

**LILLESHALL PARISH COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP
ANALYSIS OF RESIDENTS RESPONSE TO
THE LILLESHALL PARISH RESIDENTS SURVEY OF NOVEMBER 2016**

SURVEY SECTION A PROVIDING HOMES	THE FINDINGS TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT SHROPSHIRE RCC SURVEY REPORT AND SUPPORTING ANNEX AND RESIDENT AND STAKEHOLDER SUBMISSIONS	APPROVAL DATE
Q1 Should the neighbourhood plan allocate land for affordable housing to meet local needs?	There was a 96% response with a small majority of 53% favouring the allocation of land for affordable homes. LNPG noted this pending its consideration of local housing needs later in the survey.	28/02/17
Q2 Should the neighbourhood plan allocate land for houses for sale on the open market?	There was a 94% response with a significant majority of 60% not favouring any land allocation for open market housing. LNPG would therefore not allocate land for open market housing (but noted this does not prevent open market housing from finding its own land).	28/02/17
Q3 If new homes are to be built, how many should be permitted by 2031?	Lilleshall Parish currently has some 550 homes. There was an 81% response, with comments showing that 21 residents did not want any development and one each wanted 200/300/500 homes. 67% wanted no more than 30 homes and 55% a maximum of 20. LNPG decided upon a maximum of 25, a 4.5% increase in homes subject to consideration of later sections of the survey. (This is on top of the 25 homes, a previous 4.5% increase, built recently in the village at Hill Farm).	28/02/17
Q4 If new homes are to be built, what type of homes should have priority?	This multi-answer question had an 88% response. Residents were most comfortable with open market housing, with 62% giving this top priority. Linked with the earlier responses to Q1 and Q3, this was seen to indicate a strong preference for leaving the private sector to function within an overall housing limit. LNPG noted that sheltered homes to buy or rent were the second priority at 34%, for consideration alongside later survey input.	28/02/17
Q5 If new homes are to be built, how many should be built in any single development?	This multi-answer question had a 77% response. Over 67% thought that there should be a maximum of 10 homes. LNPG would recognize a 10 home maximum pending its consideration of later sections of the survey. Linked with Q3, this would permit 2-3 small housing developments, infill averaging some 1.5 homes per year, or a combination up to a maximum of 25.	28/02/17
Q6 Do you support the development of redundant buildings or brown field sites?	There was a 94% response with 90% favouring the development of redundant buildings and brown field sites. LNPG logged this for later consideration.	28/02/17

<p>Q7 If new homes are to be built, where would you suggest is the best location?</p>	<p>There was an 84% response to this multi-answer question, with 40% favouring homes being built as infill within Lilleshall Village, 24% as extensions to Lilleshall Village and 46% elsewhere in Lilleshall Parish. Regarding locations, there was a wide range of suggestions with little consensus and no significant support for any.</p> <p>LNPG noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Village Infill. This will continue find its own locations in accordance with Q2 – Q4. 2. Village Extensions. The main areas mentioned for extensions are (but see Q9): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willmoor Lane / Old Farm Lane / homes between them (9) • North of village / Red House area (11) • South of village /Lower End Church Road / Honnington (7) 3. Argument for Village Extensions. LNPG noted that one resident argued, ' There are a number of parcels of land on entry to both ends of the village that could be used. As they are on the entry to the village traffic disruption would be minimised and they would not increase congestion within the village due to its width restrictions.' However, LNPG thought it likely that drivers heading south to Muxton from the north of Lilleshall or to Newport from the south would drive through the village. 4. Elsewhere. While Wyevale, The Humbers and Station Road got a total 28 mentions, LNPG was wary of having identified sites in this area in its second circular and of comments assuming builds far in excess of 25 homes. LNPG noted one proposal suggesting the development of the garage sites on the Humbers Estate and this seemed sensible if the alternative is unsightly abandoned garages. Another proposal looked to the future development of 'redundant' Parsons Barracks, on which no information is currently available. <p>LNPG would take these suggestions (and objections at Q9) into account later in its survey analysis.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>
<p>Q8 Can you identify or do you own any suitable locations?</p>	<p>The SRCC Report and the LNPG pre-sort of it Annex separately concluded that this question was very poorly designed. It largely duplicated Q7 above, resulting in confused and duplicative responses that added nothing to the previous answers. And where residents answered 'Yes' to owning land, the anonymity meant that there was no way of knowing where. LNPG decided to ignore this question and its responses, with apologies for the confusion and inconvenience.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>

<p>Q9 Are there any locations in Lilleshall Parish where houses should not be built?</p>	<p>There was a 77% response with 453 suggestions listed in the Annex falling broadly into the following groups:</p> <p>No building anywhere 126 comments broadly opposed any development anywhere in the parish or imposed conditions that would largely rule it out. A further 23 simply answered 'No', an answer so unlikely that it was taken to mean 'no development' rather than 'no restrictions'. Reasons including protection of rural views and concern about traffic volumes, with some residents wishing to see the SLAs extended.</p> <p>No more building along Church Road and Limekiln Lane 72 comments opposed any further development along Church Road and Limekiln Lane, with many references to the narrow stretches and traffic problems at busy times. Particular concerns were expressed about protecting the general area of the church, cricket club, school and Lilleshall Hill and any interference with views of the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Humber Lane Any development along Humber Lane was opposed due to concern about traffic. LNPG noted that Humber Lane runs both sides of Parker Roundabout to Preston going south and to the junction with Kynnersley Drive going north. There has been a recent tendency to wrongly refer to the northern stretch as Richards Road, a short road set back within the Humbers Estate.</p> <p>Historic Sites While only 3 comments thought to mention the protection of historic land sites around Lilleshall with particular reference to the Quarry Woods, LNPG gave this consideration a high weighting on behalf of residents with no explanation needed.</p> <p>Objections LNPG noted that some residents could be found objecting to most of the locations that others had suggested at Q7.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>
<p>Q10 Do you have any other comments on housing development?</p>	<p>270 comments, a 46% response, were left after SRCC excluded those of residents indicating that they had no further comments. They cover a wide range of views that LNPG discussions distilled as follows for future reference:</p> <p>Starter Homes for Young Families Many residents are sympathetic to Lilleshall Village having more affordable homes to attract young couples and families with young children to live in the village, support the school and make for a more balanced community. But there was no consensus on how this might be achieved - much less sustained given that children do not stay young for long.</p> <p>'Downsizing' Homes for Older Citizens Some residents were sympathetic to the building of more homes (whether sheltered or not) that would enable senior citizens to downsize while remaining near to their friends and part of the village community. One envisaged a sheltered homes development at the bottom of Church Road, opposite the Honnington Pond and with good access to the bus stops.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>

	<p>Reduce Size of New Homes Some residents objected to what they see as the enormous size and cost of homes built recently in Lilleshall Village, with mention of Addison Way, Hill Farm (LNPG noted that this was a mix of housing types) and recent infill. There was no support for homes of this size and footprint, which were not considered in keeping with the village, community or housing needs.</p> <p>Ridge and Furrow Field below Cricket Pitch Residents arguing for the protection of historic land, medieval ridge and furrow fields and the field below the cricket pitch with its footpath to Lilleshall Hill, have not been specific. LNPG noted that the field below the cricket pitch is thought to be the last surviving example of ridge and furrow farming in Lilleshall (best appreciated from Lilleshall Hill).</p> <p>Protection of Honnington Pool. None of the comments objecting to development at Honnington thought to seek specific protection for the pool. LNPG has added this site for protection and feels that no explanation is needed.</p> <p>Six Sections to Come... LNPG noted that many of the other comments were not strictly 'other comments' on housing development as they repeated points already made. Some comments unknowingly addressed issues covered by later survey sections.</p>	
<p>Open Forum / Stakeholder Submissions for Section A</p>	<p>Submissions referencing Muxton Site H1 were discounted for the purposes of this survey evaluation: they will be considered later in the planning process. The submissions that supported infill housing and brown field sites were in keeping with the parallel survey input and findings. Lubstree Park became an additional site at which no development was proposed.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>

<p>SURVEY SECTION B</p> <p>JOBS AND THE LOCAL ECONOMY</p>	<p>THE FINDINGS TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT SHROSPSHIRE RCC SURVEY REPORT AND SUPPORTING ANNEX AND RESIDENT AND STAKEHOLDER SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p>DATE</p>
<p>Q11 Should the neighbourhood plan allocate more land to encourage employment?</p>	<p>There was a 93% response, with 78% of residents not wanting the plan to allocated more land to employment.</p> <p>LNPG would therefore not allocate more land to encourage employment.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>
<p>Q12 If yes, where should such employment land be located?</p>	<p>There are 59 responses in the SRCC Annex, with 20 stating No or NA or otherwise not answering the question and 6 stating brown field sites. 13 made mostly vague references to the Wyevale / Humbers area, while 3 looked to the future availability of MOD land. The balance were non-specific or stated locations where land should not be located.</p> <p>LNPG noted that the responses were not specific and that the decision at Q11 above rendered them academic.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>
<p>Q13 Should any existing employment locations be protected from changes of use?</p>	<p>There was an 82% response, with a small majority of 53% feeling that existing employment locations should be protected from changes of use, but with SRCC reporting, 'overwhelming support for the protection of farming and agricultural land and the jobs that it supports'. The Red House and the school are also mentioned. LNPG noted the points for later reference.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>
<p>Q14 Thinking about the kind of employment the plan could encourage, do you support the following:</p>	<p>Agriculture / Local Produce There was a 94% response, with an overwhelming 89% wishing to see agriculture and local produce encouraged.</p> <p>Pubs Restaurants and Cafes There was an 82% response, with 60% o supporting hospitality employment.</p> <p>Home Businesses There was an 83% response, with 82% of residents happy to see home businesses supported.</p> <p>Shops and Retail There was a 76% response, with 58% opposing any expansion of this type of employment. LNPG was surprised given the interest shown at the Open Forums in creating a new village shop in Lilleshall. Not rejected pending later considerations.</p> <p>Tourism Leisure and Crafts There was a 78% response, with 66% supporting this type of employment.</p> <p>Transport Storage and Distribution</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>

	<p>There was a 72% response, with 89% not supporting this type of employment, which will not be included the Plan.</p> <p>LNPG to further considered the other findings at Section D when specific employment proposals are considered.</p>	
<p>Q15 Should the neighbourhood plan include policies that encourage working from home?</p>	<p>There was a 90% response, with 87% wanting working from home to be encouraged.</p> <p>LNPG had already asked this question and determined its action at Q15 above. Apologies for the duplication.</p>	28/02/17
<p>Q16 What would encourage new businesses to locate in Lilleshall Parish?</p>	<p>There was a 77% response to this multi-answer question:</p> <p>Purpose Built Premises 25%</p> <p>Better Broadband 90%</p> <p>Others: SRCC listed comments in the Report. 9 noted the need for Better Mobile / 4G Coverage. Others added to their endorsement of purpose-built premises, extending to a full business hub with rent-a-desk and associated support.</p> <p>LNPG recognized the need for Broadband and Mobile Coverage across the village and parish to match the best already available to some. LNPG did not think that purpose-built premises would encourage new businesses and would not allocate land for that purpose.</p>	28/02/17
<p>Q17 Do you have any other comments on jobs and the local economy?</p>	<p>There was a 32% response that SRCC noted reduce to some 17% when residents who had just entered 'No' or 'N/A' in the box in the box were discounted. Some of the balance merely repeated what had already been said. A few made it clear that their support of home businesses related to office based businesses and did not extend to small workshops or car repairs on drives. One recalled the loss of businesses around The Green in favour of residential. Most of the other comments were variations on the theme that Lilleshall is a rural, agricultural and residential parish and that there should be no expansion of industrial units.</p> <p>LNPG noted that while the sample size was not significant the views expressed were considered widely representative and would inform its deliberations.</p>	28/02/17
<p>Open Forum / Stakeholder Submissions for Section B</p>	<p>No submissions fell into this Survey Section.</p>	28/02/17

<p>SURVEY SECTION C</p> <p>PROTECTING OUR ENVIRONMENT</p>	<p>THE FINDINGS TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT SHROPSHIRE RCC SURVEY REPORT AND SUPPORTING ANNEX AND RESIDENT AND STAKEHOLDER SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p>DATE</p>
<p>Q18 Should any future development in Lilleshall Parish be in keeping with its character and landscape setting?</p>	<p>There was a 93% response broken down as follows: Yes 99.3% No 0.7% LNPG adopted this as a policy.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>
<p>Q19 Are there any buildings or views which you believe are important to protect?</p>	<p>There are 273 comments in the Annex rather than the 420 stated in the Report, with 258 valid comments listed in the LNPG Pre-sort. LNPG noted that just about every building and view in the parish appeared to be covered, but the greatest concern seems to be protecting of views to and from Lilleshall Hill, the church and the abbey and the protection of these buildings.</p>	
<p>Q20 Thinking about measures which could protect and enhance the quality of the built environment, should the neighbourhood plan promote the following:</p>	<p>Design that reflects the scale of existing development There was an 89% response with 97% agreeing that the scale of future design should reflect existing.</p> <p>Minimum standards for living space in new dwellings There was an 81% response with 86% agreeing the need for minimum standards.</p> <p>High Levels of energy conservation in new buildings There was an 86% response with 93% agreeing this need</p> <p>The green space and gardens within Lilleshall Village and The Humbers Estate There was an 87% response with 89% agreeing that this should be promoted.</p> <p>Better pedestrian and cycle access through the village and parish There was an 86% response with 87% supporting the need for this.</p> <p>Signing, advertising and street furniture that respects the locality There was an 82% response with 85% supporting such a policy.</p> <p>LNPG agreed to promote these measure within the Plan.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>
<p>Q21 In general, should the neighbourhood plan promote the following:</p>	<p>Increased protection of green space There was an 94% response with 98% agreeing a need for increased protection</p> <p>Increased provision of green space</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>

	<p>There was an 87% response with 87% agreeing a need to increase green space.</p> <p>Enhanced protection of historic and natural features There was an 94% response with 99.5% agreeing a need for enhanced protection.</p> <p>Enhanced protection of the landscapes of disused quarries There was an 89% response with 93% agreeing a need for enhanced protection.</p> <p>Management of wildlife There was an 85% response with 96% agreeing a need to promote wildlife management.</p> <p>Other, please specify LNPG noted that the 21 valid comments offered on 'other' aspects in accordance with the question related to current and ongoing environmental management issues and were referred for consideration under the Council Action Plan.</p> <p>LNPG agreed that these measures should be promoted within the Plan.</p>											
<p>Q22 Thinking about green spaces, should the neighbourhood plan designate any local green space(s)?</p>	<p>There was an 84% response with 86% agreeing a need to designate local green spaces.</p> <p>Please suggest suitable locations...</p> <table data-bbox="558 833 1276 980"> <tr> <td>Lilleshall Village Centre</td> <td>71 mentions</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Area between the church and the abbey</td> <td>19 suggestions</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quarry Woods / Old Canal Route</td> <td>14 mentions</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Humbers</td> <td>3 mentions</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Red House</td> <td>3 mentions</td> </tr> </table> <p>LNPG saw merit in the proposals for Lilleshall Village Centre, Quarry Woods and a limited area at The Humbers Estate and would take professional advice with regard to including them in the Plan. The proposals for the church and abbey and canal route were likely to prove too extensive to qualify. LNPG did not support a Local Green Space in the area of The Red House.</p>	Lilleshall Village Centre	71 mentions	Area between the church and the abbey	19 suggestions	Quarry Woods / Old Canal Route	14 mentions	The Humbers	3 mentions	The Red House	3 mentions	<p>28/02/17</p>
Lilleshall Village Centre	71 mentions											
Area between the church and the abbey	19 suggestions											
Quarry Woods / Old Canal Route	14 mentions											
The Humbers	3 mentions											
The Red House	3 mentions											
<p>Q23 Do you support the local Strategic Landscape Areas (SLAs)?</p>	<p>There was an 87% response with 92% expressing support for the SLAs identified by TWC.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>										
<p>Q24 Would you like to see the SLAs expanded and/or joined up?</p>	<p>Would you like to see the SLAs expanded There was an 78% response with 54% wanting to see expansion.</p> <p>Would you like to see the SLAs joined up</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>										

	<p>There was an 72% response with 51% not wanting to see the SLAs joined up.</p> <p>Linked with Q23 above, LNPG concluded that residents supported the current TWC SLAs and boundaries and would promote them unchanged within the Plan.</p>	
<p>Q25 Please use the following space to make any additional comments on protecting the environment</p>	<p>LNPG concluded that most of the comments received were not additional but related to points already registered and under consideration. Five valid points related to ongoing environmental matters and were referred for consideration under the Council Action Plan (CAP). Many of the 15 valid comments were valid because the residents could not know that extensions to the SLAs would be ruled out by residents. There are some interesting insights but no more points requiring action.</p>	<p>28/02/17</p>
<p>Open Forum / Stakeholder Submissions for Section C</p>	<p>LNPG thought that two themes deserved consideration:</p> <p>Most of the submissions under this Survey Section have also been repeated / raised within the survey.</p> <p>Country Park / Nature Reserve. Two submissions suggest integrating the SLAs within a Sutherland Country Park, a concept first floated in 2015. Two more propose a Quarry Woods Nature Reserve with bird hides, picnic benches and tables with a wider Country Park reserve for wild animals. LNPG found the concepts interesting, but its contribution was likely to be limited to establishing Local Green Spaces that might be turned into nature reserves in the longer term if a dedicated team of volunteers existed to pursue such a goal.</p> <p>Changes to Lilleshall Boundary. Two submissions proposed changes to Lilleshall's Boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extending the Parish Boundary. LNPG did not consider proposals to aligning the parish boundary with contentious SLA boundaries outside of the parish to be workable. But proposals for agreed adjustments with Church Aston that would unite Brockton and Cheswell within closer Lilleshall Parish, and with Shropshire County Council to (re-) unite Lilleshall Hall and the Golf Club with the Parish have a rational basis if those affected agree. However, the extent to which this involves land use is debatable and, as it involves land use outside of the current designated area and a long-term commitment, the proposal was passed for consideration under the Council Action Plan. • Reducing the Parish Boundary. A proposal to reduce the parish boundary by transferring the Lilleshall element of the Muxton H1 sites to (Donnington &) Muxton Parish if they are approved was noted for later consideration, as these factors are not being considered as part of the survey. 	<p>28/02/17</p>

SURVEY SECTION D IMPROVING COMMUNITY SERVICES	THE FINDINGS TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT SHROSPSHIRE RCC SURVEY REPORT AND SUPPORTING ANNEX AND RESIDENT AND STAKEHOLDER SUBMISSIONS						DATE
<p>Q26 Should the neighbourhood plan include objectives and policies to improve the following:</p>		RESIDENTS	%	YES	YES %	NO	NO%
	Allotments	482	83.4	373	77.4	109	22.6
	Broadband Service	527	91.2	497	94.3	30	5.7
	Mobile Phone Service	492	85.1	437	88.8	55	11.2
	Vehicle Parking Facilities	462	79.9	293	63.4	169	36.6
	Public Footpaths	502	86.9	465	92.6	37	7.4
	Bridleways	463	80.1	388	83.8	75	16.2
	Access for Disabled People	467	80.8	427	91.4	40	8.6
	Public Transport	467	80.8	339	72.6	128	27.4
	Road Safety Measures	489	84.6	432	88.3	57	11.7
	Public Toilet Facilities	435	75.3	142	32.6	293	67.4
	Leisure and Recreational Facilities	455	78.7	326	71.6	129	28.4
	Facilities for Young People	479	82.9	390	81.4	89	18.6
	Facilities for Older People	477	82.5	394	82.6	83	17.4
<p>LNPG noted that residents supported improvements to all of these areas except the introduction of public toilet facilities, with high costs, cleaning and hygiene standards and lack of suitable location having been raised by some submissions.</p>							

<p>Q27 Please use the box below to give us details of any of the other issues above, detailing where and how these need to be improved and how this can be achieved.</p>	<p>There was a 41% response with 244 residents leaving comments recommended for LNPG analysis, of which 7 did not answer the question. 226 were found to relate to current and ongoing issues that were referred to the Lilleshall Parish Council Action Plan of which 7 that also had land use relevance were retained, bringing the total number of comments for LNPG consideration to 37. Some quite reasonably addressed “village meeting place” issues, but these would be considered in the next section. Few addressed where and how improvements might be achieved, of which:</p> <p>Proposals for land adjacent to cemetery: Extend cemetery, create allotments, create church car park. LNPG was sympathetic only to an extension to the cemetery. See also Open Forum notes below (may be from same resident).</p> <p>Create roundabout at Junction Old Wellington Road with A518. LNPG was sympathetic to this idea.</p> <p>Create All Weather Gym next to Children’s Play Area at the School. LNPG was sympathetic to this idea.</p> <p>All Weather Path up Lilleshall Hill. LNPG was sympathetic to this idea, having less able residents and visitors in mind.</p>	
<p>Q28 Do you have any other comments on improving community services?</p>	<p>There was a 16% response with 94 residents leaving comments of which 36 did not answer the question and 19 related to current and ongoing issues that were referred for consideration under the Lilleshall Council Action Plan. This reduced comments for consideration by LNPG to 19 comments, with the 10 relating to the need for a shop / community hub being considered further under the next section.</p> <p>Cycle Path (Footpath proposed elsewhere) between The Humbers and Lilleshall Village.</p>	

<p>Open Forum / Stakeholder Submissions for Section D</p>	<p>LNPG noted that 44 Open Forum submissions fell into this survey category and took the following into consideration:</p> <p>Village Shop. 16 argued for a village shop / tea room / relocated post office with mentions of the small site next to the Youth Centre. 1 suggested a shop run by volunteers based on the Tibberton model and selling local produce.</p> <p>Church Parking and Cemetery. 4 argued for an extension to the cemetery towards The Croft with 1 also wanting church parking. LNPG were supportive of a minor cemetery extension with suitable screening , but NOT for any other development interfering with the view between the church and the abbey and vice versa.</p> <p>Parish Office. One suggestion was for a new build outside the Memorial Hall and another for a location more central to the parish at the junction of Wellington Road and the A518. LNPG noted the Stakeholder submission showing that this is a Memorial Hall intention</p> <p>Suggestions for... Toilets, Outdoor Gym, Orchard are being considered as survey suggestions.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>SURVEY SECTION E</p> <p>CREATING A SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY</p>	<p>THE FINDINGS TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT SHROSPHIRE RCC SURVEY REPORT AND SUPPORTING ANNEX AND RESIDENT AND STAKEHOLDER SUBMISSIONS</p>						<p>DATE</p>																																			
<p>Q29 Should the neighbourhood plan promote the use of any of the following sources to produce local renewable energy?</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="562 342 1801 623"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>RESIDENTS</th> <th>%</th> <th>YES</th> <th>YES %</th> <th>NO</th> <th>NO%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Domestic Wind Turbines</td> <td>491</td> <td>84.4</td> <td>176</td> <td>35.8</td> <td>315</td> <td>64.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial Wind Turbines</td> <td>490</td> <td>84.8</td> <td>73</td> <td>14.9</td> <td>417</td> <td>85.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Solar Panels on Individual Homes</td> <td>522</td> <td>90.3</td> <td>411</td> <td>78.7</td> <td>111</td> <td>21.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Solar Farms</td> <td>481</td> <td>83.2</td> <td>163</td> <td>33.9</td> <td>318</td> <td>66.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Any other preferred forms of alternative energy production please specify...</p> <p>LNPG noted that</p> <p>4 comments proposed geothermal 3 comments proposed biomass boilers (one a community biomass ring) 2 comments proposed nuclear 1 comment proposed solar panel arrays on large commercial buildings such as Wyevale</p>							RESIDENTS	%	YES	YES %	NO	NO%	Domestic Wind Turbines	491	84.4	176	35.8	315	64.2	Commercial Wind Turbines	490	84.8	73	14.9	417	85.1	Solar Panels on Individual Homes	522	90.3	411	78.7	111	21.3	Solar Farms	481	83.2	163	33.9	318	66.1	
	RESIDENTS	%	YES	YES %	NO	NO%																																				
Domestic Wind Turbines	491	84.4	176	35.8	315	64.2																																				
Commercial Wind Turbines	490	84.8	73	14.9	417	85.1																																				
Solar Panels on Individual Homes	522	90.3	411	78.7	111	21.3																																				
Solar Farms	481	83.2	163	33.9	318	66.1																																				

<p>Q30 Do any of the following aspects of road traffic in Lilleshall Parish give you concern?</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="562 188 1801 532"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>RESIDENTS</th> <th>%</th> <th>YES</th> <th>YES %</th> <th>NO</th> <th>NO%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Traffic Volume</td> <td>504</td> <td>87.2</td> <td>389</td> <td>77.2</td> <td>115</td> <td>22.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Traffic Noise</td> <td>440</td> <td>76.1</td> <td>219</td> <td>49.8</td> <td>221</td> <td>50.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Traffic Speed</td> <td>528</td> <td>91.3</td> <td>458</td> <td>86.7</td> <td>70</td> <td>13.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Traffic Danger to Cyclists</td> <td>487</td> <td>84.3</td> <td>373</td> <td>76.6</td> <td>114</td> <td>23.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Traffic Danger to Pedestrians</td> <td>505</td> <td>87.4</td> <td>423</td> <td>83.8</td> <td>82</td> <td>16.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Other, please specify:</p> <p>LNPG noted that the concern about traffic noise would be location dependent and could be far higher along the A518. It carried forward the above and following concerns:</p> <p>Traffic Danger to Horses. 5 comments with 1 wanting improved signing</p> <p>Traffic Size and Weight. 5 comments calling for size and weight restriction on through traffic.</p> <p>Parking Concerns. Problems focus on the two brief periods a day when children are delivered to and collected from school.</p> <p>Others. Most of remaining comments related to and were repeated under the next question.</p>		RESIDENTS	%	YES	YES %	NO	NO%	Traffic Volume	504	87.2	389	77.2	115	22.8	Traffic Noise	440	76.1	219	49.8	221	50.2	Traffic Speed	528	91.3	458	86.7	70	13.3	Traffic Danger to Cyclists	487	84.3	373	76.6	114	23.4	Traffic Danger to Pedestrians	505	87.4	423	83.8	82	16.2	
	RESIDENTS	%	YES	YES %	NO	NO%																																						
Traffic Volume	504	87.2	389	77.2	115	22.8																																						
Traffic Noise	440	76.1	219	49.8	221	50.2																																						
Traffic Speed	528	91.3	458	86.7	70	13.3																																						
Traffic Danger to Cyclists	487	84.3	373	76.6	114	23.4																																						
Traffic Danger to Pedestrians	505	87.4	423	83.8	82	16.2																																						
<p>Q31 In which areas of Lilleshall Parish do these traffic problems need attention?</p>	<p>LNPG found that the many comments raised fell into 3 categories</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 24 comments failed to address the question 2. 340 comments raised matters of immediate road safety concern that have been transferred for the LPC Action Plan. Many are repeats of comments at Q30 and 272 are minor variations on the school parking problem and others associated with through traffic along Church Road and Limekiln Lane. 3. New Roundabout on A518 46 relate to problems on the A518, suggesting that the neighbourhood plan might choose to allocate land at the A518 junctions with Kynnersley Drive and Old Wellington Road for new roundabouts, to counter already danderous access on to the A518 at these junctions. There is some feeling that vehicles travelling along the Old Wellington Road from Muxton to Newport are already adding to Lilleshall's woes by cutting through Lilleshall Village at peak times to avoid the A518 junction with the Old Wellington Road and access it at the Red House roundabout. 																																											

<p>Q32 Should the neighbourhood plan encourage more walking or cycling?</p>	<p>Response 509/88.1% Yes 447/87.8% No 62/12.2%</p> <p>Please give details of how this can be achieved?</p> <p>LNPG found that:</p> <p>17 comments did not answer the question 116 comments wanted measures ranging from the improved maintenance and better advertising of existing footpaths and cycle paths around the parish. These are current matters that have been referred for Lilleshall Parish Council action. 27 comments wanted for more cycle paths and or footpaths across the parish (1 suggested add an outside gym) but were not specific.</p>	
<p>Q33 Should the neighbourhood plan allocate land to encourage the growing of local food?</p>	<p>Response 521/90.1% Yes 433/83.1% No 88/16.9%</p>	
<p>Q34 Thinking about Lilleshall village, should the neighbourhood plan aim to protect the village atmosphere many residents currently enjoy?</p>	<p>Response 535/92.6% Yes 516/96.4% No 19/3.6%</p> <p>Please give details of how this can be achieved...</p> <p>LNPG found that</p> <p>6 comments did not answer the question 15 comments made suggestions relating to community events referred for LPC 102 said that the village should be protected by allowing none or minimal change.</p> <p>Others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only permit suitably styled development and discourage highly visible roof mounted solar panels • 3 referenced establish drop in centre for youth and older residents • 1 encourage business that enhance village character walks, crafts, tea room / pub / local produce 	

<p>Q35 Thinking about The Hincks and The Humbers, should the neighbourhood plan seek to preserve their current rural aspect?</p>	<p>Response 524/90.7% Yes 492/93.9% No 32/6.1%</p> <p>Please give details of how this can be achieved...</p> <p>LNPG found that 13 comments did not answer the question 2 referred to current rubbish and communication issues that were referred to LPC. 70 essentially said that they should be protected by allowing none or minimal change.</p> <p>Need school at Humbers due to distance and lack of public transport Join SLAs Increase woodland and encourage wildlife and tourism Any development of Parsons Barracks should not involve new road access from Humbers</p>	
<p>Q36 Should the neighbourhood plan make provision for objectives and policies around unique signage for footpaths and features in the Parish?</p>	<p>Response 516/90.7% Yes 442/85.7% No 74/14.3%</p> <p>Comments not essential and use a map. If money allows but not high priority</p>	

<p>Q37 Do you think any of the following will improve life in the Parish?</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="562 186 1801 407"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>RESIDENTS</th> <th>%</th> <th>YES</th> <th>YES %</th> <th>NO</th> <th>NO%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Increased Post Office Facilities</td> <td>502</td> <td>86.9</td> <td>308</td> <td>61.4</td> <td>194</td> <td>38.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Availability of a Shop / Convenience Store</td> <td>529</td> <td>91.5</td> <td>365</td> <td>69.0</td> <td>164</td> <td>31.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Availability of a Tearoom</td> <td>470</td> <td>81.3</td> <td>235</td> <td>50.0</td> <td>235</td> <td>50.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Please give details of any other community improvements or additions...</p> <p>LNPG found that</p> <p>8 comments did not answer the question</p> <p>6 comments related to current services and have been referred to Lilleshall Parish Council for consideration</p> <p>47 comments did not strictly answer the question as they referred to items covered by the tick boxes rather than 'any other community improvements'. 16 supported a shop, 9 a tearoom , 7 a pub and 4 a combined establishment. Set against them are 11 comments questioning the viability of any such developments, with some noting past business failures.</p> <p>12 comments thought that our existing facilities (Memorial Hall/Youth Centre/Cricket Club and Red House) are underused and that their facilities should be sufficient to our needs.</p> <p>5 comments proposed that more land be allocated for tree planting around the village, including a proposal for a community orchard.</p>		RESIDENTS	%	YES	YES %	NO	NO%	Increased Post Office Facilities	502	86.9	308	61.4	194	38.6	Availability of a Shop / Convenience Store	529	91.5	365	69.0	164	31.0	Availability of a Tearoom	470	81.3	235	50.0	235	50.0	
	RESIDENTS	%	YES	YES %	NO	NO%																								
Increased Post Office Facilities	502	86.9	308	61.4	194	38.6																								
Availability of a Shop / Convenience Store	529	91.5	365	69.0	164	31.0																								
Availability of a Tearoom	470	81.3	235	50.0	235	50.0																								
<p>Q38 Please tell us what a 'Sustainable Community' means to you and how this can be achieved?</p>	<p>Responses 233/39.5%</p> <p>LNPG could not pin down who or which agency had caused this question to be included in the survey or with what expectation. Some of the wide range of views make for interesting reading, but their lack of consensus and the repetition of many points already made leaves LNPG with nothing substantive to follow up that is not already under consideration.</p>																													
<p>Open Forum / Stakeholder Submissions for Section E</p>	<p>NEW ROUNDABOUT JUNCTION A518. Linking Kynnersley Drive with Nursery Lane. Make exit onto Old Wellington Road for traffic coming from Newport a one-way slip road. Thereby remodelling two dangerous junctions with difficult exits.</p> <p>SOLAR Panels on roofs of new homes.</p>																													

SURVEY SECTION F HOUSING – IDENTIFYING NEEDS	THE FINDINGS TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT SHROSPHIRE RCC SURVEY REPORT AND SUPPORTING ANNEX AND RESIDENT AND STAKEHOLDER SUBMISSIONS	DATE															
Section F Intro	<p><i>This section should only be completed if there are, or will be in the next 5 years, people in need of additional housing within your present household. It must only be completed once per household.'</i></p> <p>LNPG noted that this section would only work if it was answered once per household in need of additional housing. Unfortunately, over half of the households in Lilleshall Parish answered the first questions, showing that it had been answered by many households that had ignored the above constraint and did not have any such housing need</p>																
Q39 Has anyone in your household already completed this section on housing needs?	<p>There was a 53.3% (308) response, of which 65.6% (202) answered No and 34.3% (106) answered Yes.</p> <p>This suggested that 308 Lilleshall households – well over half of Lilleshall households - needed additional housing within 5 years with 202 households about to answer following questions.</p>																
Q40 Which best describes the property you are living in...	<p>This question was answered by 209 household, a number reasonably consistent with the 202 replies expected from Q39:</p> <table data-bbox="558 816 1031 964"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Owner Occupied</td> <td>177</td> <td>84.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Private Rented</td> <td>17</td> <td>8.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Housing Association Rented</td> <td>7</td> <td>3.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Defence Estates Rented</td> <td>5</td> <td>2.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shared Equity</td> <td>3</td> <td>1.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Owner Occupied	177	84.7%	Private Rented	17	8.1%	Housing Association Rented	7	3.3%	Defence Estates Rented	5	2.4%	Shared Equity	3	1.4%	
Owner Occupied	177	84.7%															
Private Rented	17	8.1%															
Housing Association Rented	7	3.3%															
Defence Estates Rented	5	2.4%															
Shared Equity	3	1.4%															
Q41 How many bedrooms does the property have?	<p>This question was answered by 210 households, a number again reasonably consistent with the 202 replies first expected:</p> <table data-bbox="558 1092 953 1240"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 Bedroom</td> <td>3</td> <td>1.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 Bedrooms</td> <td>37</td> <td>17.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 Bedrooms</td> <td>87</td> <td>41.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 Bedrooms</td> <td>66</td> <td>31.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 Bedrooms</td> <td>17</td> <td>8.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	1 Bedroom	3	1.4%	2 Bedrooms	37	17.6%	3 Bedrooms	87	41.4%	4 Bedrooms	66	31.4%	5 Bedrooms	17	8.1%	
1 Bedroom	3	1.4%															
2 Bedrooms	37	17.6%															
3 Bedrooms	87	41.4%															
4 Bedrooms	66	31.4%															
5 Bedrooms	17	8.1%															
Q42 Are there any adults or couple(s) living in the property needing their own home in Lilleshall Parish which they are currently	<p>This question was answered by 206 household, a number reasonably consistent with the 202 replies first expected; with the breakdown being Yes 19 9.2% and No 187 90.8%</p> <p>Hence, only 19 of the 206 households had people living in them who are currently unable to obtain a home.</p>																

<p>unable to obtain?</p>	<p>LNPG noted that the SRCC Report stated that comments suggested that the number of people involved might be 21. But there is no telling what the partnerships might be. And the single person mentioned who needed a home outside of Lilleshall Parish should not have been included in the answer. So the requirement is likely to be 18.</p>													
<p>Q43 Are they currently registered with Telford and Wrekin Council?</p>	<p>Replies were received from 82 households Yes 17 (20.7%) No 54 (65.9%) Don't Know 11 (13.4%)</p> <p>LNPG noted that these answers did not corelate with other responses when only 19 households had identified a need. However, there might be progress if the 17 reporting being registered with TWC included the 19 at Q42</p>													
<p>Q44 What size of property would they need?</p>	<p>Replies were received from 34 households</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="558 591 968 711"> <tr> <td>1 Bedroom</td> <td>4</td> <td>11.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 Bedrooms</td> <td>19</td> <td>55.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 Bedrooms</td> <td>8</td> <td>23.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 Bedrooms</td> <td>3</td> <td>8.8%</td> </tr> </table> <p>While the weighting towards 1 -2 bedrooms looked as though there might be some correlation, LNPG agreed with SRCC that it would be wrong to read too much into this and that superimposing a range of different filters might well get nowhere.</p>	1 Bedroom	4	11.8%	2 Bedrooms	19	55.9%	3 Bedrooms	8	23.5%	4 Bedrooms	3	8.8%	
1 Bedroom	4	11.8%												
2 Bedrooms	19	55.9%												
3 Bedrooms	8	23.5%												
4 Bedrooms	3	8.8%												
<p>Q45 What type of home are they ideally seeking?</p>	<p>Replies were received from 33 households (Number and percentages skewed by one reply ticking 2 option)</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="558 959 1052 1079"> <tr> <td>Owner Occupied</td> <td>21</td> <td>63.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Private Rented</td> <td>2</td> <td>6.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Housing Association Rented</td> <td>7</td> <td>21.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shared Equity</td> <td>4</td> <td>1.4%</td> </tr> </table> <p>LNPG noted that while this correlated with Q44 above, it did not correlate with the 19 households that had identified a current need. While the weighting towards owner occupied might loosely tie in with the wish for more affordable private housing in the first section, the evidence is anything but conclusive.</p>	Owner Occupied	21	63.6%	Private Rented	2	6.1%	Housing Association Rented	7	21.2%	Shared Equity	4	1.4%	
Owner Occupied	21	63.6%												
Private Rented	2	6.1%												
Housing Association Rented	7	21.2%												
Shared Equity	4	1.4%												
<p>Q46 Is there anyone in the house, who is not currently in need of their own home but is likely to want one in Lilleshall Parish in the next five years? (e.g. a teenager who may leave home)</p>	<p>Replies were received on behalf of 147 households and were Yes 35 (23.8%) and No 112 (76.2%).</p> <p>LNPG noted that at Q39, 202 households had declared a need within 5 years. Take away the 19 with a current need at Q42 and the balance answering Yes to this question should have been 147 rather than 35, although 35 was far more credible. LNPG noted that this number would also include students leaving home and questioned the reliability of nay assumption that they would wish to remain in Lilleshall immediately after graduation.</p>													

<p>Q47 What size of property would they ideally need</p>	<p>Replies were received from 34 households as follows</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>1 Bedroom</td> <td>4</td> <td>11.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 Bedrooms</td> <td>21</td> <td>61.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 Bedrooms</td> <td>7</td> <td>20.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 Bedrooms</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 Bedrooms</td> <td>2</td> <td>5.9%</td> </tr> </table> <p>LNPG noted that the 34 replies correlated closely with the 35 answering Yes at Q46 above. (However, the number and the requirements for 1 – 2 bedrooms also correlated closely with Q44 above).</p>	1 Bedroom	4	11.8%	2 Bedrooms	21	61.8%	3 Bedrooms	7	20.6%	4 Bedrooms	0	0.0%	5 Bedrooms	2	5.9%	
1 Bedroom	4	11.8%															
2 Bedrooms	21	61.8%															
3 Bedrooms	7	20.6%															
4 Bedrooms	0	0.0%															
5 Bedrooms	2	5.9%															
<p>Q48 What type of home are they likely to be seeking?</p>	<p>Replies were received from 34 households as follows</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Owner Occupied</td> <td>25</td> <td>73.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Private Rented</td> <td>4</td> <td>11.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Housing Association Rented</td> <td>6</td> <td>17.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shared Equity</td> <td>8</td> <td>23.5%</td> </tr> </table> <p>LNPG noted that 34 replies was again consistent with Q46 and Q47</p>	Owner Occupied	25	73.5%	Private Rented	4	11.8%	Housing Association Rented	6	17.6%	Shared Equity	8	23.5%				
Owner Occupied	25	73.5%															
Private Rented	4	11.8%															
Housing Association Rented	6	17.6%															
Shared Equity	8	23.5%															
<p>Section F Q39 -Q42 LNPG Conclusions</p>	<p>Unreliable Data. LNPG had immediately noted that many residents had failed to observe the requirement that this section be completed only once per household by households with people living in them in need of additional housing now or within five years. While the data supplied is therefore contradictory, some questions were specific and provided a couple of pointers:</p> <p>Current Need. At Q42 just 19 households report having people living in them in current need of homes within Lilleshall Parish. And at Q43 a similar number of 17 households report having current housing needs registered with TWC. Yet any close correlation is contradicted by both the number (34) at Q45 and the fact that that most are seeking owner occupation.</p> <p>Future Need At Q46 some 35 households report having people living in them in current need of homes within Lilleshall Parish. As best can be judged, some 34 other households report having people currently living with them in need of additional homes within the next 5 years.</p>																

<p>SURVEY SECTION G</p> <p>AND FINALLY....</p>	<p>THE FINDINGS TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT SHROPSHIRE RCC SURVEY REPORT AND SUPPORTING ANNEX AND RESIDENT AND STAKEHOLDER SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p>DATE</p>
<p>Purpose of Q49 – Q51 What do you think about life in Lilleshall Parish?</p> <p>Q49 What aspects of life in Lilleshall Parish do you really value?</p> <p>Q50 What aspects of life in Lilleshall Parish do you not like?</p> <p>Q51 What aspects of life in Lilleshall Parish annoy or irritate you?</p>	<p>Q49 – Q51 were included on the advice of SRCC to provide a record of what people thought about living in Lilleshall Parish, what made them glad, sad or mad about living here. Objective weighting has proved to be difficult can be given to the wide range of interesting but subjective opinions, all listed in the Comments Annex to the SRCC Report</p> <p>The SRCC Annex in fact contains 304 rather than 501 comments, reduced to 300 in the LNPG sort. Countryside, peace and quiet, village atmosphere, views, walks, safety, church bells, tennis, cricket are all mentioned.</p> <p>The SRCC Annex in fact contains 208 rather than 374 comments, reduced to 191 in the LNPG sort. LNPG was pleased that most concerns reflect points covered by structured questions during the survey. The lack of a pub / shop / café /meeting place gets quite frequent mention. One concern about threat of LPC introducing bright LED street lighting.</p> <p>The SRCC Annex in fact contains 242 rather than 384 comments, reduced to 225 in the LNPG sort. LNPG was again pleased that most concerns reflect points covered by structured questions during the survey. Dog mess, light pollution and fly tipping also get mentions and one resident considers the new steps up to the stile in Limekiln Lane to be a waste of money. LNPG regrets that it can do little to assist the residents who do not like bonfire night or the weather when it rains!</p>	
<p>Q52 Are you Male or Female?</p>	<p>There was a 92% response broken down by Male 49.8% and Female 50.2%</p> <p>LNPG noted that the survey results are representative in terms of gender breakdown.</p>	

<p>Q53 How old are you?</p>	<p>There was a 546 / 94.5% response rate to this question with both numbers and percentages shown below:</p> <p>18 – 25 21 / 3.8% 26 – 35 47 / 8.6% 36 – 45 60 / 11.0% 46 – 55 111 / 20.3% 56 – 65 108 / 19.8% 66 – 75 113 / 20.7% 76 – 85 60 / 11.0% 85+ 26 / 4.8%</p> <p>00 – 17 320 (Discounted as Survey was for residents over 18) 18 – 24 81 / 6.6% 25 – 44 348 / 28.2% 45 – 59 354 / 28.8% 60 – 74 301 / 24.5% 75 – 84 106 / 8.6% 85+ 40 / 3.2%</p> <p>LNPG noted that the number of residents aged 18+ shown is 1230 whereas the number of Lilleshall registered electors at February 2015 was 1129. While this difference was queried with TWC, LNPG noted that the proportion of persons aged 25 – 74, the core central band of the two samples, was:</p> <p>Lilleshall Survey 80.4% TWC 00A 81.5%</p> <p>And concluded that the age breakdown of residents completing the Survey was representative of the local population.</p>	
<p>Q54 Do you have any comments about anything not covered in the survey?</p>	<p>There were 140 rather than 130 comments with 19 relating to the survey being repeated in the Main Report. Most of the comments referred to points already made in the survey. Three suggestions and three complaints were transferred to CAP. The SRCC Report concluded with the following observations and recommendation:</p> <p>“It is nice to see many messages of support for the volunteers of the LNPG. However, there are also a few grumbles and whilst you can’t please everyone all of the time and LNPG has done their best to explain the neighbourhood planning process to the residents, perhaps when they come to give the community an update on the survey results, they can re-iterate that these results are not linked to any individual and that real change CAN happen as a result of making a neighbourhood plan.”</p>	