are needed can be met from the other three favoured Kinnerley sites, and considering the access problems, this site IS NOT RECOMMENDED for development.

## The Findings: Housing and Development

### **KNY0008: Land to the rear of Jubilee House**

49. This site is contained within the existing development boundary. We understand that a planning application for 7 houses, 4 of them semi-detached, is currently being considered by Shropshire Council, but that there are highways issues.
50. If the recommendations to develop the sites KNY0001 and KNY0002 (part) are accepted, this would provide a total of about 24 houses in Kinnerley Village over the period to 2026. This is in addition to any houses built at the Jubilee House site, or any infill development in the village. If the existing planning application for development of the Jubilee House site were to gain approval, there would be the possibility of holding the KNY002 site in reserve for limited development towards the end of the period 2016-2026.
51. It is felt that these recommendations would satisfy the housing needs for Kinnerley for the next 14 years as identified in the consultation process on which this report is based.

### **Development boundary**

52. The existing development boundary should be extended to include the recommended sites (see map on page 38, Annex 1).

### **Maesbrook**

53. Two sites had a positive vote in Maesbrook, namely:

MBK0001: Land adjacent to the Village Hall

MBK0009: Land partly opposite MBK0001 on the other side of the road

### **MBK0001**

54. This is a small site, sufficient for about 4 modest sized dwellings. It does not encroach on neighbouring houses, and is centrally located in the village. It is also on a straighter, and therefore safer, part of the road through the village.
55. It is RECOMMENDED therefore that this site be developed.

### **MBK0009**

56. This is a somewhat larger site than MBK0001, and lies partly behind existing houses.
57. The part that fronts onto the road is partly opposite MBK0001, but staggered, and has the same advantages as MBK0001. It would not be appropriate to develop that part of MBK0009 which lies behind the existing properties, as this would be backfill development and would be out of character with the village layout. Therefore it is RECOMMENDED that the part of MBK0009 that fronts onto the road be developed (see map). That site would be sufficient for approximately 5 houses of the size supported by residents.

## The Findings: Housing and Development

58. These two sites would therefore provide approximately 9 houses, which is sufficient for the needs of Maesbrook for the next 14 years.

### Development boundary

59. It is RECOMMENDED that the existing development boundary be extended to include MBK0001, and that a new boundary be drawn around MBK0009 (part) to include the adjacent houses (see map on page 38, Annex 1).

### Dovaston and Knockin Heath

60. No site in either village received a positive vote from the Parish residents.

61. Therefore it is RECOMMENDED that only infill development be permitted in Dovaston and Knockin Heath.

### Edgerley

62. Two sites only have been put forward for development in Edgerley :

EDGY0001: Land opposite Edgerley Hall

EDGY0002: Land between Penteg and Burnt House

63. For these two sites in open countryside there was no clear cut answer. Votes for EDGY0001 were split exactly 50/50. The total number of people giving an opinion on this site was 270,

whereas the population of Edgerley is recorded as only 94, of whom 74 responded to the Questionnaire. Of these 74, only 45 expressed an opinion on this site and only 22 voted for it to be developed. Votes for EDGY002 had slightly more respondents against development than for it.

64. Because there is no clear majority of respondents in favour of housing development in Edgerley, it is felt appropriate to classify the ward of Edgerley as **'Open Countryside'**.

**The Royal Hill pub, Edgerley**



## The Findings: Economic and Tourist Development

### Economic Development

65. **The Core Strategy** recognises that small scale economic development, agricultural and non-agricultural farm diversification schemes, green tourism and leisure are areas of economic activity for which policy provision needs to be made. However, any development proposals in the countryside should be consistent in their scale and impact with the character and quality of their location. The Core Strategy has as one of its aims supporting home-based enterprise. Further details of the use of residential properties for home working are to be set out in the SAMDev documents.

#### Local employment in Kinnerley Parish

66. The 2001 census showed that the percentage of people working in agriculture and related land-based industries in Kinnerley Parish was over twice as high as in Shropshire and over seven times as high as in England. Nevertheless, in Kinnerley Parish, more people worked in retail and in health than in agriculture, and the proportion of people working in these sectors was found to be closer to the averages for Shropshire and for England (Kinnerley Facts).

67. The KPNP Questionnaire set out to identify:

- the scale and type of employment and economic activity carried out in Kinnerley Parish itself and the number of people who worked either from home or within the Parish

- the type and scale of economic activity considered suitable for expansion by the residents for the rural parish of Kinnerley

68. The census figures of 2001 showed that in Kinnerley Parish 20% of people worked from home, nearly twice as many as for Shropshire as a whole (Office of National Statistics), even though Shropshire is ranked second in the UK for the percentage of home-based enterprises (Core Strategy).

### The Findings

69. The complete analysis of the results from the Economic and Development Section of the Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire is presented as Annex 2.

#### The Local Economy

70. The analysis of questions 20 to 24 in Annex 2 shows that Kinnerley remains a predominantly rural parish and that rural employment activity within the parish is unusually high. Agriculture, horticulture and allied jobs are the main economic activities within the parish, providing 35% of the employment. The construction and building industries provide another 13%. A further 20% of employment activities are those dependent on good internet communications, such as financial and consultancy services and the provision of administrative and business support services.



## The Findings: Economic and Tourist Development

71. 43% of respondents said they were either running a business or farm, or working from home in Kinnerley on a full or part time basis. These figures confirm that home-based economic activity in Kinnerley is more than double the Shropshire average and that it makes a much more important contribution to the economy and wellbeing of the Parish.
72. Of those working at home, 75% ran a farm, were employees, or were self-employed working on their own; 19% ran businesses which employed more than one person; and 6% had regular voluntary employment.
73. The distances travelled by people living in Kinnerley and working outside the parish show that 24% travel more than 20 miles to work, while in Shropshire only 14% undertook such long distances. This reflects the longer journeys which have to be made to major centres of employment activity in the West Midlands. However, 25% of the working population in Kinnerley travel less than 10 miles to work, which confirms that Kinnerley's traditional role as a dormitory area, serving the local market towns of Oswestry and Shrewsbury, continues. 22% work within the Parish.
74. **The constraints.** The importance of the internet and broadband communication networks for successful economic activities in this rural parish was underlined by almost all respondents. Other factors also considered to be important were good road networks and the availability of workspace and office accommodation.
75. 19% of respondents reported that they were satisfied with the broadband networks, however, 81% reported some problems with the service. Only 10% thought that the mobile phone network was reliable, while 90% reported that they had some problems.
76. 87% of respondents considered that they were well provided with available work/office space, and 68% thought that the road network was adequate.

### Developing Local Employment opportunities

77. The Core Strategy emphasises the need to encourage agricultural and horticultural activities in rural areas; in particular the continued importance of farming for food production and supporting small scale rural enterprises and diversification of economic activities associated with agricultural, forestry, green tourism, leisure and the promotion of local foods and supply chains. However, any development in the countryside should be consistent in its scale and impact with the character and quality of its location.
78. Small scale employment and business activities are important to the economic wellbeing of the Parish. The KPNP questionnaire set out to find what types and scale of economic development would be considered suitable for this quiet rural parish in order to create a sustainable pattern of development, which encourages employment opportunities within the parish, but at the same time safeguards the environment and reduces the need to travel.

## The Findings: Economic and Tourist Development

### The Results from the Questionnaire

79. The detailed results of the questions asked in the Economic Development Section of the Questionnaire, questions 25-28, can be found in Annex 2 to this document. The results and conclusions reached are summarised below.

***Question 25: Should more employment opportunities be created?***

82% of respondents felt that there was a need to create more opportunities.

***Question 26 : What type of employment should be encouraged?***

Over 90% of respondents were in favour of encouraging farming, horticulture and land based industries, hospitality and tourism and professional services. 83% of respondents favoured light industry.

77% did not favour road haulage and logistic activities and 85% did not favour heavier industry.

***Question 27: Important factors for the location of employment sites.***

***Question 28: Concerns if local employment opportunities were to be increased.***

### ***Traffic***

Over 90% of respondents expressed concern about the negative impact on the Parish of any increase in general traffic and in particular HGV traffic.

The high levels of traffic on minor roads within the Parish of Kinnerley and Kinnerley Village itself have been recognised in previous planning guidelines (Policy LE14 OBLP). The view was that, while it is important that some economic development takes place, the need remains to protect the physical environment, the villages, the rural lanes and all residential amenities from the impact of HGVs.

### ***Siting of new businesses causing significant increase in traffic***

Many respondents felt that industrial development should not take place in rural areas. The road haulage industry is well represented within Oswestry, where it is connected to the country's trunk road network. Any development dependent on a high number of traffic movements should be based outside the Parish. The existence of the Pentre Industrial Estate on the edge of the Parish was also given as a reason for not having any further development sites within the Parish.

### ***Environmental Impact***

92% of respondents were concerned that any increase in traffic and industrial buildings in the countryside would have a negative environmental impact on the Parish.

## The Findings: Economic and Tourist Development

### Conclusion

80. While the respondents were strongly in favour of increasing the employment opportunities within the parish, it was felt that the thrust of such a policy should be to:

#### Encourage

- Agricultural services and other land-based employment activities.
- Tourism and other hospitality related opportunities.
- Home-based professional services, based on internet communications.
- Light industry based, for example on rural crafts and skills should be sited within or alongside existing buildings.

#### Discourage

- Any development which would increase traffic, particularly the frequent movement of large vehicles.
- Heavy industry, which should be located away from residential areas.
- Large-scale economic development, requiring the allocation of land for new sites and the construction of new buildings.



## The Findings: Economic and Tourist Development

### Tourist Development in Kinnerley Parish

#### The Planning Criteria

81. **Tourism in Kinnerley:** Kinnerley Parish is a tranquil and rural parish with few tourist amenities or attractions, apart from the quiet countryside and some pubs. The historic route of the Shropshire and Montgomeryshire (Potts) Light Railway and its associated features, including the war-time ammunition dumps, is an important landmark running through the Parish. Within a few miles of Kinnerley Parish are a range of tourist attractions, including the World Heritage Site at Llangollen, the market towns of Shrewsbury and Oswestry and, further afield, the hills of South Shropshire and mid Wales. As any visitors to the parish are likely to travel outside the Parish for their recreation and shopping, the economic benefit of tourism to the Parish may well be limited.
82. There are touring caravan parks and campsites at four sites within the Parish, which between them have pitches for 106 caravans and 7 static caravans. There are additional campsites at Melverley, Knockin, Pentre and Crew Green.
83. Using the results of the KPNP consultation and the Core Strategy, the following list of policies was established.
  - i. **The Core Strategy** aims to support schemes that diversify the rural economy for tourism and leisure uses, which are appropriate in terms of their location, scale and which are achieved without detracting from the intrinsic beauty and tranquillity for which Shropshire is renowned.
  - ii. Any tourism development should be designed to bring employment and economic benefits to the Parish, and do no harm to the residential and rural landscape.
  - iii. Proposals for any tourist development must be of an appropriate scale and in character with their surroundings.
  - iv. Touring caravans and small campsites are considered to be of appropriate scale, whereas chalets and static caravans are considered to be of a scale not easily assimilated into their surroundings.
  - v. Development should be close to or within an existing settlement or part of an established and viable tourist enterprise where accommodation is required.
  - vi. The policy does not aim to promote second homes and anticipates that guidance on chalets and static and touring caravans will be developed through SAMDev.
  - vii. Any proposed tourism development for Kinnerley Parish should be designed to show that it will bring employment and economic benefits to the parish, without placing an unacceptable burden on the narrow lanes and other infrastructure.

## The Findings: Economic and Tourist Development

### The Results from the Questionnaire

The detailed analysis of results from the questions asked in the Economic and Tourism Development Section of the Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire is presented as Annex 2 of this document. However, the results of these questions are summarised below:

**Question 29: Do you think it is a good idea to encourage tourism?**

86% of respondents were in favour of encouraging more tourism.

**Question 30: Those who were not in favour of more tourism were asked to comment.**

Concerns included:-

- The number of campsites in the parish is sufficient.
- There are no tourist attractions in Kinnerley Parish.
- The tourist attractions outside the Parish are already served by their own local campsites.

**Question 31: What opportunities for developing tourism do you think appropriate?**

Proposals included encouraging the use of footpaths and cycling, more use of the river for recreation and fishing and the need to resource more local food. Written comments suggested a few other activities but these were all minor and

showed how limited the opportunities were to attract tourists to this area.

**Question 32: What type of tourist development do you think would be appropriate?**

The respondents strongly supported the development of bed and breakfast facilities and small camp sites. There was very little support for larger sites with static caravans or chalets.

### Conclusion

- i. The respondents strongly favoured the principle of encouraging tourism, but emphasised that this should be small-scale, based on an increase in bed and breakfast facilities and the development of small camp sites.
- ii. Large scale tourist development such as static caravans, chalets and bigger camp sites were seen as out of character for Kinnerley Parish.


**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

## **Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Analysis of the results from the Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire**

**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**The number of people who completed the KPNP Questionnaire**




**Results**

**Kinnerley Parish**

Number of questionnaires distributed	919
Number of questionnaires completed & returned	460
Individuals represented	690
Percentage response	75%

**Number and percentage of people, in each village who completed the KPNP Questionnaire**





**Percentage of people who responded to the questionnaire**

Kinnerley	63%
Maesbrook	70%
Dovaston	82%
Knockin Heath	96%
Edgerley	79%
Pentre	85%

**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Q42: Housing Needs: Do we need more houses in Kinnerley Parish over the next 15 years?**




**Results**

- i. The responses to this question were analysed twice, firstly for the whole Parish. The results showed that 72% of respondents felt that more houses were needed over the next 15 years
- ii. The results were analysed a second time, for respondents from each village/hamlet who answered this question. The results showed that the number of residents in each individual village in favour of more houses in the Parish over the next 15 years was between 65% and 83%.



## Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development

### Q 43: Part 1: How many new houses do you think are needed in Kinnerley Parish?



### Results

The table below shows the weighted mean housing numbers thought to be needed for each village/hamlet from 2012 - 2026.

Number of new houses needed	
Village/hamlet	Weighted mean based on information from the whole Parish, rounded to nearest whole number
Kinnerley	23
Maesbrook	10
Dovaston	7
Knockin Heath	7
Edgerley	6
Total	54

*An analysis of the responses from each village/hamlet is shown on the next page*

## Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development

### Q43: Part 2: How many new houses do you think are needed in each village/hamlet?

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES BY EACH VILLAGE, FOR EACH VILLAGE									
Responding village	Percentage response			Weighted mean housing numbers thought to be needed for each village, rounded to nearest whole number					
	Overall	For Kinnerley	For own village	Kinnerley	Maesbrook	Dovaston	Knockin Heath	Edgerley	Overall
Kinnerley Village	39%	55%	55%	23	11	9	8	6	57
Maesbrook	42%	43%	54%	24	10	7	10	7	59
Dovaston	48%	62%	49%	21	8	6	5	5	46
Knockin Heath	40%	54%	40%	27	9	8	6	9	58
Edgerley	51%	58%	58%	22	11	8	8	5	54
Pentre	39%	43%	n/a	22	11	5	6	6	50
Kinnerley Parish	42%	53%	n/a	23	10	7	7	6	54


Further analysis was carried out to see if people from each of the individual villages and hamlets gave a different answer for their own village to that given by the Parish as a whole.

Number of new houses needed	
Village/hamlet	Weighted mean based on information from individual villages
Kinnerley	23
Maesbrook	10
Dovaston	6
Knockin Heath	6
Edgerley	5
Total	50

The analysis shows that there is little difference in response, whether expressed on a Parish wide basis, or for the respondents' own individual village/hamlet.

**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Q44: What size houses are needed in Kinnerley Parish?**



**Results**

1. Of those giving a view, the preference for either 1-2 bedroom houses or 3-4 bedroom houses was 92%.
2. Throughout each village and hamlet a similar need is expressed for smaller houses.
3. 4/5 bedroom houses are not seen as being significantly needed by any of the villages or hamlets in the Parish.


**The bar chart above shows:**

First line: the responses from the whole of Kinnerley Parish.

Subsequent lines: the responses (for the whole Parish) from each individual village/hamlet.

**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Q45: Local need: Do you or any member of your family hope to buy, rent or build a house in Kinnerley Parish but were unable to find a suitable property or site?**



**Conclusion**


20% of respondents thought that either they or their family members might need to find housing in the Parish in the next 10 years.

**Discussion**

1. The figures are speculative as no one knows what demand there will be for housing in 10 years time.
2. These figures may reflect a pent-up demand caused by the high percentage of large houses which have been built in the Parish over the last ten years.
3. Statistics show that on average in Kinnerley Parish, eleven houses a year come forward for sale.

**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Q46: Should the Kinnerley Parish Design Statement be part of the Neighbourhood Plan?**




**Results**

There was an overwhelming request that the Kinnerley Parish Design Statement should be retained and included as part of the Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan.


**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Q47: In which villages should there be new housing?**

**a. The response from the whole Parish**



**b. The response from the residents of Knockin Heath**




**Conclusion**

- a. The figures show that the majority of respondents in the Parish as a whole thought that some development was necessary in each location.
- b. Responses from Dovaston and Knockin Heath show that a majority do not want any more development in either Dovaston or Knockin Heath.

However, the responses to questions 43 and 49 show that inhabitants of Dovaston and Knockin Heath, and also Edgerley, feel that infill development within the existing development boundary would be acceptable in their villages.

**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Q48: Development Boundary? With which of the three options, shown in the legend of the chart below, do you most closely agree?**




**Results**

The results show substantial majorities in all villages and hamlets in favour of having development boundaries.

**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Q49: What size of development site in the various settlements in the Parish do you think would be most appropriate?**



**Conclusion**


1. The majority of respondents from the Parish thought that only infill development was required in Dovaston, Knockin Heath and Edgerley.
2. For Kinnerley Village, Parish respondents favoured a mix of allocations of varying sizes but did not want a single large allocation.
3. For Maesbrook, Parish respondents favoured infill and a number of small allocations, but did not want a mix of allocations of varying sizes or a single large allocation



**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Kinnerley Village Potential Housing Development Sites**

**Figures based on responses from the whole Parish**



**Analysis: Figures based on responses from the whole Parish**

Four sites received a positive response (more than 50% of respondents in favour of development).

- KNY0001 (behind Coly Anchor) First choice
- KNY0002 (opposite school) Second choice
- KNY0007 (Land off Church Lane) Third choice
- KNY0008 (Land behind Jubilee House) Fourth choice

**Analysis: Figures based on responses from Kinnerley Village only**

Only sites KNY0001 and KNY0002 received a strong positive response.


KNY0007 (Land off Church Lane) is a site which has been rejected twice by Shropshire Council Planning Officers due to highway constraints.

KNY0008 (Land behind Jubilee House), is within the existing development boundary and a planning application for 7 houses has been received by Shropshire Council. The result of this application is pending.

**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Maesbrook Potential Housing Development Sites**

**Figures based on responses from the whole Parish**



**Analysis: Figures based on responses from the whole Parish**

Only two sites received a positive response (more than 50% in favour of development).

MBK0001 (next to Village Hall)                      First Choice

MBK0009 (opposite Village Hall)                      Second Choice


**Analysis: Figures based on responses from Maesbrook Village only**

Analysis of responses from people resident in Maesbrook shows that only one site, MBK0001, received a positive response.

**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Dovaston Potential Housing Development Sites**

Figures based on responses from the whole Parish




**Analysis**

The majority of respondents were against any development except for limited infill development.

**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Knockin Heath Potential Housing Development Sites**

Figures based on responses from the whole Parish




**Analysis**

The majority of respondents were against any development except for limited infill development.

**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Edgerley Potential Housing Development Sites**

**Figures based on responses from the whole Parish**



**Analysis: Figures based on responses from the whole Parish**

The sites put forward for development are in open countryside. The analysis showed that there was no clear cut answer; neither site had a positive answer, with EDGY0001 being exactly 50/50.

EDGY0002 showing a majority of respondents, 53%, objecting to development.

**Analysis: Figures based on responses from Edgerley**


These responses showed that infill and a small number of houses, 5 – 6 houses, were favoured.

If future applications for houses were to come forward in this area of scattered houses, then they should be reserved for people with strong local connections. Edgerley had a higher than average percentage of residents with expected local needs housing over the next ten years.


**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Maps showing proposed extensions to existing development boundaries (outlined in green)**

**Kinnerley Village**



**Maesbrook**




**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Maps showing existing, unchanged development boundaries**

**Dovaston**


**Knockin Heath**



**Annex 1: Analysis: Housing and Development**

**Map showing no development boundaries**

**Edgerley**






**Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism**

## **Annex 2: Analysis: Economic and Tourist Development**

**Analysis of the results from the Kinnerley Parish Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire**

**Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism**

**Q 20: If you are in work, how far do you commute to work, on average?**



**Results**

Of those people who live in Kinnerley Parish and travel to work:

22% work within the Parish

25% commute less than ten miles


29% commute between 10 miles and 20 miles

24% commute more than 20 miles

The figures shown above are taken from both the KPNP Questionnaire and the Kinnerley Facts (and 2001 Census). They compare the distances travelled to work by people in Kinnerley Parish with the rest of Shropshire and England.

**Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism**

**Q 21: Do you run a business or farm in Kinnerley Parish, do you work from home or are you hoping to do so soon?**




**Results**

690 people responded to the Questionnaire, of whom 499 answered this question. Of these, 215 people, or 43% ran a business or farm, or worked from home, either full time or part time

**Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism**

**Q 22: If you work from home, on what basis is this?**



**Results**

Of those who worked in Kinnerley Parish:

19% of businesses employed more than one person

37% were self employed, working on their own

6% did frequent, regular voluntary work



**Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism**

**Q23: What is the nature of your home based employment/local business?**

Type of work	Percent
Agriculture (including horticulture and animal care)	35
Manufacturing	1
Construction	13
Retail	3
Hotel, Restaurant, Pub	3
Transport	1
Financial Services	5
Business and Administrative Services	15
Public Administration	1
Education	4
Health	6
Other e.g. Rural crafts, Publishing/Graphic Design, Cleaning Services, Art Work	13

**Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism**

**Q 24: What factors are important to you, in terms of making it possible to work from home or run a farm or other business in Kinnerley Parish? And how well are your business/home working needs met?**




**Results**

The bar charts show the constraints experienced by some respondents when running a business in this rural Parish:

- 19% thought that broadband provision was satisfactory, **but**
- 81 % had problems with the service
- 10% had no problem with the mobile ‘phone service, **but**
- 90% had problems with the telephone networks
- 87% said that sufficient workspace was available
- 68% considered the road network to be adequate.

## Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism

### Q25: Should more employment opportunities be created?



82% of respondents to this question felt that more employment opportunities should be created in Kinnerley Parish


### Written comments by respondents to this question

Those people who felt that no further employment should be created gave as their reasons:

- Increased traffic on narrow country lanes in our rural Parish
- The need to protect the countryside and rural environment
- The need to discourage more building and development in the countryside
- Oswestry and Shrewsbury already have Industrial and Business Estates within easy commuting distance

## Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism

### Q26: What employment should be encouraged?



### Results

Over 90% of respondents were in favour of encouraging:

- farming, agricultural services and land based industries
- hospitality and tourism
- professional services

Respondents considered that light industry and retail services should be encouraged.

77% of respondents did not consider that road haulage and logistics were suitable for this Parish.

85% did not think that heavy industry was suitable for the area.


### Written comments by respondents to this question showed that:

1. The noise and traffic problems likely to be caused by increased development activity in the countryside should be avoided.
2. Agriculture and especially horticulture, including market gardens, garden centres, wood lots and orchards were activities thought to be worthy of encouragement.
3. A small number of respondents considered the following activities to be suitable for a rural parish:
  - Riding school
  - Small care/residential homes
  - Rural crafts
  - Bakery/take away



**Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism**

**Q 27: Which of the following principles do you think are important in deciding where employment-related building development is located? Please tick the three that you think are the most important.**



**Results**


Any development which might lead to traffic impact and heavy industry was rejected.

**Written comments by respondents showed that:**

- Industrial development should not take place in rural areas.
- The poor and narrow network of roads and lanes makes large scale economic development impracticable.
- Many commented that there was no need for any employment sites.
- There is already has an industrial site at Pentre.

**Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism**

**Q28: Concerns if local employment opportunities were increased**



**Results**

96% of respondents were concerned about any increase in HGV traffic. Of these 78% expressed great concern.

92% of respondents expressed concern about increase in traffic of any sort.

92% of respondents expressed concern about the negative environmental impact.


80% of respondents were concerned about the need for new buildings in a rural parish.

**Written comments supported these concerns and added:**

- Increased noise
- Light pollution
- Traffic pollution
- The need to protect the rural environment
- The need to avoid intensive poultry units near settlements

## Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism

**Q 29: Do you think it is a good idea to encourage more tourism in Kinnerley Parish?**



86% of respondents were in favour of encouraging more tourism.


**Q30: If the answer to Question 29 is NO, why not?**

**Written comments by respondents showed that:**

1. Many of those who replied stated that there were already plenty of camp sites in the Parish.
2. Tourism would create extra traffic, noise and development in a rural parish.
3. Kinnerley Parish is a residential rural area and does not have tourist attractions.
4. Destinations which already have tourist attractions are outside Kinnerley Parish and they should have their own tourist facilities and campsites.
5. Tourist attractions and campsites already exist in towns such as Oswestry, Shrewsbury, Chirk/Llangollen.
6. Tourists who come to this parish will spend their money outside the Parish.

## Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism

**Q31: What opportunities for developing tourism services do you think are appropriate for Kinnerley Parish? Please tick all those that you think are appropriate.**




The responses reflect the limited tourism facilities.

### Written comments by respondents showed that:

1. Additional accommodation should be provided in the form of extensions to existing houses.
2. Good quality B & B accommodation would be needed.
3. Advertise local natural environment and links with tourist, cycle and guided environmental tours.
4. Use the old S & M railway as tourist attraction based at Kinnerley Station and open up the Potts Railway for walking and cycling.
5. Many comments made on the need to upgrade the Cross Keys pub.
6. No opportunity to develop fishing tourism as most of the rivers are privately owned.

## Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism

**Q32: Which of the following types of development do you think would be appropriate in Kinnerley Parish? Please tick all those that you think might be appropriate.**




Respondents favoured small scale tourist development based on bed and breakfast facilities and small campsites.

### Written comments by respondents:

1. Many stated that there were already ample campsites.
2. There are already several houses in the Parish which could run a B & B if the owners so wished.
3. The need to improve the Cross Keys was commented on several times.
4. Other comments made by individual respondents included:
  - Log cabins alongside existing settlements
  - Provide public toilets
  - Youth hostel type accommodation in barn conversions.

**Annex 2: Analysis: Economic Development and Tourism**

**Q36: The table below makes some suggestions for the CIL priorities list. Please tick each one according to how high a priority you think it should have.**



**Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

**How best to use any CIL money**

83% wish to improve public transport (*this is unlikely to come under CIL regulations*)

81% wish to use it to improve the natural environment

76% wish to use CIL money to provide better facilities for the young

61% wish to use CIL money for speed control measures

55% wish to provide off-road parking for those areas which flood