



*Our plan –  
Our future*



## The Callaughton Lane Affordable Housing Proposal

### How did we respond to your comments?

**We held two consultation events in Much Wenlock in November 2015 and February 2016 and received other comments outside of these meetings. We took careful note of all that was said and this is how we responded.**

Comments	Did we action and how
<b>Lettings and Tenure</b>	
Local wage levels mean shared ownership is not affordable in Much Wenlock. This scheme is what Wenlock needs - affordable homes to rent. Modern approaches to energy use and conservation are to be welcomed.	Our plans include for affordable rented dwellings. However, interest has been expressed by members of the community in shared ownership. There will be a local lettings policy which will help ensure that people who have a strong local connection will have priority for renting the houses.
Mix of tenure perhaps 1 Ownership to 5 Rental/ No to Shared Ownership on this site/ Would prefer properties solely for renting - not shared equity/ Definite preference for rented rather than shared ownership housing/ We support your scheme and would be very interested in shared ownership	Our proposals now include one shared ownership and eleven affordable rent homes. As noted above final tenure mix will be determined by local demand.
Need work for local people	Agree, but not something housing can deliver alone.
Could there be 3 and 4 bedroom homes for rent for larger families	The plans include 3 bedroom rent homes, no immediate need for 4 bed.
Current shared ownership houses in Wenlock are not affordable for young people starting on property ladder	Noted, proposals now include 1 shared ownership dwelling
You need housing that local young people can buy at a reasonable price, a lot of the time shared ownership is dearer than full mortgage	Agreed, SHG is providing a range of products to the market. This scheme provides rented homes and one shared ownership home.
Homes for key workers	Agreed, those in housing need should be encouraged to register on Shropshire Homepoint.

I agree with the definition of affordable housing	Noted.
Indicative rental cost required/ Please can we have housing for rental at affordable prices for the young Wenlock people.	Rents will vary dependant on delivery, however presently they are set at 1B House - £106 pw, 2B House - £117 pw, 3B House - £135 pw. However Government policy may influence rent levels through the Welfare Reform agenda, and in particular Local Housing Allowance cap.
Why have the newly built houses at Styche Close not been released for sale yet? I thought people for desperate for houses	We cannot comment on Styche Lane as this is not our scheme.
More accommodation for single people to rent.	Support noted.
The Right To Buy for Housing Association tenants is on the statue book and although SHG have to be self financing the current government thinking only has to change, then 7 to 12 years time these houses will be privately owned, sold at a discount, the stock will have gone and the need to build more will be again an issue.	Not as Shropshire Housing understand the emerging policy, however, there are never any guarantees.
<b>Site/Traffic</b>	
Need for traffic calming to deal with additional traffic/ Traffic from Callaughton Ash joining Bridgnorth Road (A458) has difficulty now; with extra traffic it will be worse. It is the amount of traffic on A458 as well as speed/ Move speed signs further out/ Good reason to extend the 30 mph zone down Bridgnorth Road also zebra crossing with lights to primary school. Use CL and S106 money/ There is excessive traffic speed through Much Wenlock./ Traffic junction worries, 20 mph limit not enough, need to do more e.g. shift signs/ The speed of the traffic on Bridgnorth Road needs addressing.	Consideration being given to extending the 30mph zone on A458 but needs the agreement of Shropshire Council.
Access to Callaughton Lane needs to be considered - very narrow lane. A lot of water lies at bottom of road despite recent unblocking/ Safe crossing from development to Primary School needs to be addressed / Traffic and control need to be addressed particularly with children crossing the road/ Vehicular access to and from Callaughton Lane needs to be addressed especially at busy times/ Junction A458 is not only inadequate but	Consideration in design to junction, however Shropshire Council Highways department are not concerned. Consideration is being given to additional signage.

<p>also dangerous./ Consider change to road priority and remove give way markings from Oakfield Park and place give way markings on to Callaughton Lane/new site./ Pedestrian crossing required for extra children that are crossing the Bridgnorth Road./ Junction with Bridgnorth Road needs to be improved, particularly when turning left into Callaughton Lane. New development will add more cars./Crossing for children is already bad without an extra 20 cars using the junction that is already dangerous./ Crossing over from Oakfield Park to primary school is dangerous already./ Concern over increased level of traffic onto Bridgnorth Road, need to lower speed. In favour of project but the junction with the main road needs looking at. Dec, Jan, Feb 8 - 9 am low sun and rush hour, traffic is difficult even now. Traffic on main road needs sorting with speed and access off Callaughton Lane needs to be better/ Safety of children crossing the main road. / Callaughton Lane to entrance of new development definitely needs to be widened for 2 cars/ Already difficult to exit junction towards Bridgnorth Road at busy times</p>	
<p>As the new housing is mostly going to attract younger people the proximity to the school is good provided good crossings are provided on the Bridgnorth Road</p>	<p>Existing crossings to remain, consideration to enhanced signage.</p>
<p>Is pedestrian access to town suitable or capable of being improved?</p>	<p>We are liaising with Shropshire Council to fully determine the requirements although we do not expect need to improve pedestrian access.</p>
<p>Site 2 totally unacceptable - Callaughton Lane - crossing to school needed</p>	<p>Difference of opinion - no action will alter outcome for either party.</p>
<p>From the new development to the main road should be widened and sufficient pedestrian walkway.</p>	<p>We are liaising with Shropshire Council to fully determine the requirements although we do not expect need to improve pedestrian access.</p>
<p>Speed limit for lane into Callaughton.</p>	<p>Consideration to extending the 30mph zone on A458. Will look into Callaughton Lane</p>
<p>A roundabout for the safety of children.</p>	<p>This is financially unviable and not warranted.</p>
<p>Review all access, parking footpath associated with junction, school drop off</p>	<p>The site is served by a footpath link.</p>

etc, safety issues.	
Concerns over residents parking more than 2 cars on site.	Presently we provide 2 parking spaces per home.
Control parking by contractors during build period, to avoid disturbing residents.	This will be addressed in the procurement of our contractor.
12 homes will make little difference to the speed of traffic	Noted.
Primary school is already full, where will the children go to school	Not something housing can resolve alone.
Concerned that this site could keep expanding and expanding. /12 today - how may next year and in the future. Safety - school children in particular, flooding, parking particularly at school time. Are there plan to further develop the proposed site./ Concerns over 'sprat to catch mackerel', lead to more housing development.	Yes the site could be expanded but this will be a choice for the community and decided within the framework of , the Neighbourhood Plan. This plan calls for 130 dwellings between 2013-2026 and to meet local demand for affordable houses.
Where would extra cars be able to park, if they have more than the spaces they have been allocated.	Presently we provide 2 parking spaces per home.
Need affordable housing for young first time. Also worried about flooding issues on Hunters Gate.	Support noted. We do not anticipate any impact from this development to Hunters Gate. Indeed this is the main reason for assessing our approach through the Mouchel model.
Original scheme 2 now acceptable than the new revised scheme	Noted, but design development has progressed determined by the site constraints – most notably the existing levels and drainage requirements..
<b>Drainage</b>	
Where will sewage go?	Into existing system at points shown on drainage plan.
The Callaughton Road already floods. New buildings will only push surface water further out on the A452 and beyond. / Flooding problem from designated field next to Oakfield Park needs to be considered/ Flooding at the bottom of Oakfield Park, increased traffic on junction of Bridgnorth Road./ Trouble with flooding on Callaughton already, massive trouble with drainage and light for Oakfield Park./ Drainage from site under main road may need addressing./ Not convinced in the flood prevention plan./ Run off from field to site. Run off from site to lower field (adjacent to school playing field). Foul water into existing inadequate sewer./	Drainage will have complied with Mouchel model and have taken recognisance of adjacent fields. Rainwater from the development will be attenuated on site as shown on drainage plan.

Area 16 - possible drainage problems (flooding) after heavy or persistent rain	
<b>Layout/Design/Landscaping</b>	
No open market garage space	None provided.
Why the increase from 10 to 12.	The natural evolution of the design and evidenced by greater housing need.
If possible, cars should be parked out of view and visitor parking allowed for	Design has been amended where possible.
Important that there's a mixture of types of tenure reflecting local needs so both rental, shared equity (if needed) and full ownership	Noted, but strong desire for first scheme of houses to be affordable rent.
Sensible location for small development. Need for rented housing for young people/families	Support noted.
Ensure planning permission granted is observed by the developer	As a responsible not for profit local landlord, this is our minimum obligation.
I agree with site choice	Support noted.
Excellent, good progress	Support noted.
I support the scheme - prefers tenure to be rented	Support noted.
We support this housing development and think the housing should be mostly for young people to rent or shared ownership	Support noted.
How can we make it easier and cheaper for people to build affordable houses on their own land?	Shropshire Council's planning policies are one of the most innovative in England.
Please can we have passive house standards	That is our ambition, subject to cost.
All fine - we need to see what they look like. Should fit with existing architecture	Support noted, the design will reflect local architecture and materials.
Designs should not be pastiche/quaint. We need good, modern design using all the materials already to be found here. Houses in scale with existing dwellings	Noted and architect briefed.
Local people have limestone and some traditional materials will be used	We will endeavour to provide a blend of materials.
Make attenuation ponds safe from children and animals. Hedgehogs need a slope or step or they will drown	Attenuation ponds will be dry most of the time, health and safety is a key consideration. Wildlife issues noted.
Some design proposals would be good to see and landscape design. Innovative and passive criteria to be incorporated	For future consultations.
Number 1 would be the preferred option.	Noted, but design development has progressed determined by the site constraints – most notably the existing levels and drainage requirements.
Layout 2 preferred option, maybe create	Noted.

ponds for wildlife in wet areas, using local stone for the building materials would be best.	
Not timber cladding.	Noted, however Passivhaus standard will need light weight structure.
Like Is there a possibility of using next generation solar roof tiles.	Noted, will consider.
Would like to see a little Wenlock stone used in some of the houses - not timber cladding (cheap and unsightly).	Noted, will consider.
The use of timber - can be colour stained or not.	Noted.
Not keen on the timber cladding suggested in the advertising, not in keeping with surround, high on maintenance, looks poor quality and will need replacing, would like to see some Wenlock stone used	Noted.
Brick or local stone preferred.	Noted.
I'm pleased to see the home will be built to high environmental standards.	Support noted.
Option with 12 houses best, trees to be planted needs thought.	Support noted.
Proposal 2 seems a better option to blend with existing housing.	Support noted.
There should be more use of traditional building material, please reduce the amount of timber cladding.	Noted.
Original scheme 2 now acceptable than the new devised scheme	Noted.
<b>Is Callaughton Lane a good site?</b>	
Seems to be a good site for Wenlock people - particularly younger ones	Support noted.
Has potential but must be 1) not too large 2) mixed, vernacular design (not like Oakfield Park)	Noted, site size is being determined by need, Neighbourhood Plan and consultation. Design is influenced by Neighbourhood Plan and Passivhaus ambition.
The site has some advantages but needs sensitive development	Agreed and we will endeavour to achieve this.
Callaughton Lane is great for young people but not for older ones	Support noted.
Many jobs rely on transport out of Much Wenlock	Noted, but not an issue housing can resolve alone.
A disabled bungalow would be good but priority for the affordable first. Hope you get a lot of interest	Noted, maybe something for future partnership.
Preferred site looks ok, please be mindful of ecology	Noted and is built into our process.

Why the increased from 10 to 12.	The natural evolution of the design and evidenced by greater housing need.
Compulsory purchase of estate land to free up better sites for homes.	Not something a Housing Association can do but future allocations and their delivery can be considered as part of the review of the Neighbourhood Plan.
This is a wholly worthwhile plan, in line with the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan.	Support noted.
According to the local estate agent this proposed development will remove the open aspect, reduce privacy, peace and quiet and at night produce light pollution and will reduce the value of my property by between £25-£30k and will also reduce the value of other properties on Oakfield Park (by not as much) but reduce their value never the less due to the proximity of a social housing site.	This is an opinion, one not shared by Shropshire Housing Group.