

Appendix 6 – Public Comments from Statutory Consultation Period

<b>OBJECTIVE 1: HOUSING</b>					
<b>Policy Number/ Reference</b>	<b>Evidence Ref No</b>	<b>Name of contributor</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested changes to the Draft NP</b>	<b>Response by MWNPSG – 8<sup>th</sup> April &amp; 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013</b>
<i>Objective 1</i>	HC8	Howard Horsley	Agrees with Objective 1	No change	Noted
<i>Objective 1</i>		Jennifer Collier	Agrees with all but 1.4	Adopt all but 1.4	Noted; see below
<i>Objective 1</i>		Stephen Locke, representing Mr A Hill of CH Hill and Son	Disagree. The objective and subsequent policies are too focused on affordable housing. The settlement needs some market housing allocations to ensure that the services, local businesses and the wider community can expand and are supported into the future.		No change; noted windfall sites will create some market housing opportunities
<i>Objective 1</i>		Tish Farrell	Object to exception sites for affordable houses in Much Wenlock. The ONLY available exception site in Much Wenlock was identified by a local developer, and planning approval for 13 shared equity houses was obtained in the face of much public opposition in 2008. This site is on the Sytche beside a watercourse, and presently consists of 3 half-built houses, a large flood defence bund for which there is no planning permission, and a culvert for which there was no consent by the Environment Agency. The culvert would appear to impinge on other residents' riparian ownership. The original approval was for an open span	There should thus be no provision for the further use of exception sites in Much Wenlock town. Infill sites and adaptive re-use of existing buildings only should be used for affordable housing, and only on the basis of strictly identified need. For all other purposes, Much Wenlock is FULL. The sewage works has long been	Noted; no change suggested as excluding exception sites would be contrary to core strategy. Previous planning approval at Sytche not a proposal of the Plan. Sewage/flooding point addressed elsewhere in Plan and the Place Plan.

			<p>bridge that would not affect the stream since the Sytche has a history of flooding; somehow this planning condition was waived. This site was apparently available for development because there are power cables near the surface and it could not be ploughed. Nonetheless, a huge amount of earth has been removed from this site. Part of it now forms part of the flood alleviation bund.</p> <p>As part of the sale of this land, the landowner attached the condition of that an access road must be provided, this when there was already sufficient access to the field behind the proposed development. The landowner recently informed the NP of his intentions to develop the rest of this field within the scope of the plan.</p>	<p>disposing our excess sewage into the Farley River. This is a disgrace in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.</p>	
Objective 1	Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estates	<p>This section fails to recognise the Town’s sustainability credentials and its role in serving a wider catchment area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It houses a secondary school with a wide catchment;</li> <li>• Very good links with Telford, Shrewsbury and Bridgnorth, including well supported bus services;</li> <li>• Has a good range of local shops.</li> </ul> <p>Wenlock Estates acknowledges that a balance of housing and employment is necessary, and to this end has put forward land for employment provision.</p> <p>The Plan’s approach to housing provision is however unsubstantiated; the unwillingness to plan positively for local needs will have serious implications for local people’s ability to remain living in the locality.</p> <p>Specifically, the Plan’s reliance on windfall sites coming forwards at the rate of 10 dwellings per year is too tenuous to rely on, as is the reliance on small unidentified exceptions sites.</p>		<p>Noted. The SG considered that the required 5 year review is adequate for monitoring the Plan. The Plan aims to provide a balance of market and affordable housing with emphasis on meeting <u>local</u> needs.</p> <p>CIL is beneficial but isn’t a determinant for more housing numbers, not something have to do and CIL is there to meet needs arising from more housing , so fewer houses requires less CIL.</p>	

			<p>The Plan needs to have more than an assumption that it will have infill sites to supply development of 10 dwellings per year; it needs to have “compelling evidence” that there are sufficient suitable infill sites available to achieve the level it expects. Without compelling evidence, the Plan cannot be considered to be based on robust evidence.</p> <p>It is refuted that the proposed and unexplained collaborations with Housing Associations will provide a “positive approach” which will “provide greater certainty”. Our view is that this suggestion will promote a negative approach which will give great uncertainty to the provision of new homes. Given the lack of consultation over where these exception sites may be appropriate, the Plan cannot be confident that the community will agree with the locations eventually proposed. It must also be noted that exception sites are not liable for CIL payments and thus if a significant proportion of the Town’s housing is made up of such sites, then that proportion of potential CIL payments will be lost. The Plan misconceives the size of “large scale development”. In planning terms, a development of 85 dwellings for example, is not large scale in the Shropshire context. The size of any allocated sites should be based on housing need and the ability of the development to fit in with the characteristics of the location, Additionally the misconception fails to recognise the benefits of larger sites in terms of CIL payments, enhancing sustainability with additional infrastructure and in the provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>A proposal of 85 dwellings will realise 17 affordable homes and about £250,000 of CIL and, in the case of land east of Bridgnorth Road, can bring very significant additional infrastructure</p>		<p>Evidence base for housing development over past years does strongly suggest windfalls will arise and work with HA’s is now being progressed. The Group noted that some claims e.g. about public transport are not correct.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

			benefits as part of the proposal which cannot be realised through a restricted proposal of 25 dwellings.		
<i>Objective 1</i>		Vivien Bellamy	Agree with objective but it is not clear how these desirable aims can be achieved given the needs of the developers. I consider it undesirable that one developer, e.g Persimmons should dominate local developments		Noted
<i>Objective 1</i>	EM17/ EM18	Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estates and Persimmon	Omission. Wenlock Estates proposes the inclusion of a new Housing Allocation Policy relating to land north of Stretton Road between the National Trust Car Park and Blakeway Hollow. The land is proposed for up to 6 dwellings on the southern part of the site with retained open space in the north. The land is considered suitable to include the delivery of single storey homes. A separate representation has been made seeking the land's inclusion within the town's development boundary.	Include new policy	Noted. The Steering Group considered the site in question. It was felt to not be appropriate for inclusion in the Plan.
<i>1.1</i>	HC2	Much Wenlock Civic Society	Agree with the Policy of restricting development to within the development boundary, other than for social housing – this should be the guiding principle of the TC in its representations with the PA		Noted; may be helpful to clarify wording of policy 1.1 - replace 'on the edge' with 'outside and adjacent ' to the development boundary
<i>1.1</i>		Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estates	Disagree The Plan fails to identify sufficient land to meet the town's needs. Relying on as yet unidentified sites does not provide the certainty required to ensure sufficient homes are provided to meet projected requirements. The policy has little credibility as there is no evidence of the potential contribution of sites on the edge of the built-up area to fulfil needs. Additionally, there is no evidence that limiting development to purely affordable housing will		Noted. See above. The Plan does not aim to only deliver 'purely affordable houses', some market housing is proposed. Also have advice from SC that the collaborative approach with HA's and their expertise is being encouraged as a

			<p>produce any new houses. The 'Reasons for our policies' section alerts the reader to the fact that this is a totally untested, new approach to providing affordable housing, and that there will be "collaborative partnerships with local Housing Associations". The partnerships are not explained and neither is the role or the identification of the Town Council's or third parties' land interests to enable any successful collaboration to provide new homes. This new approach is wholly untested, potentially leaving the town deficient in appropriate levels of new housing development.</p> <p>Limiting new houses on peripheral sites other than on Site RES1 to affordable only will mean that the town receives no Community Infrastructure Levy from those properties as affordable housing is exempt from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments. There is no explanation of how it will be judged that more than the usual limit of 10 houses may be relaxed (2nd bullet point).</p> <p>There is no mechanism proposed to judge the circumstances where it would be appropriate for market housing to be permitted to cross subsidise the provision of affordable housing.</p>		<p>delivery mechanism and it is being practiced already elsewhere in Shropshire.</p>
1.1		Stephen Locke on behalf of A.Hill	<p>Disagree. The policy only mentions market housing where cross subsidy is required. As with other settlements in Shropshire the community need some market housing supported by a limited number of affordable units where necessary</p>		<p>Noted; a small change recommended for clarity add word 'exception' to the 'open market housing will only be permitted on exceptions sites...'</p>
1.1	HC15	Rachel. M Bradley J.P	<p>Accepts the need for some low cost housing</p>		<p>Noted</p>
1.1		Vivian Bellamy	<p>Agree but...It is not clear how these desirable aims can be achieved given the needs of developers. I consider it undesirable that one</p>		<p>Noted</p>

			developer, e.g. Persimmon, should dominate local developments.		
1.1 1.2	HC16	Andrew Smith	Part agree. These policies support exception sites and infill plots. Whilst I do not disagree in principle – there are areas where this would be undesirable such as the rear of burgage plots. The Bridgnorth District local plan (2004) contained a policy WEN 3 which specifically identified two areas on the plan parts of Barrow Street and Sheinton St where development on the rear of burgage plots would not be permitted. I believe the MWNP should incorporate a similar policy.	Include new policy on Burgage plots.	Agree; add wording in Plan to protect historic feature of burgage plots – include in chapter 6
1.2		Stephen Locke on behalf of A.Hill	Disagree.	This policy needs amending to allow affordable self build dwellings on suitable plots both with and adjacent to the settlement boundary	Noted and included in Plan already in policy 1.2
1.1 to 1.3	HC10	Shelagh Allen	Agree. Housing development should be restricted to within development boundary.		Noted
1.1 to 1.3	HC11	Kenneth Allen	Agree. Housing development only to within development boundary, in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate reports of 1993/4 and 2006.		Noted
1.2		G. Squires	Agree, no development of this nature should be allowed in Homer. It is a quiet village in an area rich in public footpaths and woodlands. It is important to retain the wildlife and environment of this area for residents and non residents who use the area for walking, nature rambles etc. The village would be harmed by additional housing development.	Agree strongly, don't change the Plan	Noted
1.3	EM3	Gordon Walker	The Plan makes several comments about future development proposals which you support, but it does not appear to mention the "suggestion" by Mr Wheeler to build homes in Homer: this is the	Clarify plan with reference to development in Homer.	Noted. Not thought necessary or appropriate that the Plan should allocate

			<p>proposal that I and every resident in the village are directly opposed to, and no comment one way or another is expressed, despite widespread and unanimous objections to this proposal. It mentions "Infill" on several occasions but gives no detail as to where that will be, for us to all make relevant comments we need to know more of your decisions or plans in our village, it is a lengthy document and has many good ideas, but appears to miss the most important facts. Could you advise me if I have gone wrong, or clarify your thoughts on this particular plan i.e. Homer.</p>		<p>any land for development in Homer. Plan cannot – because of county and national planning policies – stipulate that no development will be permitted and some ‘infill’ development may be permissible as a result. Infill and exceptions sites are, by definition, sites that are not allocated in the Plan.</p>
1.3	Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estate	<p>Disagree. The policy fails to set out the level of local housing needs that requires to be met. Thus, this policy’s intention to keep the delivery of sites under review is meaningless. The Plan has no formal monitoring arrangements. Wenlock Estates considers that the Plan fails the NPPF test of being positively prepared. The plan has not been assessed for its deliverability. There is no evidence that suitable sites exist within the Much Wenlock urban area to deliver 10 dwellings per year. Indeed, Wenlock Estates considers this to be a flawed strategy which is likely to place inappropriate development pressures on garden land within the town which would be at risk of harming the town’s historic character. A better strategy is commended which positively plans to provide new homes in the most appropriate location(s) as would be the case if the issue was being addressed through the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development DPD process which is following the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. As stated in response to Policy 1.4, the RES1 site is</p>	<p>Changes:  1. The plan should set out the level of housing development required to meet local housing needs;  2. The plan should allocate sufficient land to accommodate the development required;  and  3. The policy should set out the mechanism that will be employed to trigger the release of further allocations should local needs not be being met.</p>	<p>Noted, see above. A reference to monitoring is included in the Plan. SC advise that the allocation of a large housing site would not preclude infill development also occurring.</p>	

			evidently the most appropriate location for new housing at the town and is in a location which can bring significant benefits on site as well as through the CIL. The site has a capacity of about 85 homes which is 60 more than the currently proposed maximum level. The additional 60 homes would be able to reduce pressure on infilling within the town to a significant degree. Additionally, without a list of potential sites which have been through public consultation, the intention to allocate land when required, will not meet the principles of neighbourhood planning or Sustainability Appraisal.		
1.4		J.Bailey	Disagree		Noted
1.4		Rob Sharrock	Disagrees with agricultural land being used for housing development because of flooding implications	Remove RES1 as housing development land	Noted; see comments below on flooding chapter 3
Policy 1.4	HC3	Much Wenlock Civic Society	The 1994 Devt Plan by BDC proposed a “finite boundary for the town” on the southern edge of Hunters Gate. In 2006, the Planning inspectorate rejected devt of land south of HG because it would” have an adverse effect on the setting of MW, as seen from an important approach road to the town”. Development on this site should also be rejected because: The 2006 inquiry also resulted in acceptance that this land is designated “ <b>high quality agricultural land</b> ” which, according to national guidance, should normally be protected from all save essential development. Prominent among matters cited in this report for rejecting proposals to develop this site was evidence that “ <b>some of the local facilities and services are already overstretched.</b> ” The flooding in 2007, which badly affected this part of the town, provided clear evidence that this judgment was fully justified.	Clarify within the NP why the allocation is justified. Specify all the necessary conditions which would apply before the plan would support development of Max 25 homes on site RES1. Specify location of the homes within the site.	Noted. Inspectors’ comments were known when potential sites were reviewed; the site was accepted by public comment in consultation events and the Residents Survey as the most suitable if an allocation is required. Policy 1.4 proposes much smaller scale development than proposed in 2006. But should clarify in Plan how decision for this allocation was reached. Flooding dealt with in chapter 3.



			<p>An impression may have been created more recently that the flooding problems in this area have been alleviated and that the risks have been reduced. However, this is not the case. This was recently confirmed in the response of the Shropshire Council Drainage Officer to Planning Application 13/00512/FUL. This is an application to build two houses on land opposite the junction of Hunters Gate with Barrow Street. In the Drainage Officer's response each of the following grounds was cited for objecting to this development –</p> <p>The houses are in the direct flow path of surface water flowing from higher ground to the south. There is no further capacity in the existing sewers in Barrow Street which add to the surface water flooding in Much Wenlock.</p> <p>The site is within a groundwater Source Protection Zone 1, therefore soakaways are deemed not suitable.</p> <p>The Pluvial Flood Map shows that the site is at risk of surface water flooding. Local knowledge confirms that water from higher ground to the south flows across Barrow Street to the proposed development site.</p> <p>It is well documented that the combined/foul sewer is under capacity which adds to the surface water flooding problems. No additional surface water should be added to this sewer.</p> <p>Each of these objections has relevance to the proposal, Policy 1.4, within the Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan currently provides apparently blanket "support for <b><i>The development of housing on part of land off Bridgnorth Road for a maximum of 25 dwellings...</i></b>". Such unqualified support risks</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

		<p>protracted litigation at the taxpayer's expense. The acknowledged local drainage problems, some originating on Site RES1, and the potential impact of those problems elsewhere in the town render the proposal very vulnerable. Moreover, the evidence has demonstrated that the allegedly comprehensive flood alleviation measures installed on Hunters Gate proved ineffective in preventing flooding in 2007.</p> <p>There is a further substantial objection to Policy 1.4 being adopted in its present form. This policy proposal was not put forward for the early widespread public consultation. Indeed it was not put forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan until a very late draft. Even when included there was no attempt to justify the allocation of this site in the context of the judgments of the Planning Inspectorate in 1993 and 2006. No data has provided evidence that supporting such a development is necessary to meet either local demand or verifiably expressed local opinion. Few residents at this late stage seem to be aware that it is liable to be adopted. Many residents still seem to believe that their expressed preference for no development beyond the present development boundaries is being adopted. The creation of a Neighbourhood Plan is an innovation and one which this Society welcomed and has subsequently supported. Any such innovation demands a degree of caution. Those involved in producing the final draft may have felt that they were adopting a suitably cautious approach in making provision, beyond the current development boundary, for the additional dwellings, envisaged in Policy 1.4., although no data was produced to justify this proposal. The Much Wenlock Civic Society urges the Neighbourhood Plan team and the Town</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Council to review the evidence carefully, especially that from the two reports of the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>If they continue to believe that such an allocation is necessary and if they believe it is desirable that the allocation should be on this particular site then there is an obligation upon them to clarify in writing, within the Plan, why they believe that this allocation is justified. They also need to specify all the necessary conditions which would apply before the Plan would support development of a maximum of 25 dwellings somewhere on Site RES1. Moreover, without specifying issues of location within this site and access arrangements there remains a serious danger that the allocation might become a “Trojan Horse” for much more extensive development consistent with the density requirements for the site as a whole.</p> <p>We look forward to your confirming that suitable measures are being taken to maintain the credibility of the Plan and to make only commitments which are justified and sustainable.</p>		
Policy 1.4 RES1 -		Rebecca Lawrence	<p>I do hope that the neighbourhood plan's proposals of 25 houses go ahead instead of 85, if not, what would be the point of a neighbourhood plan if it is not listened to...</p> <p>80+ houses are too many. STRONGLY DISAGREE. Do we really want to become as awful as Bridgnorth? This will result in at least 160 more cars coming in and out of the area. Very little work in much wenlock so new people will be generally commuters– any new housing will result in more traffic coming in and out of much wenlock</p> <p>I am concerned about the number of new houses that Shropshire is meant to accommodate in the</p>	<p>Whilst the comment on face value objects to the RES1 proposal, subsequent emails indicated that it is the Persimmon proposal that provokes strong objection. The objection is rooted in not changing the scale and quality of the town and also the implications of significantly higher traffic levels on the quality of</p>	<p>Noted. Recommend no change to the Draft Plan. 85 houses not a proposal of the Plan; see separate list</p>

			<p>next few years. Suggest dropping the idea of more housing in much wenlock altogether and concentrate housing projects in areas with the infrastructure to support i.e. good public transport links and close to motorway networks such as Telford. Don't want any more housing on this scale – don't mind the odd affordable home here and there but I really hate new estates – void of character, boxy and all look the same. <b>No more houses please!!</b></p> <p>It's not the houses per se that I object to - it's the resultant traffic - most households now own at least 2 cars. There is very little work in Much Wenlock, so most people of working age will have to commute to Shrewsbury, Telford or further which is going to significantly increase the traffic in the area. I am not being a 'NIMBY' - just really trying to reduce the number of cars on the road because of all the horses / walkers and cyclists in the area. Concerned about transforming quiet lanes into commuter rat runs destroying the character and compromising the safety of horse riders and cyclists who could previously enjoy the local countryside.</p> <p>If Much Wenlock is made too big, people will use cars to get into the town rather than walk. Mixing traffic with those wishing to enjoy walking, cycling and horse riding just doesn't work.</p> <p>I know there is a housing shortage but I feel that building new towns, or adding to new towns is a better way forward as new towns have been developed with the car in mind and have the infrastructure to cope with the commuter. We need to conserve the rural areas and the character of rural towns-when they're gone, they're gone. Maybe I should therefore be grateful its only 85 houses but I know from experience that it won't stop there if we don't</p>	<p>local amenity. We can therefore infer support for other Plan policies that seek to protect the countryside and environmental quality but this is not explicitly stated.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

			put up considerable resistance. Please don't ruin such a lovely town.		
Policy 1.4	HC8	Howard Horsley	<p>This is a misinterpretation/misrepresentation of the views of the community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaire results – 45% of respondents wished for devt within the existing devt boundaries. It is not clear that respondents preferred RES1 site, or any site at all on the town boundary.</li> <li>• More respondents were against devt on Greenfield or farmland than any other locations. The number and % favouring no devt on Greenfield and farmland was higher than the number and % favouring any devt on the Bridgnorth Road.</li> <li>• Objective 3 – this objective should ensure policy 1.4 is deleted;</li> </ul> <p>1. Quite apart from legitimate concerns about the capacity of the drainage and sewage systems in the town as a whole there are specific risks associated with this site. Any housing development on site RES1 is much more likely to increase than to reduce overall flood risk in the area. The site slopes markedly into the town and contributed significantly to the flooding in 2007 which had effects both locally and downstream in Farley. There have been several occasions since 2007 when further flooding of properties has been only marginally avoided. This site, and the adjacent site of Hunters Gate, has been well documented as contributing to flooding across Barrow Street for many decades. The fact that the site is now also traversed by a drainage channel, constructed to help maintain Merrywell Lane, has only added</p>	<p>Remove Policy 1.4. Having studied the evidence with some care I can only reiterate my conclusion that the inclusion of Policy 1.4 for the development of site RES 1 seems entirely inconsistent with the <b>Housing Objective</b> and with the views of local people, as expressed in responses to the Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire. It is also incompatible with the aim of reducing flood risk and with the clearly expressed judgments of two separate reports from the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	<p>Noted. Potential sites were reviewed as part of the Plan preparation; the site was accepted by public comment in consultation events and the Residents Survey as the most suitable if an allocation is required. Policy 1.4 proposes much smaller scale development than proposed in 2006. Flooding dealt with in chapter 3. Planning Inspector's decision was known when Plan prepared.</p>

			<p>to the existing problem.</p> <p>2. Objectors to the development of Hunters Gate identified the increased risk of flooding at that time but their objections were ignored. They were assured that the attenuation and flood prevention measures to be implemented would eliminate any potential problems. This proved not to be the case. More worryingly, the drainage conditions imposed upon the developer have not been seen to have been met. The system was acknowledged, after the 2007 floods, not to have been constructed according to the approved plans either at the top or the bottom end of the development. Neither the planning authority nor the residents have yet been able to access definitive "As built" plans. Any development of site RES 1 would inevitably connect into this existing flawed drainage system for Hunters Gate.</p> <p>3. The flood risk parameters used in the Neighbourhood Plan also seem to be at variance with those now recommended by the Environment Agency. Thus any assurances or suggestions that appropriate standards can be met on this site in flood risk reduction or alleviation ought to be very critically examined. Moreover, some of the flood alleviation measures previously suggested as appropriate in Much Wenlock, such as SUDS, are now regarded as likely only to add to flooding in certain critical situations.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>A further very serious objection to the inclusion of policy 1.4 arises from the judgments of two separate Planning Inspectorate Reports on proposals to develop this site. (RES 1.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any housing development on this site would add to traffic, by virtue of its location, and be likely to add to parking problems in the area of the High Street.</li> <li>2. Local services and facilities were overstretched. (A judgment which was vindicated by the 2007 floods.)</li> <li>3. Development would be likely to result in increased commuting which could be significant and detract from the objective of sustainability.</li> <li>4. Designated as High Quality Agricultural Land the development of this site would encroach upon <b><i>“an open sweep of countryside to the south of the settlement”</i></b>.</li> <li>5. Housing development on this site would <b><i>“detract from the tourist appeal of this distinctive, small and historic town”</i></b>.</li> <li>6. Any housing development on this site <b><i>“would have an adverse effect on the attractive setting of Much Wenlock as seen from an important approach road.”</i></b></li> </ol> <p>It is important in this context to note that over 97% of respondents to the Questionnaire for the Neighbourhood Plan regarded it as being very important to ensure that any new development did not detract from <b><i>“the town's character and landscape setting.”</i></b></p> <p>A further irrefutable case for deleting this policy in its entirety has become clear from the recent initiative of the potential developer of this site. Any local decision to permit limited development on this site will be misrepresented by prospective</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>developers aiming to persuade the planning authority to permit a much larger development inconsistent with the wishes of local people and driven only by commercial interests.</p> <p>The 2006 report contains a further serious objection to the roundabout on the Bridgnorth Road recently proposed by the potential developer. This access point would, in the judgement of the Inspector, compound the perception of development on this site <b>“as a substantial urban extension”</b> to Much Wenlock. Such a development would, by implication and experience elsewhere, result in a spatial and functional disconnect between this development and the town as a whole. In this situation the worst fears of local objectors and of the Planning Inspectorate might well be played out. An <b>“urban extension”</b> would then be likely to spread ever further into the countryside despoiling high quality agricultural land at the expense of the character and setting of Much Wenlock as well as its integrity as a community.</p>		
1.4		Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estate	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The proposed allocation of the RES1 site for residential development is fully supported in principle. This reflects the widespread recognition through responses to the residents' questionnaire that land at Bridgnorth Road and adjacent to the Primary School is the most suitable location for planned new housing. However, fundamentally, it is considered that the proposed limit of 25 dwellings (including 5 affordable dwellings) is arbitrary; is an inefficient use of this sustainably-located greenfield land; and fails to take on board the significant opportunities which are presented by a comprehensively planned development. A master</p>	<p>Changes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site capacity should be increased to 85 dwellings;</li> <li>2. The mechanism for preparation and approval of a development brief should be detailed, including an explanation of its status.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted. See above.</p> <p>Have agreed to stipulate the site size as approximately one hectare. 25 is not arbitrary but is drawn from public responses.</p>



			<p>planning exercise has demonstrated that 85 dwellings would be an appropriate development. This level of development (85 dwellings) would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a good quality housing development which met the needs of all sections of society, including 17 affordable homes, whilst protecting the historic built environment and the high quality landscape;</li> <li>• Deliver a roundabout access which would also act as a traffic calming measure before the primary school for traffic entering the town from the south;</li> <li>• Provide a substantial new play area in the south of the town;</li> <li>• Introduce a comprehensive land drainage and flood storage scheme to address existing local flooding concerns in the south east of the town;</li> <li>• Contribute in the region of £250,000 of CIL payments for local infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>It is also considered that the policy is unhelpfully vague on the requirement for a development brief and the logistics for bringing this forward. As currently drafted the policy is unspecific on who should prepare the brief, who will consult with the community, and how it will be decided whether agreement has been reached with the community. The status of the development brief in development management terms should also be explained.</p> <p>Wenlock Estates considers that the development brief should be prepared by the prospective developer and consulted upon in accordance with Shropshire Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>The site is suitable for meeting a range of housing needs which should not be restricted to 2 and 3 bedroom homes. By providing larger family</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			homes, the opportunity will be created for family households in smaller properties in the town to upsize and thereby release smaller existing homes for households seeking smaller properties. The role of the existing housing stock should be taken into consideration.		
1.4		Megan Morris -Jones	Objection to scale of proposed development by Persimmon Homes as not in being in line with NP policies.	None required	Noted; Persimmon's 85 houses not a proposal of the Plan.
1.4		Jennifer Collier	Disagree. Whilst the scale of development seems to be about right, I would be reluctant to give this policy my support until it is clear where on this large site the 25 houses would be situated. Moreover, Site RES1 appears to be in the same area as a hedgerow which was the subject of an unsuccessful planning appeal for its removal which was determined in 2008. I believe that the hedgerow and the field have historic significance. With all the recent interest in the town's Olympian heritage, this requires the most careful consideration before all evidence of this legacy is lost forever.	Identify where houses will be located on the site.	Noted; Location of the 25 houses could be dealt with at the design brief stage but helpful to broadly define now as an approximately one hectare plot near the Bridgnorth Rd and adjoining existing development. The justification for this would be for access purposes, relationship to existing urban form (including possible footpath/cycle access) and limiting impact on open countryside.
1.4	HC 4	Susan O'Dowd,	Disagree. I have a very strong objection to this clause which whilst advocating a maximum of 25 houses leaves an impression that this could be open to discussion. This appears to be a last minute inclusion after the consultation meeting where I studied the proposals for the whole plan and broadly agreed with them. I strongly object to such a major change without further consultation. The new government planning framework is a		Noted. See above; the proposal for 25 houses has been a potential option since November and was a part of the public events in January 2013. No change recommended.

			<p>default in favour of development and the need for local plans to provide a counter to this has been widely publicised. (Areas where no such local planning framework is likely to be in place by the time the regulations change have been aware that large scale plans for housing development will be submitted). It is vital that a suitable and clear local plan is in place. Persimmon have obviously read this draft and arranged a public meeting almost immediately after this consultation closes to discuss building 85 houses. It is likely that many people will not be aware of this change since the consultation; think the plans will be firmly opposed and find this is no longer the case with the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>This indication of willingness to discuss larger developments is totally contrary to the maximum site size of 25 units per site repeatedly proposed and accepted during consultations. Including such matter in the Plan means that sites above 25 units per site are being accepted in principle. This is absolutely and totally contrary to all consultations, meetings and discussions. Further, 3.1 identifies the need to have a comprehensive town flood plan formulated and agreed before agreeing anything but minor infill. 1.4 directly contradicts this as Persimmon representatives have already started consultations.</p> <p>Water from the current Hunters Gate went straight across the road in front of 1 Barrow Street in the last floods. Some remedial work was done but I am not aware work to take water in future into the park by installing a filter to remove oil etc. has been done. Neither have land drains disrupted by poor site work been redirected.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

1.4	HC 5	John O'Dowd,	<p>Disagree. My strong objection is to the last minute inclusion without consultation of the reference to the acceptance for discussion of the planning brief from Persimmon to build 85 houses on the additional site.</p> <p>This is totally contrary to the maximum site size of 25 units per site repeatedly proposed and accepted. Including such matter for discussion within the Plan means that sites above 25 units are being accepted in principle for discussion rather than being outside the terms of the plan. This is absolutely and totally contrary to all consultations and meetings and discussions.</p>	<p>All reference to consideration and discussions for larger sites should be deleted. In view of the betrayal of all previously expressed principles for maximum size of new sites, the Plan should specifically state a maximum number of units on any future site of 25 units and with no option for later phases on the site for additional units.</p>	<p>Noted. Plan does not propose a site larger than for 25 houses.</p>
1.4	HC 6	Brian Harris	<p>Disagree. How did 25 houses jump to 85? (Mr Harris attached a copy of his letter to Persimmon opposing their proposals for a development of 85 houses)</p>	<p>Do not permit building of more than 25 houses on RES1 site.</p>	<p>Noted; Plan does not propose more than 25 houses, see comments above</p>
1.4	HC 7	Davie and Jackie Kirkland	<p>Disagree. We have seen the draft Plan and agree with many of its stated objectives. However we have serious concerns about the field shown for new housing on the Bridgnorth Road.</p> <p>We feel the plan should provide a framework for the future of our town but always keeping its essential nature. There is clearly a need for low cost dwellings for the townspeople but the proposal for the Greenfield site has nothing to do with that aim. It is driven entirely by the wish of the landowner for a very large capital gain and by the commercial interest of a major house building company. And if approved we can all be sure it will not end there.</p> <p>We have rarely heard such a bombastic statement that it is not viable to build 25 dwellings and that at least 85 are needed to make a profit. The true nature of Persimmon's intentions is clear from that very statement.</p>	<p>Our opinion is therefore that the site should be taken out of the plan in its entirety.</p>	<p>Noted; no change recommended, see above comments.</p>

1.4	HC10	Shelagh Allen	<p>Disagree. This plan does not appear to be taking note of the findings of the Planning Inspectorate's Report of 1994 and 2006 or of the local resident's responses to the questionnaire which forms the basis for this plan.</p> <p><b>Table 3: Residents Survey of potential development sites for Housing</b></p> <p>The majority voted for Bridgnorth Road site 16.4%, followed by 14.8% for Morris Corfield site.</p> <p><b>Hunters Gate (Site C) referred to as RES 1 was only supported by 7.7% residents.</b></p> <p>Development of the Morris Corfield Smithfield site would enhance this area of the town greatly being most suitable for a mixture of affordable housing and property suitable for older residents being so close to the town centre. There are a considerable number of larger houses in the town currently occupied by single older people, some of whom would move if smaller properties with decent sized rooms were available.</p> <p>On 4th January 2013 an email was received from Oliver Morris of Morris Corfield regarding the Smithfield Works site: "For a number of internal reasons Morris Corfield has not proposed its Smithfield Works property as a potential development site for the Wenlock Plan. The situation changed over the Christmas holidays and we would like the town to have a say in the site's potential. It is one of the most obvious brownfield sites for housing or commercial development in the town, I am sure there have been some comments about its omission to date".</p> <p>Initial Permissions granted previously to this developer appear to have expanded over time, permitting greater density of housing than originally approved. Recommendations</p>	<p>Given that the Steering Group appear to have ruled out the most popular option, I would have thought that it was beholden to promote this site (Morris Corfield Smithfield) and accept the late submission by the landowner; particularly in view of the manner in which Persimmon are promoting RES1 for more extensive development considering it unviable for the number of houses the town requires.</p>	<p>Noted. See comments above in response to Civic Society and Mr. Horsley. Development in RES1 has been limited partly because the Plan recognizes that windfall development sites in the town will come forward. Flooding dealt with in Chapter 3.</p>
-----	------	---------------	--	---	---

			<p>concerning landscaping given by the Planning Inspectorate appear to have been ignored and not enforced by the Council.</p> <p>The proposed development of 85 houses is likely to increase the population of Much Wenlock by more than 10%; this is in excess of local demand. Traffic flow will increase as new residents are likely to be commuters. Existing services are currently under pressure.</p> <p>There is no provision in the plan to expand medical provision.</p>		
1.4	HC11	Kenneth Allen	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>1) The Plan disregards the Planning Inspectorate reports of 1993/4 and 2006;</p> <p>2) Residents survey of potential housing development sites:</p> <p>a) Site C (RES 1) supported by 7.7%;</p> <p>b) Bridgnorth Road site supported by 16.4%;</p> <p>c) Morris Corfield site supported by 14.8%.</p> <p>3) Morris Corfield, Smithfield Works Site, now proposed for consideration for housing development. An obvious "brownfield site" near to town facilities, would provide a considerable number of mixed development houses.</p> <p>4) Site C (RES1):</p> <p>a) Existing problems with flooding as experienced in 2007 and 2011;</p> <p>b) Existing storm water and foul water main drains are at capacity and could not cope with additional load. The prospective developers proposals for 80/85 houses would result in an additional 300 or so residents in a large development out of scale with the town;</p> <p>c) Families with small children and older residents who would not wish to, or might not be able to, walk into the town for shopping etc. would add to the existing traffic flow and parking problems;</p> <p>d) The 1994 development plan by Bridgnorth</p>		<p>Noted; response as above. Morris Corfield currently an active employment site which may come forward for redevelopment in the Plan period.</p>

			District Council proposed a finite limit to the development of the southern boundary of Hunter's Gate, upheld by the Planning Inspectorate then and again in 2006; e) Several small infill sites in the town plus the Morris Corfield site would provide sufficient housing required, in scale with the existing and more accessible to the main facilities in town.		
1.4	HC12	Yvonne Holyoak	Disagree. I support the development of 25 houses on site RES1. But I do not believe that a greater area of development should be even considered, because the services to this area of Much Wenlock are already overstretched and ineffective and such a large development would completely change the shape and balance of the town.		Noted.
1.4		Colin Taylor	Policy 1.4 seems at odds with Policy 1.1. The single exception of the land off Bridgnorth Road should be made clearer. In my opinion the number of houses built on this land should be increased from 25 to 50, provided adequate safeguards on flooding are provided. This would enable sufficient variation in types of housing to be included and would reduce pressure on other potential development sites in the town.	Increase number of houses permitted to 50	Noted. Recommend no change to the number of houses. Plan needs to be clear that RES1 will be an allocation and therefore within the (new) development boundary, rather than an exception site. Should add a reference i.e. a fifth tick within the objective and change 'development' to 'allocation' in 1.4, so is clear is allocated. And add in wording about size and location noted above.

1.4	HC13	Jean Edwards	<p>Disagree. These houses should not be built. They go against previous Inspectors' recommendations and will aggravate known flood possibilities. Not enough work in Much Wenlock for residents contributing to more commuting to areas such as Telford and Shrewsbury where hundreds of houses are being built so more stress on Wenlock's already busy roads and pollution. Do not need more affordable homes; some built last year still up for sale and more affordable houses being built in Styche Lane.</p>	<p>Keep to infill and brownfield sites as Much Wenlock townspeople want, builders are only interested in profit.</p>	<p>Noted. No change to the Plan recommended; need for affordable homes have been identified.</p>
1.4		Tish Farrell	<p>Please remove this policy. It does not reflect public opinion as expressed in the survey – to protect the character of the town, to not build on good agricultural land, to not add to existent flood risk. Para 1.4 will open the door to ever more development along the southern sector of the town. Persimmon's application to build 85 houses on this site is apparently already being negotiated with Shropshire Council. There should therefore be no 'loop holes' in the plan to allow further development of any kind beyond the existent boundary. This has been fully endorsed by planning inspectorate reports. The landowner's plans to deal with the town's drainage problems are open to serious question, since the failure of attenuation measures will have serious impact on residents in Farley. The developer who is planning to build more houses beyond Hunter's Gate has still to rectify the drainage problems of the Hunter's Gate estate. Local landowners have expressed their development intentions to the Plan, i.e. to build on all western and southern locations adjoining the development boundary. That is their intention.</p>		<p>Noted. No change recommended – see above.</p>



1.4	HC14	Alan Edwards	<p>Disagree. Supported by letter written to Town Clerk:</p> <p>"I consider the Plan to be very well constructed but I do have serious concerns regarding housing, flooding coupled with the danger of Much Wenlock becoming a dormitory for larger industrial conurbations sited some distance away. These concerns have been heightened by a recent circular and public meeting arranged by Persimmon Homes in respect of the area shown as RES 1 on the town map: this I see as an early challenge to the authenticity of the Plan and the clearly stated views of the people of Much Wenlock. Persimmon has stated that "The Neighbourhood Plan has proposed to limit the new homes on the site to not more than 25 Dwellings. This is not a viable proposal". I suggest by including this site you are inviting future challenges with the possibility of litigation as developers attempt to impose their agenda against the expressed wishes of the people.</p> <p>In reading the draft I was surprised to see the inclusion of Policy 1.4 it seems to have been a late addition. To my mind the wording is confusing and I do not believe as presented it will satisfy the clearly stated objectives set out in the Plan. In fact I feel it will do the opposite and open a door to developers such as Persimmon who will endeavour to develop the site to its maximum; their draft proposal includes provision for 85 new dwellings. If approval is ever given to proceed on this site the next stage will most likely be to extend the boundary line even farther south to that which was proposed by the developer but rejected in the Public Enquiry 2006. I am very surprised that the conclusions of HM Inspectors, following two separate independent public</p>	Remove policy 1.4 from the Plan	Noted. See comments above.
-----	------	--------------	--	---------------------------------	----------------------------

			<p>enquiries, of the need to retain the present boundary as a finite boundary to protect the Town's unique landscape setting appear to have been ignored completely. I consider that the plan as presently presented will put at risk the unique landscape setting we all enjoy. The risks are of overdevelopment and flooding. Persimmon has stated that the allocation for RES 1 in the Neighbourhood Plan is not viable: I see this as a challenge to the wishes of the people of this Town and those who have been involved in the Plan.</p> <p>I cannot see any justification of need for policy 1.4. I agree that we must have limited amount of housing to meet local need but I haven't seen any evidence to support the policy. I have not seen any reasoning for its inclusion. At present there are quite a lot of houses for sale in Much Wenlock: some have been on the market for some time. It should also be noted that the allocation of some of the affordable homes on the Lady Forester site has yet to be taken up. In addition there are a further 13 affordable homes in course of construction. I would argue that any developer will build to maximise profit and that any probable development will be well in excess of local need. This could result in Much Wenlock becoming a dormitory for larger conurbations; this is an unsustainable concept as there is no work locally to support such development a result of which will be increased traffic and attendant pollution as people commute to work. I understood one of the founding principles in creating Telford was to prevent overdevelopment of small communities in Shropshire. Bearing in mind the current housing expansion going on in Telford I would have thought this would be</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>sufficient for this area.</p> <p>Two other issues should also be considered, one is that the land is classified as high grade agricultural land which I understand should be protected from all but essential development. I cannot agree that any development on this site can be deemed as essential particularly with regard to local need. The other issue is to do with flooding and existing services. In 2007 there were severe floods on Hunters Gate even though flood precautions had been put in place. There is clearly a risk by further development of exacerbating the situation. I take no comfort from assurances from developers bearing in mind it was understood that adequate measures had been built into the Hunters Gate development. Clearly the floods of 2007 have demonstrated that this was not the case.</p> <p>One of the Inspector's conclusions following the most recent enquiry was that the existing services were overstretched. This view is confirmed by the comments of Shropshire Council's Drainage Officer in response to an application to build on the site adjacent to 1 Barrow Street. I trust you will look at the Officer's comments which are clear and unequivocal in objecting to the application and bear in mind that this was for two units and not the 25 listed in Policy 1.4.</p> <p>If Policy 1.4 is incorporated into the Plan it will demonstrate a willingness to permit extension of the current Town boundary and to permanently lose prime agricultural land. I suggest the vague attempt to limit RES1 to 25 houses is more romantic than realistic and will be the subject of</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			challenge by developers. The attendant risks are of overdevelopment and flooding: these are considerable and not in accord with the wishes of the people."		
Site RES1 Policy 1.4		Rachel. M Bradley J.P,	<p>Agree with Policy 1.4 in principal, but have to disagree and say no to 25 houses. If you give Persimmon entry onto that site, the wishes of the people are damned.</p> <p>The proposal from Persimmon is outrageous and far removed from the wishes of the Wenlock People. It has only one motive and that is purely of commercial interest. My fear is that the legal processes will be ignored and the way will be open for Persimmon to forge ahead. They will have no thought for what the Wenlock people so clearly wish.</p> <p>Have the people who drew up the NP the will and resources to monitor what happens next?</p> <p>We believed the Govt. initiative of localization was to give weight to local views. This may well be lost or ignored under the huge resources available to persimmons and the Vendor of the land. Please be vigilant!</p>	Remove Policy 1.4	Noted. See comments above.
1.4		James Orves	<p>Planning permission to build residential properties on RES1 was sought in 2006 and was subsequently rejected. How can the Neighbourhood plan overturn this when it stated the following?:</p> <p><i>i)"it would have an adverse effect on the setting of Much Wenlock, as seen from an important approach road to the town. It would extend development further along the valley, breaking through what the 1993 Local Plan inquiry Inspector found to be a logical and finite boundary to the built up area"</i></p> <p><i>ii) that the land was "high quality agricultural</i></p>		Noted. See above response to Civic Society comments

			<i>land" requiring it to be protected from all but essential development. iii) that "some of the local facilities and services are already overstretched."</i>		
1.5	HC9	Anthony Drury	Disagree. Affordable housing in Much Wenlock is an oxymoron.		Noted.
1.5		Stephen Locke on behalf of A.Hill	Disagree. The rate of affordable housing is very high; suggest it is reduced to say 15% to relate more to the rates set out by Shropshire Council		Noted. However advice from SC that suggesting 20% is achievable in MW.
1.6	EM7	Rob Sharrock	If the policies of the present government remain in force it is single bedroomed housing that will be in demand in the affordable sector.	Consider amending	Noted.
1.6		Brian Andrews	Welfare cuts would imply one bedroom accommodation will be in more demand	Amend	Noted.
1.6		Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estates	Disagree. As stated in response to Policy 1.4, the need for two and three-bedroomed dwellings should be substantiated by a housing needs study which properly reflects current and future needs and anticipates the effect of the release of existing properties once new housing is built. As drafted this policy is unduly restrictive, limiting the potential developer and its partner housing association to provide an appropriate mix of dwellings.		Noted. The Plan is based on housing needs information from the Residents Survey.
1.7 2.2	HC16	Andrew Smith	Disagree. These policies ensure that some sites (such as Corfields) if viable for employment, may never be considered for uses which may be of more benefit to the community (e.g. Health Centre or housing) for which the site may be ideal. Supporting such alternative uses would ease the pressure around the Much Wenlock development boundary. Allowing viable employment use to take priority over other desirable uses is inflexible and I disagree with this policy.	Amend	Noted. Plan aims to only release employment land if not viable to ensure local employment opportunities and the town doesn't become a commuting settlement. But retains flexibility.
1.7 & 1.9	HC9	Anthony Drury	Broadly agree.		Noted

1.7		Stephen Locke on behalf of A.Hill	Disagree. This statement assumes that brownfield sites are employment sites. There may well be other sites currently used for alternative development that are also brownfield and therefore the wording should state" where it can be shown that the use of the site in its current form is no longer viable"		Noted. Clarify that brownfield land includes uses other than employment; policy 1.7 should be changed to 'shown that the original use of the site is no longer viable'
1.8	HC9	Anthony Drury	New development must avoid making Much Wenlock another crowded town.		Noted

**OBJECTIVE 2: ECONOMY AND JOBS**

<b>Policy Number/ Reference</b>	<b>Evidence Ref No</b>	<b>Name of contributor</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested changes to the Draft NP</b>	<b>Response by MWNPSG – 8<sup>th</sup> April &amp; 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013</b>
Objective 2		Jennifer Collier	All agreed except 2.6 and 2.8	See comments on 2.6 and 2.8	Noted
2.1		Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estates	<p>Disagree. The proposed employment land allocation at Stretton Road should be increased to include adjoining land to the west as identified on attached Plan RPS1 and referred to in the representation on the Proposals Map. A comprehensive approach to the area south of Stretton Road is considered appropriate and will provide greater flexibility to meet potential demand.</p> <p>An access to the additional land has been approved by Shropshire Council which will have capacity to serve the proposed development. Discussions have been held between Wenlock Estates and Shropshire Council, who own the currently proposed allocation site, and there is a willingness to work together in promoting the land were the wider area proposed for development.</p>		Noted. The Plan has allocated a limited amount of employment land to meet currently anticipated need and will be reviewed; if additional demand is identified further allocation can be considered.
2.2		R.Dower	Stretton Road site. The recession is forecast to continue and as we approach the tenth year of this site's 'Industrial Zoning' with just one interested potential tenant - who did not pursue the opportunity (Shropshire Council's figures) the site looks to be empty for a long time to come. Just zoning it 'Industrial' is likely to condemn the site to deteriorate even more - nobody uses it, everybody knows that! It has been subject to fly-tipping, litter drops from late night car 'users' and until I complained to the		Noted. Shropshire Council has said the employment site is viable and will be brought forward for development.

			<p>Council at Shirehall and they tidied it up, it was rapidly becoming an even worse eyesore. Shropshire Council are on record saying 'there are no plans to return the site to its previous use as a pasture' despite the planning condition that determines it should be. Are The Steering Group and indeed the MWTC happy with a situation that may last and indeed worsen for another ten years?</p> <p>If it is zoned 'Industrial' in the Neighbourhood Plan it will undoubtedly sit vacant, unused, unmaintained and degenerate into an even worse nuisance and 'BLOT' on the landscape than it is now. Water is now coursing up through the MOT and nobody is interested. MWTC has no money to maintain or fix problems and these will worsen. Assurances from Shropshire Council as to its future are haphazard and cannot be relied upon; they do not control the market. Access is poor, the site has a 15ft or so slope, a deterrent for any commercial developer and there are empty sites in every surrounding town.</p> <p>Also it now known that NO ecological study was ever carried out before the work on the 'temporary car park' was commenced. I have a copy E mail from the County Environmentalist/Ecologist to prove this. The decision was left to the Project Engineer - he is probably a capable engineer but he certainly is not an ecologist.</p>		
2.6		Jennifer Collier	<p>Disagree. Whilst the quarries identified in policy 8.1 (Lilleshall, Westwood and Farley) are clearly recognized, the description of all the others is not defined. There are those where work is approaching the end of their economic life or have been abandoned within living memory and are clearly recognisable as such (e.g. Coates, Shadwell), and, on the other hand there are</p>	<p>Create better definition/description of individual quarries</p>	<p>Noted. Agree that the Plan does need to differentiate between the different nature and use of the quarries; make changes to chapter 8 as well to ensure</p>



			<p>those which nature has largely reclaimed although they are either still evident to some extent, or recorded (e.g. at Vineyards, Homer, Bradley Rock, Wyke, Gleedon Hill, Presthope, Knowle and Hayes).*</p> <p>This policy should be far more clearly defined about the nature of the quarries – I assume it is intended for the likes of Coates, Shadwell etc. and, that being the case, I would agree. Please define them in the Plan.</p> <p>I would vehemently disagree if it was intended to encompass other historic ones such as those I have listed (Vineyards, Homer etc.). The Plan should be clear so that landowners cannot exploit this policy and so that residents are protected from development of land that they may not even realise is a former quarry.</p> <p>The policy refers to an Area of Natural Beauty. I assume that this is an error and should read 'Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'. My objections above apply whether or not the historic workings are within the AONB.</p>		<p>consistency. Advice from TC to be drafted in the changes for final discussion. Note AONB title.</p>
2.7		Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estates	<p>Disagree. It is considered inappropriate to seek to preclude Class B2 and B8 development within the Parish. Clearly, all proposals for Class B uses should be assessed appropriately in respect of the impact they might cause and whether than would be acceptable. However, blanket preclusions are not conducive to economic growth and prosperity and is contrary in Wenlock Estates' views to proper planning of sustainable development.</p>		<p>Agreed and the policy has been amended to include B2 and B8 uses.</p>
2.8		Jennifer Collier	<p>Disagree. I have a particular concern about the way this policy seeks to address the proposal</p>		<p>Noted. The Plan does not propose indoor</p>

			<p>submitted by the trustees of the Willey Estate at Bradley Farm (proposal 'A') in October/November 2012. The principles that concern me would also apply to any other similar proposal submitted in due course elsewhere in the parish. This proposal included the development of an indoor riding school 40m x 80m. This would be part of a major investment project and will rely upon heavy utilisation for a significant period in order that the capital investment and presumed grant and charity funding might be justified.</p> <p>The time may come when the proposed use might cease. At this point, what becomes of the building? It will be approximately half the size of a football pitch, lying prominently in open countryside. Whilst an agricultural use might be applied for, clearly other commercial uses might be sought. The Plan, as drafted, does not appear to have considered this or other scenarios where an otherwise laudable proposal, sited in the wrong place, fails.</p>		riding school etc and Plan policies for protecting the countryside.
2.8		Stephen Locke , Agent on behalf of A.Hill	Disagree. We agree with the policy to promote tourism; but suggest that the policy is amended to read "for recreational and tourism activities, facilities and <i>accommodation</i> will be supported"		Noted. Not recommend changes; policy as drafted is flexible enough.

**OBJECTIVE 3: REDUCING FLOOD RISK**

<b>Policy Number/ Reference</b>	<b>Evidence Ref No</b>	<b>Name of contributor</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested changes to the Draft NP</b>	<b>Response by MWNPSG – 8<sup>th</sup> April &amp; 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013</b>
<i>Objective 3</i>		Brian Andrews	Plan does not acknowledge that the towns drainage and sewage system is inadequate	Priority given to improvements to both systems	Noted. Plan does acknowledge it and proposes policies to address it.
<i>Objective 3</i>		Roy Dower	<p>The Flood Attenuation Pond proposal presently takes in some of my land, some of Skan's and some of Wenlock Estates. It does not incorporate any of the 'temporary car park' site of 1.79 acres - despite the fact that initially (before the planning consent in Oct 2011) it did! Engineers designing the pond quite rightly included part of this land in the proposed pond as the gradients clearly indicate they should.</p> <p>If part of this site is taken into the attenuation pond, none of my land would be required. The Council already owns the car park land so there would be a saving in expenditure but MOST importantly a saving of 105 metres of established mature hedging and trees that will be destroyed under the current proposal. I am not sure the Steering Group are aware of this fact.</p> <p>The Steering Group has one last chance to get this right and so ensure a proper rural aspect and attenuation pond is built and the area maintained as a country pasture with the existing hedges and trees in place.</p>	The location of the attenuation pond be changed to include part of the temporary car park and, as a consequence, to avoid part of contributor's land	Noted. Concern about location of the attenuation land noted and SC have confirmed (email 26.3.13) the pond was never located on the temporary car park area. Therefore, recommend no change to Plan. Boundaries shown on Plan reflect SC advice on required land.
<i>Objective 3</i>		Much Wenlock Civic Society	Concern over flooding if any development occurs on RES1 .Full comments included under Civic Society 1.4 comments	None	Noted. See comments above. The concern is well understood. The Plan strives to address residents concerns over flooding
<i>Objective</i>		Howard Horsley	Concern over flooding if any development occurs	No specific	Noted. Plan could be

3			on RES1. See full comments by Mr Horsley at 1.4		changed to include a specific reference to appropriate responses but in delivery terms SC Water and Flood team understand these risks and will require appropriate flood alleviation measures to be incorporated into all developments. Recommend no change.
Objective 3	HC10	Shelagh Allen	<p>Provision must be made to ensure existing properties are properly protected from flooding before land adjacent to Hunters Gate is even considered for development. The inadequate drainage installed inappropriately on private land instead of the highway by Developer originally is unable to deal with heavy rainfall. (Photographic evidence 27 June 2011).</p> <p>Monies paid to the Council by Persimmon Homes to alleviate the flooding at Hunters Gate have not been spent on improving the situation. Existing sewers cannot cope with the current population under certain conditions. This site should be retained as a flood attenuation area, free from development.</p>		Noted. This issue of flooding risk is addressed in Core Strategy and the Plan policy.
3.1		Jim Orves	<p>Please could you also clarify the position concerning the following: Underwriting of risk to homeowners and businesses: there is general acceptance that the drainage is inadequate, as demonstrated by the flooding in 2007. The people of Much Wenlock gave a clear message, rejecting any further</p>	Minor developments needs to be defined. IUDMP to be implemented before any development at RES1	Noted. The Plan recognizes both the environmental risk as well as the health risk to public health due to the foul and surface water drainage

			<p>development until drainage and traffic problems were resolved. I cannot see how the Neighbourhood Plan can propose any new development without underwriting any losses resulting from its implementation. This would include indemnifying any residents, either in the current flood path or residents that may be within any redirected flood path as a result of the development in RES1.</p> <p>The Neighborhood Plan team, Town Council, Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water and Parliament (through Philip Dunne our local Member of Parliament) have all been made aware of the hydrological data and drainage shortcomings. Adopting a plan that ignores these issues, especially when they are recognised by previous planning decisions, would at best be ill considered and at worst reckless. Unless the Council can indemnify such an assurance is included in the Neighbourhood Plan and / or the referendum for its adoption, I would have to campaign against its adoption and potentially call for a separate referendum calling for the appropriate indemnities</p>		problems
3.1		Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estates	Disagree. It is considered unreasonable that an application for development which is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment demonstrating its acceptability in flood risk terms, should not be supported by the Plan.	Change 3.1 to reflect this	Noted. The Plan recognizes both the environmental risk as well as the health risk to public health due to the foul and surface water drainage problems

3.4		Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estates	It is unreasonable to require more onerous sustainability criteria that that set by national guidance.		Noted. But have support for this from EA for Much Wenlock's circumstances
3.5	HC9	Anthony Drury	Agree. Last year's wet weather was a reminder of how poor drainage is here.		Noted
3		Jennifer Collier	Agree		Noted
3.		Environment Agency, Mark Davies	Concern over reference to 'supporting the use and/or enlargement of containment ponds...'  A policy line could also be added, in Policy 3, to state "Development will not result in the loss of open watercourse, and culverts should be opened up where possible to improve drainage and flood flows. Proposals involving the creation of new culverts (unless essential to the provision of access) will not normally be permitted".	Remove reference  Add wording	Agree to removal of the tick reference as too narrowly defined a solution. Agree to add wording as suggested.
3.3		Environment Agency, Mark Davies	Suggestion to maximize the separation of foul and surface water.	Incorporate into Policy	Agree if not already clear that expected of the Plan by strategic policy.
3.4		Environment Agency, Mark Davies	We support the use of a high level of water efficiency as proposed in Policy 3.4. This will secure a minimum requirement of 80 l/p/day for all new dwellings. This measure will help to minimise loading to the existing combined sewerage system. It will also contribute to wider climate change reduction/sustainability. This issue is supported by the WCS evidence base (water efficiency recommendations).	Retain 80l/p/day	Agreed, keep in Plan.
3.4		Mark Sackett, RPS Group, Agent for Wenlock Estates	Unreasonable to require more onerous sustainability criteria than that set out by national guidance	Change 3.4 to reflect this	Noted. The Plan recognizes both the environmental risk as well as the health risk to public health due to

					the foul and surface water drainage problems
--	--	--	--	--	--

**OBJECTIVE 4: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

<b>Policy Number/ Reference</b>	<b>Evidence Ref No</b>	<b>Name of contributor</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested changes to the Draft NP</b>	<b>Response by MWNPSG – 8<sup>th</sup> April &amp; 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013</b>
4.1 to 4.7	HC9	Anthony Drury	<p>No consideration towards significant public transport - local buses. Recent bad weather reminds motorists of the importance of the local bus network.</p> <p>436 bus is not reliable, partly for reasons beyond immediate control. If austerity continues, as seems likely, motor car use will decline and bus use will increase!</p> <p>Much Wenlock does differ from being some distance from national transport links, such as rail and National Express.</p>	More pressure should be put on Arriva and Shropshire Council.	Noted. Some aspects of this comment relate to the Place Plan.
4		Jennifer Collier	Agree		Noted
4.1-6		Vivien Bellamy	Agree. New developments need more parking than two per house. To avoid clogging the streets during the evenings and at holiday times, accommodation should be made for visitor parking as well. I would prefer to see parking to rear of houses rather than frontage.		Noted. No change recommended.
4.1		Colin Taylor	Policy 4.1 may be inadequate with car ownership likely to continue to increase, and with increasing numbers of young people having to continue living at home. This would mean more houses with more than 2 cars.		Reference changed to read ' a minimum of 2 spaces'
4.3		Colin Taylor	Policy 4.3 Some of the existing car parks are not fully used on a daily basis because too many people coming into town park on the street, causing unnecessary traffic chaos. The policy should reflect a desire to change how parking is handled, e.g. making on-street parking available	Amend	Noted. However, Plan cannot address operational parking controls



			during the working day to residents and employees of local businesses only.		
4.7		Colin Taylor	Policy 4.7 Much of the problem with HGVs and other heavy vehicles arises from the two A roads through the town. Pressure could be applied to make the road to Buildwas a B road with limitations on weight. The policy should reflect a more positive determination to do something concrete.		Noted. Not a Plan matter.

**OBJECTIVE 5: COMMUNITY WELL BEING**

<b>Policy Number/ Reference</b>	<b>Evidence Ref No</b>	<b>Name of contributor</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested changes to the Draft NP</b>	<b>Response by MWNPSG – 8<sup>th</sup> April &amp; 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013</b>
Objective 5	HC1	John Davies	Medical provision is inadequate, patients can wait up to a month for an appointment	Give priority to provision of a second doctor's surgery.	Noted and Plan supports provision of community facilities.
5		Jennifer Collier	Agree		Noted.
5.2		Mark Sackett, RPS Group, Agent for Wenlock Estates	Disagree Although Policy 5.2 is permissive and encourages new and improved community facilities, Wenlock Estates consider that the Neighbourhood Plan has missed the opportunity to address specific infrastructure needs or identify land where such new provision could appropriately be made. The policy should be extended to refer to land south of the Gaskell Arms Hotel and west of Bridgnorth Road which is considered suitable for locating new community infrastructure as identified on the Proposals Map.	Reasons: A major requirement to ensure community well-being is the provision of adequate levels of housing to meet local needs. In our view, the Plan does not demonstrate that sufficient housing is planned for or indeed will eventually be supplied as a result of the Plan's strategy and the suggestion that a review should deal with non-provision is considered unsatisfactory as there is no trigger mechanism for such a review as the plan includes no housing target. The reasons note the recent loss of a number of services and facilities and that the community is concerned about further losses. More new homes and a larger	Noted. The policy provides for this eventuality when specific proposals are identified. Site assessments previously considered some of these land possibilities.

				<p>population will help stem the loss of facilities and services by assisting in sustaining them. In doing so the Town will assist the wider catchment. Further, new market dwellings will generate CIL for enhancing local community infrastructure – the Neighbourhood Plan will enable greater local control of how the CIL funds are expended.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

**OBJECTIVE 6: GOOD QUALITY DESIGN**

<b>Policy Number/ Reference</b>	<b>Evidence Ref No</b>	<b>Name of contributor</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested changes to the Draft NP</b>	<b>Response by MWNPSG – 8<sup>th</sup> April &amp; 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013</b>
<i>Objective 6</i>	HC3	Much Wenlock Civic Society	Wheelie bins are unattractive, and are cluttering pavements	New development should make provision for visually attractive storage and easy access for wheelie bins to the pavement side	Noted.
6		Jennifer Collier	Agree		Noted
6		Vivien Bellamy	Agree 6.4 might include a reference in layout to reasonable space between building and road, especially where road is a busy through-route		Noted.
6.2		Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estates	Disagree. It is unreasonable to link the policy to an untested and un-founded document. This policy should be deleted and at most replaced by a cross reference to the existence of the document in the supporting text.		Noted. The Design Guidance has been adopted by the Bridgnorth Council and therefore Shropshire Council as well as the Town Council as supporting guidance

**OBJECTIVE 7: GREEN AND OPEN SPACES**

<b>Policy Number/Reference</b>	<b>Evidence Ref No</b>	<b>Name of contributor</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested changes to the Draft NP</b>	<b>Response by MWNPSG – 8<sup>th</sup> April &amp; 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013</b>
Objective 7		Jennifer Collier	Agree		Noted
Objective 7		Colin Taylor	The policies under Objective 7 do not delineate other potential open community areas, for example the field immediately above the Gaskell Arms on the Bridgnorth Road.		Noted: Recommendation to Town Council to review local green space designation separately from MWNP.
7.1		Mark Sackett, RPS Group Agent for Wenlock Estates	Disagree. This policy does not appear to be sure whether there is a shortfall. Unless a shortfall is identified by way of audit and qualitative appraisal, any development should only be required to provide on-site open space or play space to satisfy the needs of its new population.		Noted. A quantitative shortfall of play provision has been identified by SC's PPG 17 Study and is in the Place Plan as an infrastructure need
7.2	HC16	Andrew Smith	Part agree. This is a commendable policy and I believe consideration should be given to adding an extra specific area to be protected as green open space along with those already defined – it is outlined in green on the attached plan. It is the area west of the footpath crossing the parkland from the EH car park to the station houses. Whilst the land to the east of the path is protected by the national Trust covenants, the outlined area is not protected and may be seen a future exception site and should be protected as green open space, the loss of which to any type of development would be unacceptable.	Protect area on map as open green space. See PDF map	No change but recommendation to Town Council to review local green space designation separately from MWNP.
7.3	EM7	Rob Sharrock	The map does not show all existing green spaces. Southfield Rd near the bridge has a community orchard and Hunters Gate has a green.	Amend map	Map and text amended for clarification.

7.3		Colin Taylor	Policy 7.3 should reflect a lot more of existing green areas of the town, e.g. grassed areas along Southfield Road (including community orchard), grassed area at Havelock Crescent, and the open area at Hunters Gate which was a designated play area but which now needs re-examination.		As above.
7.3		Vivien Bellamy	Greens at Havelock Crescent and Southfield Road, the latter a particularly important visual aspect of the townscape, should also be designated as Local Green Space.		As above.

**OBJECTIVE 8: THE LOCAL LANDSCAPE AND WILDLIFE**

<b>Policy Number/ Reference</b>	<b>Evidence Ref No</b>	<b>Name of contributor</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested changes to the Draft NP</b>	<b>Response by MWNPSG – 8<sup>th</sup> April &amp; 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013</b>
<i>Objective 8</i>		Jennifer Collier	All agreed except 8.1	See concerns at 2.6	Noted
8.1		Jennifer Collier	Disagree. My concerns are the same as identified in respect of 2.6. Additionally, I believe that this policy has been drafted without thorough investigation of the current use of the three quarries in question. Farley Quarry, for instance, is still being used for industrial processes – believed to be the crushing of hardcore. Large vehicle movements are frequent at present. Within the last four years there is also evidence of the site being used for off-roading leisure activities. The nature of the activity includes submersing vehicles in the pool(s) and involves a significant element of danger – there was a serious accident reported in recent years.		See 2.6 above.
8.3	EM15	Vivien Bellamy	Agree	Could the word “require” be substituted for “expect” here?	Policy revised but wording kept as ‘expect’

**OBJECTIVE 9: SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE**

<b>Policy Number/Reference</b>	<b>Evidence Ref No</b>	<b>Name of contributor</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested changes to the Draft NP</b>	<b>Response by MWNPSG – 8<sup>th</sup> April &amp; 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013</b>
<i>Objective 9</i>		Jennifer Collier	Agree		Noted
<i>Objective 9 and 9.2</i>		Environment Agency, Mark Davies	Objective <b>9</b> and Policy 9.2 could make reference to local biomass facilities.	Amend	Noted; include in the policy.
<i>Objective 9</i>		Glynn Barrett, on behalf of Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership	<p>There is no reference to wind turbines. Wind turbine technology is a very emotive topic within communities in general and particularly within the protected landscape of the protected landscape of the Shropshire Hills AONB. Our policy is contained in our 2009-2014 Management Plan ( Policy 35) I quote:</p> <p>“ Proposals for wind turbines and associated technologies within the APNB should take account of factors including landscape character, visual amenity, biodiversity, heritage, recreation and overall sustainability ( including cumulative impacts), and following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within 200m of buildings (excluding Listed buildings and Conservation Areas), one or two wind turbines of up to 12m to blade tip are likely to be acceptable within the AONB.</li> <li>• Turbines of over 25m to blade tip, or groups of more than two turbines, are not likely to be acceptable within the AONB.</li> <li>• Wind turbine proposals should be linked to local energy needs and energy in preference to amenity or other measures.”</li> </ul>	Include reference.	Noted. The Plan now has a reference to the AONB Management Plan.



**General comments on the draft neighbourhood plan**

<b>Policy Number/ Reference</b>	<b>Evidence Ref No</b>	<b>Name of contributor</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested changes to the Draft NP</b>	<b>Response by MWNPSG – 8<sup>th</sup> April &amp; 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013</b>
General	HC15	Rachel. M Bradley J.P	Wishes to record her appreciation of all the time and dedication put into the preparation of the document. Sees it as essential that all decisions should present a framework for the future of the historic town of Much Wenlock.		Noted
All except 1.4	HC 4	Susan O'Dowd,	Agree with NP		Noted
All except 1.4	HC 5	John O'Dowd,	Agree with NP		Noted
All except 1.4	HC12	Yvonne Holyoak,	Agree with NP.		Noted
General		Jennifer Collier	The quantity and quality of the work that has been undertaken by the Steering Group and other volunteers has been outstanding. The community should be very pleased with this opportunity to shape the future of Much Wenlock and the surrounding area. However, the first paragraph of the draft plan indicates that the rural area to the north east of Much Wenlock has yet again been overlooked. Wenlock Edge continues north of the town towards the Severn Gorge, and this area and its wildlife are continually vulnerable to the threat of development.		Noted
General		Colin Taylor	I feel the Draft in general is a huge step forward and I hope it meets with general approval.		Noted
General		Jim Orves	The NP needs to understand the key elements of the IUDMP	Include key elements	To keep the Plan a reasonable size, key documents are referenced.
2.1, 2 3, 4 & 5		Vivien Bellamy	Agree but... Exactly what is meant by the word "support"	Define	Noted.

			here? How will this support change the present lack of interest in developing the small industrial site at Stretton Road? Will there be economic incentives?		
2.6,7& 8		Vivien Bellamy	Agree but.. Well-meaning words such as these have failed to protect the Le Quarry from unsuitable industry with accompanying increase in heavy traffic		Noted
3		Vivien Bellamy	Like “support” the word “encourage” is not defined	Amend	Noted
General		Vivien Bellamy	OVERALL, I THINK THIS AN IMPRESSIVELY COMPREHENSIVE DOCUMENT WITH A REASSURINGLY PROFESSIONAL FEEL.		Noted
Proposals Map		Mr M. Sackett, PRS Group Agent for Wenlock Estates	Disagree. The proposals map should be drawn on an up-to-date base plan which properly reflects existing built development and thus shows the context of the Plan’s proposals correctly. Additionally, the development boundary should be altered as per Drawing RPS 1 to include the following: 1. The existing planning permission for affordable housing south of Sytche Lane; 2. Site RES1 – this site is proposed for allocation for housing and has long been recognised as being a sustainable location for housing development; it is illogical to include the proposed employment land within the development boundary and exclude RES1; 3. The site which is suitable for a small housing development to the west of the town and north of Stretton Road, between the National Trust Car Park and Blakeway Hollow 4. The site which is suitable for an extension of the existing employment proposal to the west of the town and south of Stretton Road – this can be planned comprehensively having regard to	Amend map as per Drawing RPS1	Noted and an up to date base plan will be used. Other comments – see above.

			<p>proposals for a flood attenuation pond. Further, as identified on Plan RPS1, land north of Dark Lane/west of Bridgnorth Road, to the south of the Gaskell Arms Hotel has been suggested by Wenlock Estates as being suitable for a variety of potential uses which could include for example a doctors' surgery, and/or assisted living accommodation.</p>		
General		Glynn Barratt, on behalf of the Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership	<p>On behalf of the Partnership I would like to compliment the authors on the creation of a comprehensive and clear document.</p>		Noted, with thanks.